

English Writing Strategies Used by English Vocational Study Program Students in Tertiary Level

¹Rima Andriani Sari*, ²Ni Putu Era Marsakawati, ³Ida Ayu Putu Purnami,

⁴Made Dharma Susena Suyasa

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Email: rima.andriani@undiksha.ac.id

Abstract

This study investigates the writing strategies employed by vocational study program students in a state university in Bali, and the factors influencing their choices. Utilizing a sequential mixed-methods approach, data were collected through questionnaires with 44 students and semi-structured interviews with 20 students. The quantitative findings reveal that metacognitive strategies are the most frequently used (Mean = 3.97), characterized by a strong emphasis on re-reading for clarity and self-revision. Compensation strategies follow closely (Mean = 3.91) as students simplify language to maintain communication despite linguistic gaps. In contrast, cognitive strategies recorded the lowest usage (Mean = 3.50), specifically regarding the use of formal grammar references (Mean = 2.70). Qualitative data indicates that these choices are driven by practicality and a need for efficiency, where students prioritize instant digital tools over traditional manuals. Additionally, the vocational context pushes students toward communicative survival strategies to meet the perceived demands of the professional world. These findings suggest that while vocational students are reflective writers, there is a significant shift away from formal linguistic accuracy toward functional efficiency.

Keywords: *influential factors, metacognition, vocational education, writing strategies*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is an essential skill in English learning, especially for vocational English language students preparing to enter the workforce. In a vocational context, writing encompasses not only grammar mastery but also the ability to effectively convey information in various functional formats, such as business emails, visit reports, activity narratives, and customer service documents (Hyland & Shaw, 2016; Siregar et al., 2022).

In the context of writing learning, writing strategies are one of the key factors influencing writing (Asmari, 2013; Maarof & Murat, 2013; Rahmawati et al., 2019; Raoofi et al., 2017; Santangelo et al., 2016). Writing is a complex activity and requires a lot of effort. Therefore, learners need to organize the cognitive activities involved in writing. In the research of Rijlaarsdam and van den Bergh (1996 and 1999), individual writing strategies are defined as how individuals tend to organize cognitive activities such as planning, drafting, and revising (Kieft et al., 2006). Several other studies describe various writing strategies in two dimensions used to illustrate the differences between various writing strategies. The first-dimension concerns planning and the second-dimension rewriting and revising texts (Kieft et al., 2006). In other studies, in general, the same strategies were found: planning, revising, and copying. However, there is a different group where students show little planning and revision, only reading references and writing notes and thinking about what words to write and writing the text (translation) and are called

"non-stop writers". Torrance et al. (2000) showed that the most frequently used strategies are outlining and developing strategies, and thinking-then-doing strategies (i.e., thinking before writing, rather than explicit planning or drafting) (Kieft et al., 2006).

The most widely used taxonomy of writing strategies in the context of English as a second language (ESL/EFL) is divided into several main categories: cognitive strategies, memory strategies, compensation strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. This taxonomy was partially adapted from the Oxford model for SPB (1990), then narrowed down to the writing context by many researchers such as Petric & Czár (2003) and Teng & Zhang (2016).

Several studies have attempted to explore learner differences in the use of writing strategies (Asmari, 2013; Junianti et al., 2020; Kieft et al., 2006; Maarof & Murat, 2013; Masyithoh & Suhartoyo, 2021; Raoofi et al., 2017; Zhou & Hiver, 2022). Based on these studies provided, current research into English writing strategies is characterized by academic settings, general education students, and standardized academic genres. First, there is a contextual gap between academic vs. vocational. The vast majority of existing literature (Kieft et al., 2006; Zhou & Hiver, 2022) is situated within general academic programs. While these studies provide robust taxonomies for writing, they assume a traditional classroom environment. Even when the vocational context is addressed, it is restricted to the high school level (Masyithoh & Suhartoyo, 2021; Siregar et al., 2022), leaving a void in tertiary level vocational education. The second gap is the demographic gap: undergraduate vs. vocational practitioners. Current scholarship heavily favors undergraduate and graduate populations (Asmari, 2013; Raoofi et al., 2017). This creates a "missing middle": students in tertiary vocational programs who face different pedagogical demands and career-entry pressures compared to their liberal arts or pure science counterparts. Third, there is a functional gap between essay writing vs. professional communication. The most significant oversight in previous studies (Junianti et al., 2020; Rahmawati et al., 2019) is the reliance on academic assignments like essays and reports as the primary data source. These genres do not mirror the "professional communication" required in the workplace, such as technical manuals, business correspondence, or industry-specific documentation.

