Introduction

In the area of L2 learning, much attention had been paid to the relationship between L2 learning processes and learning strategies. When considering the relationship between strategy use and language learning, researchers concentrated on variables such as language skills and language proficiency. Consequently, a lot of research investigated the employment of learning strategies and yielded the existence of relationships between strategy use and learning outcomes in the L2 area. Other researchers reported results which have to do with the number and type of strategies employed by successful learners and the number and type of those employed by unsuccessful ones. As far as the number of strategies used is concerned, it has been proved that more successful learners make use of more strategies in comparison to less successful ones. However, other studies proved that no such relationship exists between frequency of strategy use and learners proficiency level (cf. Chamot and El-Dinary, 1999 as cited in Park (1994: 299). This necessitates, according to Park (ibid), the investigation of different aspects of strategy use by learners beyond the dimension of frequency of strategy use. In their (1987) study, Abraham and Vann discovered that strategies were employed randomly in an unplanned way by less effective the learners with them being used in a systematic and organized way by effective learners. A study by Nunan (1991) revealed that language learning processes were articulated with a greater ability by effective learners than by less effective ones. As for the type of strategies employed, some studies proved that more cognitive strategies were used by proficient learners (Oxford and Ehman, 1995: 185 and Park , 1994), whereas others showed that metacognitive strategies were more employed by such learners Purpura, 1999 as cited in Park (ibid: 300).

Thus, it is evident that much research has been carried out in this area, whereas, as Park (ibid.) points out, less research has investigated strategies in a specific domain and even less has been done for L2 writing. Some studies like Vann and Abraham, (1990) and Zamel (1983) investigated the use of writing strategies in terms of the relations between strong writers and weak writers. However, little research has been done on the relationship between L2 writing development and learning strategies. Thus, Park's (1994) study aims at investigating the
development of L2 writing putting emphasis on the relationship between strategy use and L2 writing development.

1. Previous Studies

A number of studies have been carried out concerning the type of strategies used and their relationship with L2 proficiency. As has been mentioned above, learning strategies are certain kind of actions which learners perform to enhance their learning process. Previous studies proved the existence of a positive relationship between language proficiency and learning strategies. (cf. Oxford and Ehrman, 1995: 181; Oxford, Judd and Giesen, 1998: 155 and Purpura, 1999: 70) as cited in Park (1994: 302). In other words, more proficient learners use more strategies with more success than less proficient ones (e.g. Chen, 1990: 200 and Green and Oxford, 1995). In Chen's study, the subjects were 12 English majors of different proficiency levels. Results of the study showed that it is not how many strategies learners employ which makes a difference in language learning but it is how successfully learners use proper strategies on a specific language task. Thus, irrespective of their level of proficiency, all learners made use of strategies, however, the more proficient learners employed particular strategies effectively and the less proficient ones used them ineffectively.

In this respect, a number of studies have been conducted among which is the one by O'Malley and Chamot (1990: 305) who investigated in a longitudinal study the learning strategies employed by effective and ineffective foreign language students for four semesters. Through the use of a think-aloud protocol, they investigated the learning strategies used by learners in doing different tasks they were asked to perform. Analysis of results revealed differences in strategy use especially in writing tasks. Whereas effective students learning Russian made use of mostly the same types and frequencies of strategies over time, ineffective students displayed a remarkable increase in use of metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective strategies for the writing task. On the other hand, regardless of their proficiency level, effective students learning Spanish showed significant increase in the use of strategies for the writing task. Thus, this longitudinal study showed that a greater range of strategies with more frequency are used by more effective language learners and that an important factor in strategy use is student motivation for learning.

Another study by Khalidieh (2000: 210-250) involved examining American students' strategies by observing their learning journals. It has been found out that there is a difference between proficient writers and less proficient ones in the use of two strategies, risk-taking and anxiety with proficient L2 Arabic writers intending to take more risks and showing lower anxiety than less-proficient L2 Arabic writers. The study
proved that the reason behind the difference between L2 learners in strategy use and improvement in writing is their lack of linguistic proficiency.

Korean college students' writing process based on their use of strategies was examined by Kim (2001: 173) who asked sixty–five college students to answer a questionnaire made up of 36 items which have to do with writing strategies related to different stages of writing process: pre-writing, during–writing and post–writing. Results proved that Korean students did not give enough time to revise and edit their essays and paid much attention to superficial-grammatical accuracy. According to Kim this lack in composing strategies is due to the teaching method of English writing in Korea which puts more emphasis on the final product with no instruction on writing strategies. Kim's study suggested that Korean learners may be weak at using strategies even though her study did not directly deal with learning strategies in L2 writing.

