INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF

LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION RESEARCH

1 (2021) 3

This is a PEER REVIEWED publication.

Contributions by any author, including those with any relation to the editorial board are double blind peer reviewed externally.

The *International Journal of Language and Translation Research* is a REFEREED academic journal published four times a year

Ethical Statement

The Ethical Statement is based on the recommendations of the Publication Ethics Committee (COPE) Good Practices drafted in 2011.

1. Obligations of the editor:
   1.1. Neutrality. The intellectual content of submitted manuscripts is evaluated is evaluated regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, ethnicity, political philosophy of the authors.
   1.2. Confidentiality. All manuscripts should be treated as confidential documents. They must not be shown to anyone without the permission of the editor. Managers and editorial staff should not disclose information about the manuscript submitted to anyone except the author, reviewers and potential reviewers.
   1.3. Disclosure of information and conflicts of interest. Unpublished data contained in the submitted manuscript must not be used by editors or reviewers in their own research without the explicit consent of the author.
   1.4. Decision on publication. The editor of the journal decides on the publication of submitted articles. The editor is guided by the Editorial Committee's policy, taking into account the legal obligations regarding defamation, copyrights and plagiarism. The editor can share the decision with other members of the Editorial Board or with reviewers. In the event of an appeal of the decision of the Reading Committee, the editor may solicit two new reviewers.
2. Obligations of reviewers.
   2.1. Editorial decisions. Reviewers assist the editorial staff in making decisions and may also assist the author to improve the quality of the manuscript.
   2.2. Delays and deadlines. When a guest reviewer does not feel competent enough to evaluate the research presented in the manuscript, or if he finds himself unable to provide his report in time, he must inform the editor without delay in order to give him time to contact other reviewers.
   2.3. Standards of objectivity, civility and respect. The reports must be objective. Personal remarks and criticisms directed at the author or hurtful remarks directed at the text content are not eligible. The opinion of the reviewer must be clear, well-argued and respectful of the author.
   2.4. Indication of sources. The reviewer must identify appropriate publications not cited by the author. Any such indication must be accompanied by an appropriate comment. The reviewer should draw the editor's attention to any similarity, any overlap between the manuscript and previously published data.
   2.5. Disclosure of information and conflicts of interest. Information and ideas obtained through anonymous replay are confidential and should not be used for the personal benefit of the reviewer. Reviewers should not accept reviewing manuscripts where this may result in a conflict of interest arising from competitive, collaborative or other relationships with the authors.
3. Obligations of the authors.
   3.1. Information validity. The information contained in the manuscripts submitted for publication must present the results of the authors' research as well as an objective discussion of these results and their importance. The underlying data must be presented correctly. Fraudulent and consciously inaccurate information is considered unethical and unacceptable. The identification of research done by others must always be given. Authors should cite the publications that influenced the study in question.
   3.2. Originality and plagiarism. Authors must ensure that they have written a completely original study, and if they have used other people's books or statements, they must be properly cited.
   3.3. Multiple publications. An author should not submit manuscripts representing the same study to more than one journal (or book). Submitting the same manuscript in more than one journal is unethical and unacceptable. The journal accepts articles originally published in languages other than English. In these cases, the authors must give the reference of the first publication and be free from the copyright of the original publisher.
   3.4. Paternity of the manuscript. Only authors who have made a significant contribution to the study in question are considered to be authors. All those who contributed to the study must be present in the list of authors. If other people have been involved in some aspects of the research project, they should be mentioned in the acknowledgments. The lead author must ensure that all co-authors and only they are included in the list of authors of the manuscript, that the co-authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript, and that they have agreed to submission of the manuscript.
   3.5. Disclosure of information and conflicts of interest. All authors must indicate, as a result of their biographical presentation, any conflicts of interest that may affect their proposed publication. Funding for research projects that made the study possible must be indicated.
   3.6. Errors in publishing. If the author discovers an important error or an inaccuracy in its publication, its obligation is to quickly inform the editor and to consider, in agreement with the person in charge, the withdrawal of the article or the publication of the information about the error.

Impact of Dialogue Journal Writing on EFL Learners' Self-regulation and Reading Comprehension Performance

Mehdi Rostami Ravari[1], Neda Fatehi Rad[2*]

[1]M.A., Department of English Language, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of English Language, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

Abstract

Dialogue journal writing is an activity by which language participants can make a bond of written communication with their teachers and practice various aspects of the target language. This feature can make dialogue journal writing a learner-centered instrument to improve learners' proficiency in different aspects of language. With this in mind, the present study explored the impact of dialogue journal writing on self-regulation and reading comprehension performance of EFL learners in a language institute. To this purpose, an experimental pre-test, post-test research design was used. The participants of the study were 60 pre-intermediate participants who were divided into experimental and control groups of equal size (30). At the end of the treatment, the participants took a post-test and post-questionnaire of self-regulation and the scores were recorded carefully. The results of the study indicated that the employment dialogue journal writing has a significant impact on Iranian EFL learners' reading comprehension skill and their self-regulation.