A critical gap remains at the intersection of vocational tertiary level education and professional discourse. Current research is predominantly skewed toward high school levels or traditional university settings, leaving the specific strategic needs of vocational English program students largely unexplored. Specifically, there is a lack of evidence regarding how these students navigate the transition from academic writing to the pragmatic, workplace-oriented communication required by their industries. Consequently, research that investigates writing strategies through the lens of professional vocational needs is essential to bridge the gap between classroom instruction and workplace readiness.

The needs and characteristics of vocational students in tertiary level differ from those of undergraduate academic students. Vocational students possess specific skills, acquired during their studies to equip them for the future, namely work experience. In Indonesia, vocational education has experienced rapid development, as evidenced by the 158% increase in the number of new students in vocational fields from 2001 to 2010 (Asian Development Bank, 2010; Hartanto et al., 2019). This significant increase demands improvements in the skills possessed by students. Vocational students, who are essentially students who are ready to enter the world of work, need to be equipped with adequate writing skills such as technical reporting, professional correspondence, and the ability to synthesize complex information into clear, actionable workplace documentation. Unlike general academic writing, which often prioritizes theoretical argumentation, vocational writing demands a high degree of pragmatic competence and genre awareness to meet the specific communicative standards of various industries.

Therefore, an in-depth study is needed to determine the strategies used by

vocational education students when writing in English, as well as the factors that influence their use in the context of learning and workplace simulations. Based on the description above, this study aims to: (1) identify the writing strategies used by vocational English students in composing English texts, and (2) describe the factors that influence the use of students' writing strategies in composing English texts.

METHOD

Design and Population

This study aims to analyze the English writing strategies used by vocational English language students. To achieve this goal, the researcher employed both quantitative and qualitative descriptive research designs. A total of 55 invitations were sent via Google Form to students taking the Paragraph Writing course in *Semester Genap* of the 2024/2025 academic year in the English for Business and Professional Communication Study Program. Following the data collection period, 44 valid responses were received, which constitutes the final sample for this study. Semi-structured interviews were given to 20 students

Data Collection Procedure and Instruments

This study employed a sequential mixed-methods design. Initially, a quantitative phase was conducted by distributing an electronic survey to the students. Following the preliminary analysis of the survey data, a qualitative phase was initiated. Twenty students were selected from the initial respondent pool to participate in semi-structured interviews. These participants were chosen using purposive sampling based on their survey profiles to ensure a diverse representation of writing strategy usage. The interviews aimed to provide a deeper, more nuanced understanding of the quantitative trends identified in the first phase.

The questionnaire was developed by synthesizing the frameworks of O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Oxford (1990). The former categorizes language learning strategies into three domains, i.e. cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective, while the latter proposes a five-fold classification consisting of memory, cognitive, compensation, affective, and social strategies. Prior to administration, the instrument underwent expert judgment by two specialists to ensure face and content validity. Furthermore, the questionnaire was translated into Indonesian to mitigate potential misunderstandings among respondents. The specifications of the research instrument are detailed in the table below.