The results of the above mentioned studies highlight the fact that successful learners are more active in language learning and more eager to employ learning strategies than less successful ones.

Park's (1994) study aims at investigating whether or not Korean EFL learners' learning strategies affect L2 writing development. To achieve this end, the range and frequency of learning strategies that Korean EFL learners employ for developing their essays are examined and then the relationship between those strategies and development of L2 writing are investigated for eight representative student writers in terms of the holistic and analytic aspects. The study uses as subjects 30 Korean college students enrolled in an English composition course. Ten of them are males whereas the rest are females. From those, 8 were randomly selected on the basis of their scores on the learning strategies questionnaire for the purpose of investigating the relationship between L2 writing development and strategy use. Those 8 representative students were composed of 3 high strategy users, 2 medium strategy users and 3 low strategy users. To survey the range and frequency of learning strategies by Korean students for English compositions Oxford (1990)'s SILL (Strategy Inventory for Language Learning) was adopted and translated. The questionnaire which is composed of memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies is made up of 45 items on a 5 point- likert scale. For the holistic evaluation Hugh, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Jacobs' scales were used. Depending on Hugh etal's guideline scales, the student writers' essays were rated by an experienced ESL native teacher. As for the analytic evaluation of essays, it was performed through the use of objective measures: total words.
Park (1994:305) started by explaining the purpose of the survey to the participants, then they followed his instructions to complete the questionnaire in the classroom at the end of the semester. The writing samples, on the other hand, were collected both at the beginning and end of the semester. Time limit was given to write the essays whose topics were "My most memorable/interesting/joyful thing" and "Advice to freshmen" respectively.

Results of the study proved that Korean learners are not generally active strategy users and that they preferred using social strategies than other types of strategy. In addition, it was proved that the more actively learners used learning strategies, the more they showed improvement both in terms of the holistic and analytic evaluation. This is reflected in the fact that learners who more frequently employed learning strategies went through more improvement in their writings. This finding suggests that there does exist a relationship between strategy use and L2 writing development a fact which necessitates teachers and learners being aware of learning strategy training.

2. Research Questions

Being based on Park's (1994) study; the present study aims at investigating how Iraqi EFL learners' learning strategies affect writing development. To achieve this end, it first investigates the range and frequency of learning strategies employed by Iraqi EFL learners in order to develop their essays and, then, it examines the relationship, if any, between learning strategies and L2 writing development for the 24 student writers in terms of the holistic and analytic aspects. Thus, the present research has set itself the task of answering the following questions:

1. what strategies do Iraqi EFL learners use for improving their writing skills?
2. Are there any relationship between strategy use and L2 writing development?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants are 24 Iraqi 3rd year college students in the Department of English, College of Arts, University of Baghdad. The rationale behind selecting 3rd year students is that they have a course called "Essay and letter writing" the aim of which is to help students to develop their ability in L2 writing. Unlike Park's (1994) study, all of the 24 students participated in writing essays at the beginning and end of the
The purpose behind this is to get at a better view at the relationship between strategy use and L2 writing development.

3.2 Instruments

Following Park's (1994) study, the present study employs the same Oxford (1990)'s SILL for the purpose of investigating both the range and the frequency of learning strategies by Iraqi EFL for English compositions. Thus, the same 45 items questionnaire on a 5 point- likert scale and which is composed of memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies is used.

Memory strategies are related to the storage and retrieval of new information such as grouping and using imagery. Cognitive strategies are those involving manipulation of learning materials like resourcing and inferencing. Compensation strategies make up for limitations in grammar and vocabulary. The process of guessing intelligently and coining words are realizations of this kind of strategy. Metacognitive strategies embody planning thinking about, and evaluating learning. Affective strategies are related to managing and controlling emotions for L2 learning as in lowering anxiety and encouraging oneself. Finally, social strategies require interaction with native speakers or other proficient L2 speakers for the sake of asking and cooperation.

