

Metacognitive Experiences and Writing Development in the Japanese Context

Adam Christopher

Atomi University

Reference Data:

Christopher, A. (2026). Metacognitive experiences and writing development in the Japanese context. In B. Lacy, M. Swanson, & H. Yoder (Eds.), *LanguageS: Learning, Teaching, Assessing – JALT 50 Years – Challenges and Perspectives*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2025-18>

Metacognition is an important individual difference that enables learners to monitor, regulate, and evaluate their learning. Within this broader construct, metacognitive experiences, including metacognitive judgments, metacognitive emotions, task-specific metacognitive knowledge, and task-specific metacognitive strategies, play a critical role in second language (L2) writing. However, little is known about how these experiences develop over time among Japanese EFL learners. This mixed-methods study investigated the longitudinal development of metacognitive experiences among 28 Japanese university students enrolled in a 14-week EFL writing course. Questionnaire data collected before and after the course were analysed using latent profile analysis (LPA), and semi-structured interviews with 10 participants explored factors influencing changes in learners' metacognitive experiences. Two learner profiles emerged, demonstrating different developmental patterns. The findings provide theoretical insights into changes in metacognitive experiences and pedagogical implications for EFL writing instruction.

外国語教育において、メタ認知は学習者が自らの学習をモニタリングし、調整し、評価することを可能にする重要な個人差要因である。本研究は、日本人大学生28名を対象に、14週間のEFLライティング授業におけるメタ認知的経験の発達を混合研究方法によって縦断的に調査した。授業の前後で質問紙調査を実施し、潜在プロファイル分析(Latent Profile Analysis)を用いて学習者プロファイルを特定した。また、10名の学生への半構造化インタビューを通して、メタ認知的経験の変化に影響を及ぼす要因を検討した。その結果、異なる発達パターンを示す2つの学習者プロファイルが確認され、メタ認知的経験がライティング学習を通して動的に発達することが示された。本研究は、日本のEFLライティング教育におけるメタ認知的指導への示唆を提供するものである。

Individual differences play a central role in learning because they shape how learners approach and engage in language learning (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Among these differences, metacognition has attracted increasing attention due to its role in enabling learners to monitor, regulate, and evaluate their cognitive processes during learning (Chen et al., 2022; Jin et al., 2024; Kormos, 2023). In the context of L2 writing, metacognition supports learners as they plan, monitor, evaluate, and revise their writing while responding to linguistic and rhetorical demands.

Metacognition is commonly conceptualised as comprising three interrelated components: metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive regulation, and metacognitive experiences (Teng, 2023). The present study focuses specifically on metacognitive experiences, which refer to learners' task-related judgments, emotions, task-specific knowledge, and strategies that emerge before, during, and after task performance (Sun et al., 2021). These experiences are dynamic rather than static and influence how learners interpret writing tasks, evaluate their performance, and regulate subsequent learning. Understanding how metacognitive experiences develop over time, therefore, provides valuable insights into the processes underlying successful writing development.

Although previous studies have demonstrated that metacognition contributes to successful L2 writing (De Silva & Graham, 2015; Dong & Zhan, 2019; Sun & Zhang, 2022), most research has focused on metacognitive knowledge and strategies or has adopted cross-sectional research designs. Consequently, relatively little is known about how learners' metacognitive experiences evolve throughout a writing course, particularly in EFL contexts. Furthermore, previous studies have primarily employed variable-centred approaches that examine relationships among variables across an entire sample, potentially overlooking meaningful individual differences in learners' developmental trajectories (Chen et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2023).

The Japanese university EFL context provides an appropriate setting for investigating the development of metacognitive experiences. Although students typically receive

extensive English instruction before entering university, many Japanese EFL learners continue to experience difficulties expressing ideas effectively in academic writing (Kamimura, 2007). Consequently, successful writing depends not only on linguistic knowledge but also on learners' ability to evaluate task demands, regulate their learning, and reflect on their writing processes. Examining the development of metacognitive experiences throughout a semester-long writing course may therefore provide valuable insights into how learners become more effective and self-regulated writers.