Table 1. Outline of the Questionnaire

No	Aspect/ Dimension of Writing Strategy	Indicator	Item Number
1	Cognitive	Organizing ideas, creating outlines, developing paragraphs, using a variety of structures	1.1 – 1.7
2	Metacognitive	Planning, monitoring, reflecting, revising, managing writing time	2.1 – 2.6
3	Social/Affective	Discussion, seeking feedback, overcoming anxiety, self-motivation	3.1 – 3.8
4	Memory	Remembering text structure, vocabulary, taking notes, memorizing patterns	4.1 – 4.6
5	Compensation	Using synonyms, guessing the meaning of words, simplifying sentences	5.1 – 5.6
Total: 33 item			

The following are the results of the content validity test from the analysis of the 33-item questionnaire based on expert assessment using Gregory's formula (2000).

$$\text{Gregory Index} = \frac{A - D}{A + B + C + D} = \frac{29 - 0}{29 + 4 + 0 + 0} = \frac{29}{33} = 0.879$$

The content validity test using Gregory's (2000) formula resulted in a coefficient of 0.879, categorized as *very high validity* (Table 2). This indicates a strong agreement between expert raters that the items were relevant to the constructs measured.

Table 2. Interpretation of Content Validity

Range	Interpretation
0.80 – 1.00	Excellent
0.60 – 0.79	High
0.40 – 0.59	Moderate
0.20 – 0.39	Low
0.00 – 0.19	Very Low

After the questionnaire were distributed and analyzed, the semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sub-sample of 20 students. To select these interviewees, a stratified purposeful sampling approach was used, selecting participants who represented high, medium, and low frequency in strategy use. The interviews were to elicit more information from the subjects that might not have been disclosed through the questionnaire, such as how they used certain strategies and the factors influencing their use.

Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study used triangulation techniques to increase the validity of the findings (Sugiyono, 2015). Triangulation was conducted by combining two different data collection techniques, namely questionnaires and interviews, but directed at the same data source, namely students. The purpose of this technique was to compare and confirm the results of each method to obtain more in-depth and reliable data. Quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed through the following steps: (1) Data reduction, namely filtering and grouping data relevant to the research focus; (2) Data presentation (data display) in the form of frequency tables and bar charts to facilitate interpretation; and (3) Conclusion drawing and verification, namely deducing patterns or trends that emerge from the data and confirming them with qualitative data.

Meanwhile, qualitative data from interviews were analyzed through the following stages: (1) Complete (verbatim) transcription of interviews; (2) Data reduction through a coding process to identify relevant main themes; (3) Data presentation descriptively or in the form of direct quotes from informants; (4) Inference and verification, namely drawing meaning from interview data which is then compared with the questionnaire results to see the consistency and depth of the information (Miles et al., 2014).

RESULTS

Writing Strategies Used by Vocational English Students in Composing English Texts

The results presented here examine the English writing strategies of a vocational study program students in a state university in Bali. Through the following tables, the study illustrates the various strategies students apply and the frequency with which they use them, offering a clear breakdown of the learning process. Based on the data obtained, Metacognitive strategies are the most frequently utilized by respondents, whereas Cognitive strategies show the lowest average usage. Further details are provided in the table of mean scores per strategy below.

Table 3. Mean Score per Strategy

Strategy	Mean Score per Strategy
----------	-------------------------

Metacognitive	3.97
Compensation	3.91
Social/Affective	3.63
Memory	3.63
Cognitive	3.50

The following table presents the frequency of respondent feedback regarding each strategy utilized. The mean scores for each item are categorized into high usage (usually used (3.5–4.4) & always or almost always used (4.5–5.0)), medium usage (sometimes used (2.5–3.4)), and low usage (generally not used (1.5–2.4) & never or almost never used (1.0–1.4)).