The holistic evaluation was measured from the same scale used in Park's study, namely, that of Hugh, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Jacobs'(1983). Based on the Hugh et al.'s guideline scales, the student writers' essays were related by an experienced ESL native teacher. The analytic evaluation of essays was carried out in terms of the objective measures TW, TS, TC, EFS, EFC and DC. These measures were employed in a number of studies to evaluate learners' development in fluency, accuracy and complexity of L2 writing (cf. Arther, 1979; Hirano, 1991; Larsen-Freeman, 1968, 1983 as cited in Park, 1994: 309).

This study assumes that the development of fluency in L2 writing is reflected in the total words, clauses, and sentences and the improvement in accuracy is mirrored in the number of error- free clauses and sentences with the complexity of writing being indicated in the number of dependent clauses.

3.3 Procedure

The students' learning strategies were surveyed both at the beginning and end of the academic year 2005-2006 using the same questionnaire. The writing samples were also collected at both times. Time limit was given for the writing of the essays and the topics were as in Park's (ibid) study "My most memorable /interesting/ joyful thing" and "Advice to freshmen". To get at a better view of the students
development, each of the participants was supposed to write on the same topic which he or she had chosen to write about at the beginning of the course.

4. Results
4.1 Overall Range and Frequency of Strategies
The first thing to do is to calculate each category of learning strategies according to memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social categories (cf. Table 1 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strategy category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear in the table above, the total mean of strategies used is 3.64 which indicates that learners somewhat use learning strategies. This view is reflected in the figures above which point to the fact that students take a little positive position towards using those strategies. However, this does not mean that they actually employ those strategies. In general, the most frequently used type of strategies is metacognitive with a mean of (4). This means that students are active in planning, understanding and using best writing conditions in addition to paying attention to their mistakes and to their progress in writing English. On the other hand, the least frequently used strategies are the cognitive ones with a mean of (3.47) and this indicates that learners are least effective in cognitive matters like applying a general rule to a new context or making a summary of the composition. In addition, they do not rely heavily on direct translation of expressions, words, concepts or structures from their native language to the target language. Between those two types of strategy, social strategies occupy the second position with a score of (3.80) followed by memory (3.54), affective (3.53) and compensation (3.53).

Generally the score gained at the end of the year (Time 2) are higher than those at the beginning of the year (Time 1) when the researcher surveyed students’ learning strategies using the same questionnaire. Table 2 below shows the mean of each strategy category.
Table (2) means of Each Strategy Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melacognitive</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worth noting that in both times Metacognitive strategies occupy the highest position among other strategies with a mean of (3.81) in Time One and (4) in Time Two. However, Whereas in Time Two cognitive strategies occupy the final position, in Time One, this position is occupied by compensation strategies. Memory and social strategies exchange their places in that in Time One memory strategies occupy the second position followed by social strategies with the opposite being true in Time Two. In both times, affective strategies occupy the same position, namely, the fourth one and like metacognitive and social strategies, cognitive and compensation strategies exchange their places with cognitive occupying the fifth position and compensation the final one in Time One and the opposite happening in Time Two.

In Time One, the strategies that learners employ most are:

14 I make a note of main ideas and specific points. (mean= 4.91).
1  I memorize new English words with a meaningful sentence. (mean= 4.87)
22 I pay attention to linguistic structures which are important for the writing. (mean= 4.66)
23 I try to find out how to be a better English writer through reading or talking with someone. (mean= 4.62)
30 I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better. (mean= 4.50)
29 I look for opportunities to write in English as much as possible. (mean= 4.45)
16 I underline or mark with an asterisk an important part of the writing. (mean= 4.26)
24 I try to understand and use the best English writing conditions. (mean= 4.20)
32 I try to relax whenever I fell afraid of writing English. (mean= 4.16)
17 I choose an interesting topic for which I know a lot of vocabulary and related structures. (mean= 4.12)
In Time Two, on the other hand, the most frequently used strategies are:

5. I regularly repeat English words, phrases and sentences. (mean= 4.58)
30. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better. (mean= 4.58)
22. I pay attention to linguistic structures which are important for the writing. (mean= 4.45)
23. I try to find out how to be a better English writer through reading or talking with someone. (mean = 4.45).
24. I try to understand and use the best English writing conditions (mean = 4.45).
14. I make a note of main ideas and specific points. (mean=4.29)
32. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of writing English. (mean=4.16)
1. I memorize new English words with meaningful sentence. (mean=4.12)
44. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers. (mean=4.08)
84. I take a rest by watching a funny movie or reading a book. (mean = 4.04).
16. I underline or mark with an asterisk an important part of the writing. (mean=4.04).
17. I choose an interesting topic for which I know a lot of vocabulary and related structures. (mean=4.04).
29. I look for opportunities to write in English an much as possible. (mean=4.04).