This study focuses on the longitudinal development of metacognitive experiences among Japanese university students enrolled in a 14-week EFL writing course. Using latent profile analysis (LPA) and semi-structured interviews, the study adopts a person-centred approach that recognises individual heterogeneity by identifying distinct profiles of learners based on their metacognitive experiences (Chen et al., 2022). The study then reveals how learners' metacognitive experiences developed over time and how these developmental patterns are reflected in writing development.

Literature Review

As noted earlier, metacognition is conceptualised as comprising three interrelated components: metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive regulation, and metacognitive experiences (Teng, 2023). Among these components, metacognitive experiences have recently attracted considerable attention because they reflect learners' immediate cognitive and affective responses during task performance. Sun et al. (2021) conceptualised metacognitive experiences as comprising four dimensions: metacognitive judgments, metacognitive emotions, task-specific metacognitive knowledge, and task-specific metacognitive strategies. Metacognitive judgments refer to learners' evaluations of their performance and perceived task difficulty, whereas metacognitive emotions reflect affective responses such as confidence, anxiety, and satisfaction experienced during learning. Task-specific metacognitive knowledge concerns learners' awareness of the knowledge required to complete a task successfully, while task-specific metacognitive strategies involve the deliberate planning, monitoring, and regulation of cognitive activities throughout task completion. Together, these dimensions provide a comprehensive framework for understanding how learners regulate their writing processes.

Previous research has consistently demonstrated that metacognition contributes to successful L2 writing. Metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive strategies have been

associated with improvements in planning, monitoring, revision, and overall writing performance (De Silva & Graham, 2015; Teng, 2020). More recently, researchers have shifted their attention towards metacognitive experiences because they capture learners' reflections during writing and provide a more dynamic understanding of self-regulated writing (Lee & Mak, 2018; Sun & Zhang, 2022). Rather than focusing solely on what learners know or the strategies they use, this perspective emphasises how learners interpret writing tasks, evaluate their progress, experience emotions, and regulate their learning throughout the writing process.

Empirical evidence suggests that learners with richer metacognitive experiences generally demonstrate stronger writing performance and greater awareness of their writing processes (Sun et al., 2023; Sun & Zhang, 2023). However, most previous studies have employed cross-sectional research designs, making it difficult to determine how metacognitive experiences develop over time. Furthermore, these studies have primarily adopted variable-centred approaches that focus on relationships among variables while overlooking the possibility that different groups of learners may demonstrate distinct developmental patterns. Consequently, relatively little is known about how metacognitive experiences evolve during sustained writing instruction, particularly in Japanese EFL contexts.

To address these limitations, recent research has used person-centred approaches, such as LPA, which identify distinct subgroups of learners based on patterns across multiple characteristics, including metacognitive characteristics (Chen et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2023). Unlike variable-centred analyses, LPA recognises that learners with similar overall scores may differ substantially in the ways they experience, regulate, and develop their learning processes. Adopting a person-centred perspective therefore provides a more nuanced understanding of individual differences and enables researchers to examine how different learner profiles develop over time.

Building on this perspective, the present study adopts Sun et al.'s (2021) framework of metacognitive experiences to investigate how Japanese university students' metacognitive judgments and emotions, and task-specific metacognitive knowledge and strategies developed during a 14-week EFL writing course. By integrating LPA with qualitative interview data, this study seeks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the development of metacognitive experiences and their relationship with writing development in the Japanese EFL context.

Research Questions

The following research questions are addressed:

- RQ1. What metacognitive experience profiles were identified among Japanese EFL writers enrolled in a semester-long writing course?
- RQ2. How did learners' metacognitive experiences develop over time across the identified learner profiles?
- RQ3. What factors contributed to changes in learners' metacognitive experiences throughout the writing course?

Methodology

Participants

This study was conducted at a private university in Japan during a 14-week EFL writing course. The participants were 28 first-year Japanese university students (18-20 years old) enrolled in a compulsory freshman English writing course. Before entering university, all participants had studied English in the Japanese educational system for approximately 10 years. Their TOEIC scores ranged from 405 to 600, indicating lower-intermediate to intermediate levels of English proficiency. The writing course focused on developing academic writing through a process-oriented approach that emphasised planning, drafting, revising, and receiving feedback. Throughout the semester, students completed two argumentative writing tasks that formed the basis for both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Prior to data collection, participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided written informed consent. Participation was voluntary, and students were assured that their responses would remain confidential, would be anonymised during analysis, and would have no effect on their course grades.