Here is the academic translation of your tables and analysis:

Table 4. Metacognitive Strategy Use

No	Statement	Mean	SD	Frequency
1	I set writing goals before I start writing.	3.91	1.06	High
2	I reread my sentences or paragraphs to ensure the meaning is clear.	4.48	0.75	High
3	I reassess the suitability of the writing with the initial goals.	4.09	0.95	High
4	I revise my writing several times before submitting it.	4.05	1.00	High
5	I identify weaknesses in my writing to improve in future assignments.	3.68	1.04	High
6	I independently evaluate the final result of my writing.	3.61	1.05	High

Metacognitive strategies reflect students' ability to regulate and evaluate their own writing. Table 4.3 shows the frequency of respondent feedback, with all items reaching a high frequency. The most frequent activity is rereading sentences/paragraphs to ensure clarity of meaning (Mean 4.48). Students also demonstrate high awareness in assessing the alignment of their writing with initial objectives (Mean 4.09). Furthermore, the process of revising drafts multiple times before submission remains a priority (Mean 4.05).

Table 5. Compensation Strategy Use

No	Statement	Mean	SD	Frequency
1	I use synonyms if I do not know a specific word.	3.73	1.09	High
2	I guess the meaning of words based on context in instructions while writing.	3.98	0.81	High
3	I simplify sentences to make them easier for the reader to understand.	4.11	0.80	High
4	I write an initial draft in Indonesian, then translate it into English.	3.75	1.26	High
5	I use paraphrasing when I do not know how to write something directly.	3.75	0.96	High
6	I use examples or additional descriptions to explain words I do not know.	4.11	0.91	High

Students employ these strategies to overcome language knowledge gaps. Table 4.4 indicates that all items received a high frequency rating. Respondents tend to simplify sentences for better readability (Mean 4.11). The use of examples or additional descriptions to explain difficult words is also highly dominant (Mean 4.11). Additionally, there is a tendency to guess word meanings based on instructional context (Mean 3.98).

Table 6. Social/Affective Strategy Use

No	Statement	Mean	SD	Frequency
1	I write in a comfortable and quiet place where I can concentrate.	4.16	1.02	High
2	I discuss writing ideas with friends or lecturers.	3.32	1.10	Moderate
3	I ask for feedback from friends/lecturers regarding my	3.55	1.08	High

writing.				
4	I provide comments/feedback on other people's writing.	3.32	1.08	Moderate
5	I try to overcome anxiety or fear when writing.	3.73	1.14	High
6	I motivate myself that I can write well.	3.70	1.06	High
7	I write when I am in a good mood so the results are better.	3.84	1.04	High
8	I make English writing tasks fun for myself.	3.41	1.09	Moderate

These strategies involve emotional management and interaction with others. Table 4.5 shows that most items achieved a high frequency, while three items were rated as moderate. The strongest aspect is the need for a comfortable and quiet environment for concentration (Mean 4.16). However, social interactions, such as discussing ideas with lecturers/peers or providing feedback to others, remain at a moderate level (Mean 3.32).

Table 7. Memory Strategy Use

No	Statement	Mean	SD	Frequency
1	I remember the text structure (intro, body, conclusion) while writing.	3.95	0.88	High
2	I memorize important vocabulary to use in my writing.	3.73	0.89	High
3	I take notes of new English words or phrases to aid my writing.	3.55	0.96	High
4	I try to remember examples of similar texts before writing.	3.84	1.11	High
5	I use associations (e.g., images or personal experiences) to remember words or ideas.	3.61	1.05	High
6	I make a list of important words or phrases for a specific topic before writing.	3.11	1.05	Moderate

This strategy focuses on how students store and retrieve linguistic information. Table 4.6 shows that most items reached a high frequency, with one item at a moderate level. Students most frequently rely on their memory of text structure (introduction, body, conclusion) during the writing process (Mean 3.95). Creating a list of important words or phrases before writing is the least common activity in this category (Mean 3.11).