The highest mean score is observed in items 5 and 30 which have to do with the efforts exerted by the students to improve their language through repeating English words, phrases and sentences and observing their performance and benefiting from their mistakes. They are also eager to become better English writers (23) through their attempts to understand and use the best English writing conditions (24) and paying attention to linguistic structures which are important for the writing (22). This reflects the belief that having a good proficiency in English is the main way for getting a good job or having a better social life (cf. Park, 1994: 307). When writing, students prefer to choose a topic for which they know a lot of vocabulary (17) and they outline their writing through making notes of main ideas and specific points (14) and underlining an important part of the writing (16) and they spare no effort to learn or to write in that they look for any opportunity to write (29). Taking into account that not all of the students participated in this study are strong writers a fact which may be mainly brought about from the process-oriented writing instruction of the class. Within this approach to L2 writing, the teacher encourages the students to plan what they want to say and to attempt several drafts of the
essay before coming to the final version. Consequently, the teacher’s approach to L2 writing may be a significant factor influencing the students’ use of strategies. An important point to note is that, through their writing, students try to learn more and more about the culture of English speakers (44). The affective strategies employed by the students which have to do with encouraging oneself are related to relaxation whenever a student feels afraid of writing English (32) and watching a funny movie (34). The memory strategy employed by students is a simple and traditional one which has to do with memorizing new English words with a meaningful sentence (1).

Whereas the strategies that learners least employ in time one are:

19 I make up new words if I don’t know the right words in English.
13 I translate word -for- word depending on Arabic words, concepts, structures.
18 I often change the content of the writing by omitting a part of it or expressing some complex thing with less accuracy.
36 I take a risk of writing in English even if I might make a mistake or lose my face.
28 I outline the overall organization of the writing
11 I try to apply a general rule to a new context.
6 I practice the writing mechanics of English.
12 I directly translate Arabic expressions into English.
25 I set my short - term and long – term goals for English writing.
40 I keep a learning journal.

Those that are least employed in time two are:

18 I often change the content of the writing by omitting a part of it or expressing some complex thing less accuracy.
13 I translate word -for– word depending on Arabic words, concepts, structures.
12 I directly translate Arabic expressions into English.
19 I make up new words if I don’t know the right words, concepts, structures.
6 I practice the writing mechanics of English.
39 I pay attention to my body’s signal.
37 I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in writing in English.
35 I give myself a positive remark in order to have confidence in writing English.
8 I make a longer sentence by combining what I already know and new things I learn in English.
10 I use various resources for the writing task.
7 I try to recognize and use English formulaic expressions such as “Can I have ___?” and “It’s time to___”.


It is clear that five of those ten least used strategies are the same in time one and time two although they appear in a different order each time.

Thus, the students in this study are not creative in that they do not change the content of the writing or try to paraphrase it although with less accuracy (18). Contrary to the expectations that students are likely to translate word-for-word or from Arabic into English in their attempts to express themselves in writing, items (13 and 12) are among the least used strategies. Another proof that the students are not creative is the fact that they are not good at making up alternative words if they do not know the proper one (19). It is recommended here that in order to achieve more successful language learning, students should take responsibility for their new language learning or at least review their learning regularly (cf Park, ibid: 308). Other items show that students have few chances to relax and reward themselves (39, 37, 35). Another indication of the students being not creative are items 8 and 10. In addition, they are not good at using formulaic expressions (7). It was suggested that although they may be employed in language use, compensation strategies such as using synonymous words or phrases, using circumlocution, and generalizing the meaning of a word from one context to another (18,19) aid language learning (cf. Oxford, 1990 as cited in Park, ibid: 305).

4.2 Relationships between Strategy Use and L2 Writing Development

The next step is to examine the relationships between strategy use and L2 writing development. Contrary to Parks, (ibid), study and in order to get at a clearer view of the relationship between strategy use and L2 writing, all the subjects were asked to write an essay in both time 1 and time 2.