EFL Learners' Writing Metacognitive Experiences Questionnaire

Learners' metacognitive experiences were measured using the English as a Foreign Language Learners' Writing Metacognitive Experiences Questionnaire developed by Sun et al. (2021; Appendix A). The questionnaire contains 16 items measuring four dimensions of metacognitive experiences: metacognitive judgments (five items), metacognitive emotions (four items), task-specific metacognitive knowledge (three items), and task-specific metacognitive strategies (four items). Responses were recorded on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sun et

al. (2021) reported acceptable internal consistency for the questionnaire, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .70 to .85 across its four dimensions.

Writing Tasks

Participants completed two argumentative writing tasks during the semester. Each task required students to write an approximately 150-word essay within 30 minutes on comparable topics, such as the advantages and disadvantages of studying abroad and whether university students should have part-time jobs. Essays were independently evaluated by an experienced English writing instructor and the author using the same assessment criteria. Inter-rater reliability was high (intraclass correlation coefficient = .86), indicating a high level of consistency between the two raters' scores. Although writing performance was analysed, it served primarily as contextual evidence for learners' development during the course.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Following the quantitative analysis, 10 participants representing the identified learner profiles participated in semi-structured interviews. The interview protocol was developed with reference to previous qualitative studies of metacognition in L2 writing and explored learners' writing experiences, self-evaluations, emotional responses, strategy use, and perceptions of their development throughout the course (Appendix B). Interviews were conducted in Japanese, audio-recorded with participants' permission, transcribed, and returned to participants for verification.

Data Analysis

Latent profile analysis was conducted using Mplus 8.3 to identify learner profiles based on the four dimensions of metacognitive experiences. Model selection was based on Akaike information criterion (AIC), Bayesian information criterion (BIC), sample-size-adjusted BIC (ABIC), entropy, the Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (LMRT), and the bootstrap likelihood ratio test (BLRT). These indices were used to determine the optimal number of latent profiles.

Following profile identification, independent-samples *t*-tests were conducted using SPSS 24.0 to determine whether the two learner profiles differed significantly in their metacognitive experiences. Paired-samples *t*-tests were also conducted to examine whether metacognitive experiences and writing performance changed significantly

from the beginning to the end of the semester within each profile. Effect sizes (d) were calculated to evaluate the magnitude of the observed differences and changes.

Qualitative interview data were analysed using NVivo 12 through a combination of inductive and deductive thematic analysis. To enhance trustworthiness, a second researcher independently coded 25% of the interview transcripts, resulting in an inter-coder agreement of 95%. The qualitative findings were subsequently integrated with the quantitative results to explain the developmental patterns observed across learner profiles.

Results

Profiles of Metacognitive Experiences

Latent profile analysis resulted in model fit indices indicating that the two-profile solution provided the best balance between model fitness and interpretability. As shown in Table 1, Profile 1 ($n = 15$) consisted of learners with less intensive metacognitive experiences, whereas Profile 2 ($n = 13$) consisted of learners with more intensive metacognitive experiences. These two profiles formed the basis for all subsequent quantitative and qualitative analyses.

Table 1
Binary Profile Model for Student Metacognitive Experiences

Model	AIC	BIC	ABIC	Entropy	LMRT (p)	BLRT (p)	Class size by profile
Binary	18,157.084	18,351.426	18,195.942	0.848	0.0000	0.0000	13/15

Notes. AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; ABIC = sample size adjusted BIC; LMRT = Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT = bootstrap likelihood ratio test.

The entropy value (.848), together with significant LMRT ($p < .001$) and BLRT ($p < .001$) values, supported the selection of the two-profile model. The two-profile solution indicates that participants could be distinguished into two groups based on the different patterns of metacognitive experiences described above.