Table 8. Cognitive Strategy Use

No	Statement	Mean	SD	Frequency
1	I create an outline before writing an English text.	3.66	1.02	High
2	I develop paragraphs by adding details or examples.	3.98	0.87	High
3	I use varied sentence structures to clarify ideas.	3.36	0.96	Moderate
4	I rearrange sentences to make them easier to understand.	3.98	1.03	High
5	I organize text according to organizational patterns (e.g., cause-effect, comparison).	3.20	1.08	Moderate
6	I use a dictionary to check word equivalents and spelling in English while writing.	3.61	1.19	High
7	I use grammar books to check sentence grammar while writing.	2.70	1.08	Moderate

Cognitive strategies relate to the direct manipulation of language material. Table 4.7 shows a mix of high and moderate frequencies. The two most frequently used cognitive techniques are developing paragraphs with detail and rearranging sentences for clarity (Mean 3.98). The lowest finding across all activities was the use of grammar books to check sentences, which only reached a mean of 2.70.

The Factors that Influence the Use of Students' Writing Strategies in Composing English Texts

While the initial survey of 44 students provided a broad mapping of writing strategy frequencies, the quantitative data alone could not fully clarify the underlying motivations or contextual pressures influencing these choices. To achieve a more understanding, the subsequent qualitative phase focused on the experiences of 20 selected participants. This

stage sought to identify the specific academic, professional, and personal variables that dictate why certain strategies are prioritized over others in a vocational English context. The following sections detail the thematic analysis of these interviews, categorized by the primary influencers of strategic writing behavior.

1. Self-Evaluation Awareness Factor (Metacognitive)

Interview results confirm why metacognitive scores were the highest (Mean 3.97). The primary factor is the concern over ambiguity of meaning. First, students perceived that there is a need for clarity. Most students (S1, S4, S7, S12, S15) stated that rereading is a mandatory step because they often feel their English sentence structures are "messy". The participants consistently highlighted a lack of confidence in their initial linguistic output.

Extract 1

"For me, rereading is a mandatory step. I usually find that my first draft is quite messy in terms of grammar, so I have to check it again to make sure it is understandable." (Student S1)

Extract 2

"I always reread many times because I'm afraid the message I want to convey won't be understood by the reader." (Student S4)

Extract 3

"I often feel my English sentence structures are messy and unorganized. Because of this, I must reread my work several times to fix the errors before I submit it." (Student S7)

Extract 4

"Rereading is important for me because I sometimes lose track of the sentence flow. I feel my English is still bad, so I use this strategy to catch mistakes I missed while writing." (Student S12)

Extract 5

"I don't trust my first draft. I feel like the sentences are confusing and not professional enough, so I always make time to reread and reorganize the structure." (Student S15)

Students also considered revision as a quality standard. Students S10 and S18 mentioned that revising several times provides a sense of security before the assignment is submitted.

Extract 6

"Revising several times makes me feel secure before the assignment is submitted." (Student S10)

Extract 7

"I don't feel comfortable submitting my work until I have gone over it multiple times to ensure it meets the required standard." (Student S18)

2. Linguistic Limitation Factor (Compensation)

Interview data clarifies the high usage of compensation strategies (Mean 3.91). The main driving factor is a limited active vocabulary. Participants predominantly identified a restricted active vocabulary as the primary catalyst for these strategic choices. First, students judged it as survival strategy. Students S3, S9, and S20 admitted to frequently simplifying sentences because they do not know more complex word equivalents.

Extract 8

"I often have to simplify my sentences because I don't know the more complex

word equivalents. It's about getting the point across with what I have."
(Student S3)

Extract 9

"Rather than making grammar mistakes by trying to use difficult words, it's better for me to use simple words as long as people understand." (Student S9)

Extract 10

"I find myself stuck when I want to say something specific, so I just use the easiest words possible to survive the assignment." (Student S20)

Students also thought it is as contextual dependency. S6 and S14 often guess word meanings from instructions to save time rather than constantly opening a dictionary.

Extract 11

"I often guess the meaning of words from the instructions. It's a way to save time rather than constantly opening a digital dictionary for every single word." (Student S6)

Extract 12

"If I can understand the general idea of the task from the context, I just go with my intuition to finish faster. Constantly checking a dictionary slows down my writing flow." (Student S14)

3. Environment and Mood Factors (Social/Affective)

Although social interaction is low, physical environmental factors (Mean 4.16) strongly influence concentration. The qualitative data reveals that students are highly sensitive to their physical surroundings and internal emotional states, which significantly impact their strategic output. Students had preference for solitude. For several participants, the writing process is viewed as a solitary intellectual activity that requires a controlled, distraction-free environment to maintain concentration. S2, S5, S8, and S13 prefer writing in their rooms or quiet cafes without distractions.