The relationships between strategy use and writing development are investigated by means of holistic evaluation and objective evaluation. Table (3) below displays the holistic aspects of the writing. The rating guidelines of the holistic evaluation is based on Hughey et al.(1983: 87).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>First writing</th>
<th>Second Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from the table above that, generally speaking, the majority of subjects exhibit development through time in that out of the 24 subjects participated, 16 of them show development and the remaining 8 show no change in their writing skill. It is important to note that not even one subject is degenerated from a higher level to a lower one. Comparing the results of the strategies used through time with those of the essays we see that 5 of the subjects participating show development in the means of the strategies used in time one and time two and in the holistic development. For example, the mean of strategy use of subject 8 in time one is 3.3, in time two 4.1 and in writing essay he shows development from poor to good. Other 5 subjects show no development in strategy use in that the mean of using strategies remains the same in times one and two but they show development in essay writing. As an example of this is subject 4 whose mean score in strategy use in both times is 3.5, however, his level in essay writing in time one is good and in time two is ‘very good’. A further 5 subjects show the opposite to what has been mentioned above in that they show development in strategy use with no such development in essay writing. The mean of subject 16, for example, is 3.5 in time one and 4.7 in time two with the same subject having the grade "poor" in both times. A number of subjects specifically 3 exhibit regression in the means of strategy use and no change in essay writing as represented by subject 14 whose mean score of strategy use in time one is 3.9 and in time two 3.8 but whose essay writing has the grade "good" in both times. The remaining (6) subjects exhibit regression in the means of strategy use and progress in essay writing. Subject 11, for
instance has the mean (3.6) in time one and 3.4 in time two but he gets the grade "poor" in time one and "very good" in time two.

Looking at the development of students' writing in terms of the objective measures (Table 4 below) and starting with the measures related to frequency TW, TS, TC, one can see that the number of total words increased from the average (121.5) to (182.1). This is reflected in the fact that all the subjects with the exception of (2) show increase in the number of words used. This means that the more subjects use strategies, the more the total number of words increases. The total mean of the number of sentences in writing increased from (6.1) to (9.1) in that (19) out of the (24) subjects show increase in the number of sentences used. As for the total mean of the number of clauses used, there is increase in this number from 12.9 to 16.5 and this increase is confirmed by the fact that (15) of the (24) subjects show increase in the number of clauses they use in writing their essays. Thus, the numbers of TW.TS and TC are related to the development of learners. In other words, whenever there is increase in these three measures, this means that there is increase in the number of strategies used on the part of the learners and this is an indication that "strategy use facilitates the development of learners' fluency" (cf. Park: ibid: 306).

Moving to the accuracy aspects EFS and EFC, one can conclude that, generally speaking, the total mean of error-free sentences increased from 1.08 to 1.79. However, when subjects are taken individually, only (10) subjects exhibit such increase in the number of EFS. The remaining (14) are divided between (5) subjects who did not produce even one EFS neither in time one nor in time two and (9) who either produce the same number of EFS in both times or show decrease in the number of EFS produced. Consequently, it is possible to claim that, in general, the more students use strategies, the more they show improvement. Finally, the number of DC measures the complexity of the learners’ language. On the whole, the rate of DC increased from 5.7 to 8. Specifically, 16 of the subjects show increase in the number of DCs, one subject uses the same number of DCs in both times and the remaining subjects show decrease in the number of DCs (cf. Table 4 below).

Table (4) Analytic Development by the Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>TW</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>EFs</th>
<th>EFs</th>
<th>DC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Discussion and Conclusions**

In general, the learners of this study show a tendency to employing more metacognitive strategies for planning, thinking about and evaluating learning than any other strategies indicating that they are eager to better their writing abilities through writing as much as they can, to get benefit from their mistakes, to use the best writing conditions and plan the organization of their writing. This finding points to an implication to the teaching of L2 writing, namely, that the process oriented approach to L2 writing can lead students to effectively employ a greater variety of learning strategies, and ultimately to be better language learners.

The learners of this study show reluctance to using cognitive strategies in that they tend not to rely on direct translation of Arabic expressions into English or depend on word–for–word translation depending on Arabic words, concepts and structures. They also do not make, when writing, a note of main ideas and specific points or make a summary of the essay. However, it is important to mention that when writing their essays, a number of students tended to rely on direct translation of ideas or constructions from Arabic into English due to their ignorance or inability to express themselves in English. Thus, this may be justified by the fact that they are unconsciously trying to get rid of this tendency due to their teachers’ emphasis on the necessity of thinking, when the write, in English rather than in Arabic, since they are two different languages.