Differences Between the Two Learner Profiles

Independent-samples t -tests were conducted to examine whether the two learner profiles differed significantly in their metacognitive experiences. As shown in Table 2, Profile 2 reported significantly higher levels of metacognitive judgments, metacognitive emotions, task-specific metacognitive knowledge, and task-specific metacognitive strategies than Profile 1.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Metacognitive Experiences of Student Binary Profiles

Factor	Profiles			
	Less intensive metacognitive experiences ($n = 15$)		Intensive metacognitive experiences ($n = 13$)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Metacognitive judgments	3.864	0.638	0.638**	0.453
Metacognitive emotions	2.139	0.747	0.747**	0.866
Online task-specific metacognitive knowledge	3.808	0.766	0.765**	0.635
Online task-specific metacognitive strategies	3.443	0.739	0.739**	0.653

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

The two profiles differed significantly in reported metacognitive experiences, with Profile 2 showing higher levels across the four dimensions than Profile 1. These findings confirm that the profiles identified through LPA represented distinct patterns of metacognitive experiences. The subsequent longitudinal analysis revealed how these profiles changed over the course of the semester.

Changes in Metacognitive Experiences Over Time

Changes in learners' metacognitive experiences across the semester are presented in Table 3. Overall, learners in both profiles showed increases in several dimensions of metacognitive experiences, although the pattern and extent of change differed between the two groups.

Table 3
Changes in EFL Learners' Metacognitive Experiences Over Time

Profile	Metacognitive experiences	Time 1	Time 2	<i>p</i> (<i>t</i> value)	<i>d</i>
1	Metacognitive judgments	3.864 (0.638)	4.041 (0.685)	0.001** (− 3.480)	0.274
	Metacognitive emotions	3.139 (0.746)	3.375 (0.748)	0.000*** (− 3.855)	0.307
	Online task-specific metacognitive knowledge	3.808 (0.765)	3.986 (0.784)	0.009** (− 2.658)	0.236
	Online task-specific metacognitive strategies	3.442 (0.739)	3.686 (0.788)	0.000*** (− 3.713)	0.316
2	Metacognitive judgments	4.646 (0.455)	4.907 (0.627)	0.000*** (5.257)	0.476
	Metacognitive emotions	3.768 (0.729)	3.834 (0.867)	0.293 (− 1.057)	0.083
	Online task-specific metacognitive knowledge	4.545 (0.637)	4.793 (0.748)	0.000*** (3.713)	0.355
	Online task-specific metacognitive strategies	4.383 (0.653)	4.648 (0.768)	0.000*** (4.497)	0.376

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

For learners in Profile 1 (less intensive metacognitive experiences), paired-samples *t*-tests indicated statistically significant increases in all four dimensions of metacognitive experiences, including metacognitive judgments, metacognitive emotions, task-specific metacognitive knowledge, and task-specific metacognitive strategies. These findings indicate that learners who initially reported lower levels of metacognitive experiences showed higher levels of these dimensions by the end of the semester.

For learners in Profile 2 (intensive metacognitive experiences), significant increases were observed in metacognitive judgments, task-specific metacognitive knowledge,

and task-specific metacognitive strategies. In contrast, metacognitive emotions did not change significantly. Taken together, these findings indicate that metacognitive experiences changed over the course of the semester, with different patterns of change across learners' initial profiles.

Changes in Writing Performance

Although the focus of this study was the development of metacognitive experiences, writing performance was examined to provide contextual evidence of students' learning throughout the course. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Changes in EFL Learners' Writing Performance Over Time

Profile	Construct	Measures	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	<i>p</i> (<i>t</i> value)	<i>d</i>
1	Lexical complexity	MSTTR	0.774 (0.054)	0.755 (0.051)	0.000***	0.409
	Syntactic complexity	MLT	13.358 (3.245)	13.983 (2.955)	0.022*	0.208
	Accuracy	C/T	1.477 (0.291)	1.580 (0.447)	0.001**	0.327
	Fluency		5.394 (1.127)	5.683 (1.216)	0.000***	0.249
	Overall scores		61.44 (7.430)	80.69 (5.640)	0.000***	2.926

Profile	Construct	Measures	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	<i>p</i> (<i>t</i> value)	<i>d</i>
2	Lexical complexity	MSTTR	0.751 (0.049)	0.772 (0.043)	0.000***	0.467
	Syntactic complexity	MLT	13.607 (2.802)	13.987 (2.982)	0.095	0.134
		C/T	1.452 (0.267)	1.623 (0.329)	0.066	0.523
	Accuracy		6.020 (2.886)	6.380 (2.461)	0.181	0.144
	Fluency		5.289 (1.052)	5.693 (1.103)	0.000***	0.383
	Overall scores		61.39 (8.371)	81.73 (5.013)	0.000***	2.945