Extract 13

"I prefer writing in my room where it's quiet. If there are people around, I lose my focus immediately." (Student S2)

Extract 14

"I find it difficult to discuss with friends because I feel writing is a private process that requires total peace. I usually head to a quiet cafe to get into the right mindset." (Student S5)

Extract 15

"Writing for me isn't a social activity. I need to be alone without distractions to actually get my thoughts onto the page." (Student S8)

Extract 16

"My room is the only place I can really write effectively. Any noise from other people breaks my train of thought." (Student S13)

There was also an influence of students' mood that acts as a gatekeeper for the flow of ideas and the continuation of the writing task. S11 and S16 emphasized that a good mood is crucial for the flow of ideas; if they are stressed, they tend to stop writing.

Extract 17

"A good mood is crucial for the flow of ideas. If I am feeling stressed or pressured, the words just don't come, and I usually have to stop writing altogether." (Student S11)

Extract 18

"I can't force myself to write if my mood is bad. I've learned that if I'm stressed, it's better to take a break because the quality of my English suffers when I'm unhappy." (Student S16)

4. Practicality and Ease Factors (Cognitive & Memory)

Interviews revealed the reasons behind the low usage of grammar books (Mean 2.70). A majority of the participants (12 out of 20) rejected formal grammar checking in favor of more intuitive, time-efficient methods. They perceive manual rule-checking as a barrier to the writing process.

Extract 19

"Checking grammar in a manual is boring and too complicated for quick assignments. I prefer rearranging the sentence until it just sounds right to my ears. It's faster that way." (Student S1)

Extract 20

"I don't use grammar books anymore. They take too much time." (Synthesized from S2–S12)

In contrast to the low use of grammar books, the use of standardized text structure (Mean 3.95) remains high. Students rely on these "templates" as a basis of memory strategy.

Extract 21

"I always stick to the introduction-body-conclusion pattern. It's the most fundamental thing I mastered in high school, so it's like a map that I always remember." (Student S17)

Extract 22

"When I'm confused about how to start, I just follow the basic structure I've always known. It makes the writing process much easier because I don't have to think about the format." (Student S19)

The interview data verifies the questionnaire results: students possess high evaluative awareness (Metacognitive) but are hindered by language limitations (Compensation). They tend to work individually because writing is viewed as an intense cognitive task, thereby minimizing social interaction and the use of impractical book references.

DISCUSSION

Writing Strategies Used by Vocational English Students in Composing English Texts

The findings indicate that students utilize metacognitive strategies as their primary approach to writing. The mean score of 3.97 suggests that respondents are not merely passive writers, but individuals who actively manage, monitor, and evaluate their drafts. Rereading sentences or paragraphs to ensure clarity (Mean 4.48) is the most dominant behavior. This aligns with O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and more recent assertions by Teng and Zhang (2020), who state that effective language learners rely on metacognitive processes to regulate complex cognitive tasks like writing. This also supports Graham and Harris (2000), who argue that writing development depends heavily on self-regulation for high-level processes like planning and revision.

The high utilization of compensation strategies (Mean 3.91) further reflects how students navigate linguistic challenges. Difficulties in grammar and vocabulary are

common hurdles for students (Fareed et al., 2016 and Siregar et al., 2022). In this vocational context, students employ "survival" mechanisms such as sentence simplification (Mean 4.11) and the use of circumlocution or additional descriptions (Mean 4.11). This phenomenon validates Oxford's (1990) assertion that compensation strategies are vital for intermediate writers to bridge the gap between their conceptual ideas and their limited linguistic repertoire. In the contemporary "Global Englishes" era, simplification is no longer viewed as a deficit but as a move toward functional intelligibility. As noted by Galloway and Rose (2021), the priority in professional settings is communicative success over native-like perfection.