On the other hand the learners in this study tend to make less effort in the use of creative learning strategies in favour of more traditional ones. For example, they prefer to repeat words and constructions than to make up new words and reward themselves for good performance. In order to help them to employ various learning strategies, they need to have awareness of learning strategies and training. Learners, in such training sessions, can be presented with a variety of strategies and be guided to make use of those strategies for the purpose of improving their writing skills (cf. Park: ibid).

Another important point that cannot be ignored is the uneffective effect of time on strategy use in that from the beginning i.e. Time One, learners recognized the importance of metacognitive strategies and persist on using them, a fact which is reflected in those strategies occupying the first position among others in both times. This may be due to the fact that learners are trying to improve their writing and to get rid of problems that are attributable to a lack of structures and vocabulary limitations through planning and evaluating their learning by employing metacognitive strategies. The implication that can be drawn for L2 teaching is an important one, namely, that the process oriented approach to L2 writing
can lead students to make use of a greater number of strategies and in a more effective way for the sake of becoming better language learners.

The findings of the essay writing of the subjects provide more useful information in that it has been found out that the more writers employ learning strategies the more they improve in their writings with regard to the holistic and analytic aspects. As far as the holistic evaluation is concerned, it has been found out that the more the subjects employ strategies the better their writing becomes. This shows that one of the essentials of successful language learning is to effectively employ learning strategies, suggesting that there is a significant relationship between strategy use and the outcomes of the specific domain of language learning, or L2 writing development. Thus, whereas several studies reveal the existence of a relationship between strategy use and outcomes in language learning without analyzing the changes of particular language skills over some period this one has shown that the use of strategy may decide the destiny of language learning.

The changes in the objective measures also give us another important evidence for the relationships between strategy use and L2 writing development.

From the findings discussed above, it can be deduced that learners' language development is positively affected by strategy use. Thus, students in the classroom should be exposed to a variety of strategies both directly and indirectly, a responsibility that should be taken by the teacher who should also encourage students to attempt to experience a varied of strategies. As a result, students will realize the importance of strategies and consequently they will take more responsibility for their language learning.

Bibliography


Appendix

Questionnaire (Learning Strategies for Writing)

1. Never.
2. Usually not true of me.
4. Usually true of me.
5. (Almost) always.

1. I memorize new English words with a meaningful sentence.
2. I connect the sound of a new English word and an image of the word to help me remember the word.
3. I regularly review new English words, gradually increasing the interval.
4. I use creative and specific techniques to help me remember a new word including card, menial image and sound of the word.
5. I regularly repeat English words, phrases, and sentences.
6. I practice the writing mechanics of English.
7. I try to recognize and use English formulaic expressions such as "Can I have ___" and "It's time to _____".
8. I make a longer sentence by combining what I already know and new things I learn in English.
9. I practice English writing in a natural situation like exchanging letters with a pen pal.
10. I use various resources for the writing task.
11. I try to apply a general rule to a new context.
12. I directly translate Korean expressions into English.
13. I translate word-for-word depending on Korean words, concepts, structures.
14. I make a note of main ideas and specific points.
15. I make a summary of the composition.
16. I underline or mark in important part of the writing.
17. I choose an interesting topic for which I know a lot of vocabulary and related structures.
18. I often change the content of the writing by omitting apart of it or expressing some complex thing with less accuracy.
19. I make up new words if I don't know the right words in English.
20. I use a word or phrase that means the same thing if I can't think of an English word.
21. I review key concepts, principles, and resources related to the writing. Connecting them and what I already know.
22. I pay attention to linguistic structure which are important for the writing.
23. I try to find out how to be a better English writer through reading or talking with someone.
24. I try to understand and use the best English writing conditions.
25. I set my short-term and long-term goals for English writing.
26. I identify the purpose of the writing task.
27. I plan language elements and functions for the English writing task.
28. I outline the overall organization of the writing.
29. I look for opportunities to write in English as much as possible.
30. I notice my English mistakes and use that information to help me do better.
31. I think about my progress in writing English.
32. I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of writing English.
33. I use music as a way of relaxation.
34. I take a rest by watching a funny movie or reading a book.
35. I give myself a positive remark in order to have confidence in writing English.
36. I take a risk of writing in English even if I might make a mistake or lose my face.
37. I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in writing in English.
38. I keep a learning diary of English composition.
39. I pay attention to my body's signal.
40. I keep a learning journal.
41. I give someone to correct my writing.
42. I cooperate with others in essay.
43. I ask for help from proficient English speakers outside the classroom.
44. I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.
45. I try to take account of other people's thought and emotion.