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

For learners in Profile 1, significant increases were observed in lexical complexity (MSTTR), syntactic complexity (MLT and C/T), fluency, and overall writing scores. No statistically significant increase was found for writing accuracy. For learners in Profile 2, significant increases were observed in lexical complexity, fluency, and overall writing quality. Although mean scores for syntactic complexity and accuracy increased slightly, these differences were not statistically significant. These findings provide complementary evidence of changes in learners' writing performance alongside the changes observed in their metacognitive experiences. While writing performance generally increased across several measures throughout the semester, these changes provide contextual information for interpreting the development of learners' metacognitive experiences over the course of sustained writing instruction.

Factors Influencing Changes in EFL Learners' Metacognitive Experiences

To gain deeper insight into the quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants (five from each profile) following completion of

the writing course. The qualitative analysis explored how learners perceived changes in their metacognitive experiences and the factors they associated with these changes throughout the semester. Building on the initial thematic analysis described above, the results below explicitly link participants' comments to the four dimensions of metacognitive experiences examined in the questionnaire. This integration provides insight into the quantitative findings.

Instructional Experiences and Metacognitive Judgments

Many participants reported that classroom instruction helped them evaluate their writing more critically by increasing their awareness of differences between Japanese and English academic writing. These reflections illustrate the development of metacognitive judgments, as learners became better able to assess the quality of their writing and recognise the demands of academic writing tasks. Student C stated, "I was able to learn the difference between the Japanese and English way to compose an essay." This quotation suggests that explicit instruction prompted learners to reconsider how they approached writing tasks. Participants frequently described becoming more aware of essay organisation, topic sentences, and rhetorical structure, indicating that they increasingly evaluated their own writing using criteria introduced during the course. These findings provide insight into the significant increases in metacognitive judgments observed in both learner profiles.

Independent Learning and Task-Specific Metacognitive Strategies

Participants also described actively regulating their learning outside the classroom through digital resources, mobile applications, and online learning platforms. These behaviours illustrate the development of task-specific metacognitive strategies, as learners deliberately selected learning resources, monitored their progress, and adjusted their writing practices according to their perceived needs. Student E described using digital tools to support English learning outside class, explaining that "WeChat helped me read English novels and recall vocabulary despite my poor grades." The student also reported using WeChat and other English-learning applications on their phone to support their writing after class. Learners also reported using automated writing evaluation systems to receive immediate feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Although participants recognised limitations in automated feedback, they valued these tools because they supported self-monitoring and self-regulation between classes.

Language Development, Metacognitive Knowledge, and Metacognitive Emotions

Interview data further indicated that improvements in language proficiency influenced both task-specific metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive emotions. Participants frequently described becoming more aware of their strengths and weaknesses while simultaneously gaining confidence in their writing ability. Student H described the difficulty of expressing complex ideas in English and the continued challenges they experienced despite perceiving some improvement in their writing:

I believe it is hard to say what I think inside my head. I can say what I want to say in complicated Japanese, but I don't know how to say it in English. I think my English writing has gotten better this semester, but I still can't get my ideas across easily in English. (Student H)

This quotation illustrates learners' emotional responses developing alongside their cognitive understanding of writing. Although participants recognised their progress, many continued to experience uncertainty when expressing complex ideas in English. This finding provides further insight into why metacognitive emotions increased less consistently than the other dimensions, particularly among learners in the intensive metacognitive experience profile.

Reflection Through Feedback

Participants consistently described teacher feedback as an important catalyst for reflection and self-regulation. Revising written work encouraged learners to evaluate their vocabulary, grammar, and organisation more carefully, strengthening both their metacognitive judgments and task-specific metacognitive strategies. Student K described using teacher feedback to review and revise their writing, particularly their vocabulary and spelling:

As my English teacher gave me his feedback, I checked what I had written twice. Most of the time, I would go back and correct my vocabulary and spelling. After revising, I was pleased with how well I had written. (Student K)

This quotation demonstrates how feedback promoted reflective learning by encouraging learners to monitor, evaluate, and revise their writing. Such reflective behaviour is consistent with the theoretical framework of metacognitive experiences proposed by Sun et al. (2021) and provides qualitative support for the quantitative increases observed across the semester.