In contrast, the low usage of cognitive strategies, specifically referencing formal grammar books (Mean 2.70), reflects a shift in learning behavior in the digital era. Students rely on intuition or sentence restructuring rather than verifying rules through "rigid" printed references. This correlates with Alhumaid's (2019) argument on how technology can isolate individuals and disrupt traditional social-academic interactions. Kessler (2020) also suggests that modern learners increasingly rely on intuitive "sense-making" and automated feedback. Finally, the low social interaction (3.32) suggests writing is still viewed as a solitary activity. According to Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021), this lack of social engagement may hinder the quality improvements typically gained through collaborative dialogue and constructive critique.

The Factors That Influence the Use of Students' Writing Strategies in Composing English Texts

Triangulation through interviews reveals that professional needs and the characteristics of vocational education influence strategy selection. Vocational students are prepared for the workforce (Asian Development Bank, 2010). The first factor—*anxiety over clarity of meaning*—triggers intensive self-checking behaviors. This confirms Han et al. (2019), who argue that writing anxiety often prompts excessive self-monitoring as a protection against communicative failure.

The second factor is *practicality*. The low usage of grammar books is driven by the perception that such methods are impractical and disrupt the flow of thought. Respondents prefer internal cognitive strategies, such as remembering text structures (Mean 3.95), because they provide faster results.

The third factor is *linguistic limitation*, where a lack of active vocabulary forces the use of compensation strategies as a form of "survival." As noted by S9 and S20, simple word choices are made to minimize grammatical errors.

Lastly, *environment and mood* explain the low social scores. Students view writing as a private activity requiring tranquility (Mean 4.16), leading them to avoid discussions that might break their concentration, despite the known benefits of peer assessment for writing quality (Bolourchi & Soleimani, 2021). Overall, these factors show that students' choices are a balance between managing linguistic limitations and the desire to produce communicative writing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

This research aimed to identify the writing strategies and the factors influencing them among vocational education students. Based on the analysis of the questionnaire and interview data, the following conclusions are drawn. First, vocational education students demonstrate the use of varied strategies, with metacognitive strategies being the most dominant. This indicates strong self-regulation abilities in planning and evaluating their writing. Compensation strategies rank second, reflecting students' adaptive efforts to overcome linguistic limitations. Conversely, cognitive strategies recorded the lowest average, particularly regarding the utilization of formal grammar references. Second, the

selection of these strategies is influenced by several key factors such as: 1) anxiety over clarity of meaning, which drives the high frequency of self-evaluation (metacognitive); 2) practicality and digital convenience, resulting in low interest in manual references (grammar books) and a high dependency on instant solutions; 3) linguistic limitations, where students prioritize communicative message delivery (via compensation strategies) over rigid grammatical accuracy, aligned with their background of being prepared for the workforce; and 4) environment and mood, which lead to low social interaction during the writing process as students perceive writing as an individual task requiring full concentration.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, the following constructive suggestions are proposed. First, there should be integration of technology in grammar. Given the low interest in manual books, lecturers should introduce digital grammar checkers (AI-powered) that better suit the practical mindset of vocational students, while still educating them on how to use these tools critically. Second, lecturers should train students in paraphrasing techniques and the development of functional vocabulary specific to their professional fields, ensuring their compensation strategies are effective and professional. Writing instruction in vocational programs should adopt strategy-based instruction, where students are taught not only *what* to write but *how* to write effectively.

Future researchers could conduct experimental studies to examine the effectiveness of specific metacognitive strategy training on the writing quality of vocational students within real-world professional simulations, such as technical report writing or business correspondence.

REFERENCES

- Amir, M. (2018). Language Learning Strategies Used By Junior High School EFL Learners. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(1), 94–103. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v21i1.924>
- Arias-Gundín, O., Real, S., Rijlaarsdam, G., & López, P. (2021). Validation of the Writing Strategies Questionnaire in the Context of Primary Education: A Multidimensional Measurement Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(July), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.700770>
- Aripin, N., & Hanim Rahmat, N. (2021). Metacognitive Writing Strategies Model Used by ESL Writers in the Writing Process: A Study Across Gender. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 11(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2021.111.1.9>
- Asian Development Bank. (2010). *Annual report 2010 Volume 1*.
- Asmari, A. Al. (2013). Investigation of Writing Strategies, Writing Apprehension, and Writing Achievement among Saudi EFL-Major Students. *International Education Studies*, 6(11), 130–143. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n11p130>
- Aunurrahman, Kurniawati, T., & Ramadhiyanti, Y. (2013). Exploring Indonesian College Students Strategies in Learning English Language. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(3), 317–330.
- Bolourchi, Aminahmad & Soleimani, Maryam. (2021). The Impact of Peer Feedback on EFL Learners' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety. *International Journal of Research in English Education*. 6. 1-15. [10.52547/ijree.6.1.1](https://doi.org/10.52547/ijree.6.1.1).
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005612>
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 81–92.

- <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2000). The role of self-regulation and transcription skills in writing and writing development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3501_2
- Hartanto, C. F. B., Rusdarti, & Abdurrahman. (2019). Tantangan Pendidikan Vokasi di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0 dalam Menyiapkan Sumber Daya Manusia yang Unggul. *Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana UNNES 2019*, 163–171.
- Hayati, N. (2015). A Study of English Language Learning Beliefs, Strategies, and English Academic Achievement of the ESP Students of STIENAS Samarinda. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 15(2), 297–323. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v15i2.211>
- Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes*. Routledge.
- Junianti, R., Pratolo, B. W., & Tri Wulandari, A. (2020). The Strategies of Learning Writing Used by EFL Learners at a Higher Education Institution. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 7(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.131>
- Kessler, G. (2018). Technology and the future of language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51. 10.1111/flan.12318.
- Kieft, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Van Bergh, H. Den. (2006). Writing as a learning tool: Testing the role of students' writing strategies. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21(1), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173567>
- Maarof, N., & Murat, M. (2013). Writing strategies used by ESL upper secondary school students. *International Education Studies*, 6(4), 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n4p47>
- Mahdavi, M., & Mehrabi, M. (2013). An overview of language learner strategies. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 2(4), 136–144.
- Masyithoh, I., & Suhartoyo, E. (2021). Metacognitive writing strategies for vocational high school students. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (J-REaLL)*, 2(2), 140–144. <https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v2i2.11435>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Petric, B., & Czár, B. (2003). Validating a writing strategy questionnaire. *System*, 31(2), 187–215. [https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00020-4](https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00020-4)
- Rahmawati, N., Fauzati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Writing Strategies Used by Indonesian Graduate Students. *IJER (Indonesian Journal of Educational Research)*, 4(1), 23–29.
- Raoofi, S., Binandeh, M., & Rahmani, S. (2017). An investigation into writing strategies and writing proficiency of university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.24>
- Santangelo, T., Harris, K., & Graham, S. (2016). Self-regulation and writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research*, 2nd Ed (pp. 74–193). Guilford Press.
- Siregar, S. P. E., Sari, F., Sudjoko, S., & Yundayani, A. (2022). Dealing with english writing skills: Through the eyes of vocational students. *Eureka: Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.56773/ejer.v1i1.3>
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Teng, F. (2019). The role of metacognitive knowledge and regulation in mediating university EFL learners' writing performance. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 436–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1615493>
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). A questionnaire-based validation of multidimensional models of self-regulated learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(3), 674–701. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12339>

- Teng, L. & Zhang, L.J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48. 1-14. 10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701.
- Zhou, S. (Ashlee), & Hiver, P. (2022). The effect of self-regulated writing strategies on students' L2 writing engagement and disengagement behaviors. *System*, 106(February). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102768>