Summary of the Qualitative Findings

Overall, the qualitative findings help interpret the patterns identified in the quantitative analyses. Classroom instruction was associated with changes in learners' metacognitive judgments, particularly in their awareness of effective academic writing. Independent learning activities were associated with changes in task-specific metacognitive strategies, while learners' accounts also indicated links between language proficiency and changes in task-specific metacognitive knowledge and, to a lesser extent, metacognitive emotions. Together, these findings suggest that learners' metacognitive experiences were shaped by the interplay of instructional support, self-regulated learning, and linguistic development, providing insight into the two learner profiles identified through LPA.

Discussion

The present study investigated the longitudinal development of metacognitive experiences among Japanese university students enrolled in a 14-week EFL writing course using a person-centred mixed-methods approach. By integrating LPA with qualitative interview data, the study extends previous research by demonstrating that learners' metacognitive experiences are dynamic and develop differently across learner profiles. Unlike previous studies that primarily adopted variable-centred approaches (Dong & Zhan, 2019; Sun & Zhang, 2022, 2023), the study reveals that learners do not experience changes in metacognitive experiences uniformly. Instead, two distinct learner profiles were identified, each demonstrating different developmental trajectories in metacognitive judgments and emotions, and task-specific metacognitive knowledge and strategies.

The quantitative findings show that learners with less intensive metacognitive experiences demonstrated significant increases across all four dimensions of metacognitive experiences during the semester. In contrast, learners with more intensive metacognitive experiences increased significantly in metacognitive judgments, task-specific metacognitive knowledge, and task-specific metacognitive strategies, whereas metacognitive emotions remained relatively stable. These findings suggest that cognitive aspects of metacognition may develop more readily through classroom instruction than affective components such as confidence and anxiety. This interpretation is consistent with Teng (2023), who argued that metacognitive experiences are dynamic and sensitive to instructional contexts, and with Sun et al. (2023), who reported that learners' metacognitive experiences evolved through continued engagement with writing tasks.

The qualitative findings help interpret these quantitative results. Participants reported that explicit instruction, teacher feedback, and opportunities for reflection were associated with changes in how they evaluated their writing and regulated their learning. These experiences correspond closely to the four dimensions of metacognitive experiences measured by the questionnaire, providing insight into quantitative findings. For example, learners described becoming increasingly aware of rhetorical differences between Japanese and English writing, using digital resources to support independent learning, and reflecting on teacher feedback when approaching subsequent writing tasks. Together, these findings suggest that changes in metacognitive experiences were associated with the interaction of instructional support, self-regulation, and language development, rather than with linguistic improvement alone. One important contribution of the present study is the application of a person-centred approach to investigating metacognitive experiences in L2 writing. By identifying two learner profiles, this study demonstrates that learners with similar writing backgrounds may nevertheless differ substantially in how they monitor, evaluate, and regulate their writing processes. These findings support recent calls for person-centred approaches in second language acquisition research (Chen et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2023) and extend this perspective to the investigation of metacognitive experiences in Japanese EFL writing classrooms. Overall, this study contributes to the growing literature on metacognition in L2 writing by demonstrating that metacognitive experiences are dynamic, multidimensional, and responsive to instructional practice.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings have several implications for EFL writing instruction. First, writing instruction should explicitly promote learners' metacognitive experiences rather than focusing exclusively on writing products or linguistic accuracy. Classroom activities that encourage learners to evaluate task difficulty, monitor their progress, reflect on feedback, and discuss their emotional responses to writing may strengthen changes in metacognitive experiences and support self-regulated learning.

Second, the identification of distinct learner profiles suggests that writing instruction should take into account variation in learners' metacognitive experiences. Learners may differ in the extent to which they engage in planning, monitoring, evaluating, and regulating their writing, and instructional activities can provide opportunities to develop these processes while allowing learners with greater metacognitive experience to exercise increasing autonomy. Such an approach may help accommodate differences

in learners' needs without requiring instructors to formally classify learners according to metacognitive profiles.

Finally, reflective activities should be integrated throughout the writing process rather than being limited to post-writing evaluation. Encouraging learners to reflect before, during, and after writing tasks may foster continuous changes in metacognitive experiences and improve learners' ability to regulate their own writing.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study involved a relatively small sample of students from a single Japanese university, which limits the generalisability of the findings. Second, metacognitive experiences were examined over a single 14-week semester. Longer studies are needed to determine whether similar developmental patterns emerge over extended periods of instruction. Third, although the integration of questionnaires and interviews provided complementary evidence, future studies could incorporate classroom observations, learner journals, and think-aloud protocols to capture metacognitive experiences as they occur during writing. Future research should also examine whether similar metacognitive profiles are evident in other educational contexts and investigate the effectiveness of instructional interventions specifically designed to foster learners' metacognitive experiences.

Bio Data

Adam Christopher is an associate professor in the Faculty of Letters, Atomi University. His research interests include foreign language acquisition, applied linguistics, CALL, curriculum development, intercultural communication, and comparative culture.

References

- Chen, J., Zhang, L. J., & Chen, X. (2022). L2 learners' self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy for writing achievement: A latent profile analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 30(1), 14–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221134967>
- De Silva, R., & Graham, S. (2015). The effects of strategy instruction on writing strategy use for students of different proficiency levels. *System*, 53, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.009>

- Dong, X., & Zhan, J. (2019). Impacts of metacognitive instruction on college students' EFL writing metacognitive features: Knowledge experiences and strategies. *Foreign Languages in China*, 16(1), 62–70.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.
- Jin, Y., Jiang, N., & Zhang, L. J. (2024). The English reading enjoyment scale and its preliminary evidence of psychometric properties. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 18(4), 301–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2024.2302503>
- Kamimura, T. (2007). The developmental pattern of Japanese EFL student writers. *KATE Journal*, 21, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.20806/katejo.21.0_1
- Kormos, J. (2023). The role of cognitive factors in second language writing and writing to learn a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45(3), 622–646. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263122000481>
- Lee, I., & Mak, P. (2018). Metacognition and metacognitive instruction in second language writing classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 1085–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.436>
- Ma, L., Li, B., Jiao, Y., & Liu, J. (2024). Motivation profiles of Chinese rural foreign language learners: Link with learning strategy and achievement. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 15(6), 2427–2452. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0198>
- Sun, Q., Pan, H., & Zhan, J. (2023). Untangling the relationship between English as a foreign language learners' metacognitive experience and writing proficiency: A mixed-methods approach. *System*, 117, Article 103100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103100>
- Sun, Q., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Understanding learners' metacognitive experiences in learning to write in English as a foreign language: A structural equation modeling approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 986301. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.986301>
- Sun, Q., & Zhang, L. J. (2023). Examining the effects of English as a foreign language student-writers' metacognitive experiences on their writing performance. *Current Psychology*, 42(27), 23743–23758. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03416-0>
- Sun, Q., Zhang, L. J., & Carter, S. (2021). Investigating students' metacognitive experiences: Insights from the English as a foreign language learners' writing metacognitive experiences questionnaire (EFLWMEQ). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 7448812, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.744842>
- Teng, M. F. (2020). 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, M. F. (2023). Metacognition. In Z. Wen, R. Sparks, A. Biedron, & M. F. Teng (Eds.), *Cognitive individual differences in second language acquisition: Theories, assessment, and pedagogy* (pp. 175–200). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514749-009>

Appendix A

EFL Learners' Writing Metacognitive Experiences

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I am interested in writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I finish the writing task as expected.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel confident about myself as a writer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I check my grammatical errors.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I re-organise my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I check my spelling.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I check my sentence structures.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I ensure the first and last sentences are strong enough to explain the meaning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I learn/write more if I am interested in this writing topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I use what I have learned from my English courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am satisfied with my writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I check if I finish these writing tasks on time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I pay attention to grammar use in my writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I pay attention to vocabulary use in my writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I pay attention to sentence structures in my writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I pay attention to logical reasoning in my writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B

Questions for Semi-Structured Interview

1. How do you acquire the skill of writing in English during class?
2. How do you acquire proficiency in writing in English after class?
3. Please elaborate on your objectives for studying English composition.
4. When you are learning to write in English, do you reflect about how you learn, and about what is hard and what is easy?
5. Are you assured of your proficiency in writing?
6. Are there any factors that have influenced your writing process?