[2]Corresponding Author's Email:
nedafatehi@yahoo.com

Introduction

Dialogue journal writing is considered as an activity through which language learners try to create a unity of written communication with their teachers' help and practice various aspects of the target language continuously. This feature makes dialogue journal writing a learner-centered instrument to improve learners' proficiency in various aspects of language. Furthermore, dialogue journal writing is a research instrument to recognize teachers' views on teacher education (Baily, 1990), participants' responsibility for their learning (Porter, Goldstein, Leatherman, and Conrad, 1990), learners' ideas on learning (Myers, 2001), language learners' strategies (Halbach, 2000), and to affect learners' reflection (Hashemi and Mirzaei, 2015). Self-regulation is a psychological concept that attracted many educational researchers' attention (Zimmerman, 1990). It is defined as self-generated thoughts, behavior, and feelings that are planned and cyclically adapted regarding performance feedback to obtain self-set objectives (Zimmerman, 1989). Also, Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) referred to such processes as setting goals, selecting and using strategies, planning strategically, self-monitoring one's effectiveness and self-evaluation while remembering and learning knowledge and academic skills (Zimmerman, 2008). In other place, Schunk and Zimmerman (1997) viewed SRL as an approach to make learners autonomous and behaviorally, motivationally and meta cognitively active. It can also enable learners to take responsibility for their own learning and problem-solving. The process of making learners autonomous indicates that self-regulation is an ability that can be improved. Teachability of self-regulation can be observed in Palincsar and Brown (1984), who showed that self-regulatory strategies and processes can be instructed, and teachers can train their participants in self-regulation. More importantly, it has been confirmed by some research (e.g. Perels, Gurtler, and Schmitz, 2005; Perry, Hutchinson, and Thauberger 2007; Stoeger and Ziegler, 2008). Reading skill is considered as a significant part of the learning process which involves the reader's variables which lead to the reading process and comprehension would be the result of it. In Anderson's (2001) definition, reading is an important skill to master EFL and ESL learners. Reading skill is an important activity in any EFL class, because it is a pleasant activity, a source of information, and a means of increasing linguistic knowledge (Mori, 2004). Given that, EFL participants need to improve some strategies in doing significant task of EFL reading comprehension (Grabe, 2004). Considering different EFL reading

strategies and their positive impacts on reading comprehension achievement (e.g., Block, 1986; Carrell, 1988), researchers have spotlighted self-regulation and SRL strategies as complementing the reading strategy instruction in improving First Language (L1) reading comprehension (e.g., Souvignier and Mokhlesgerami, 2006). Despite different research on dialogue journal writing and self-regulation, not many studies have explored its effect on self-regulation and reading comprehension skill. Accordingly, the present study tries to bridge this gap through examining the effect of dialogue journals writing as an outside classroom task, on self-regulation and reading comprehension performance of EFL learners.There are a lot of problems in teaching reading that the language teacher has to pay attention to them. One of these problems refers to the lack of self-regulation that the language learners need to organize their views and ideas in a logical manner. It may display itself for different reasons as lack of enough skill and knowledge, lack of trained teachers, and poor training and instruction can be only some of the problems that may lead to failure (Hashemnezhad, 2012). Keyuravong and Maneekhao (2006) believed that participants have become accustomed to the traditional classroom setting that the teachers possess all the knowledge and give it to the participants. Teacher-centered activities as lecturing to the class remain a well-known way of English teaching in educational setting especially in in the language classes of primary and secondary schools (Chatranonth, 2008). As Jarvis and Atsilarat (2004) stated, in spite of the official endorsement regarding a move towards a learner-centered classroom, most of the teachers of school still focus and practice the traditional teacher-centered methods which is characterized by memorization and rote learning of target language rules. Mastering reading and its skills is the great objective for Iranian language learners. However, not every language learner achieves the skill to read comprehensively, effectively, and fast enough to enjoy the task. On the one hand, it takes a long time for language learners to read long passage and on the other hand, they fail to understand the passage meaningfully and deeply. In this area, the poor ability can be referred to many sources, one of which is using inefficient and poor teaching strategies that teachers employ in the reading classes. Besides, the techniques may be too mechanical or too much emphasize is given to the form, but not meaning. Therefore, not enough attention is given to the roles of the participants and their personality in teaching and learning (Grabe, 2004). That is to say, focusing on teacher-centered methods and paying too much attention to language forms may lead teaching reading in low efficiency and gradually make it as a salient skill for Iranian learners

who want to master English. Research on self- regulation revealed several related positive results containing higher academic achievement, better workplace performance, better relationship quality, and a greater sense of well-being. Moreover, studies on self-regulation concluded that self-regulation is associated with more positive social relationships, greater social competence, and greater empathy and social skills (Mayer, 2011). As most EFL teachers are not aware of employing various strategies for self- regulation in the language classrooms, they might not apply the effective strategy and may get disappointed. Also, little is known about the self- regulation that are most useful in contexts where learning is a priority (Ghonsooly and Ghanizadeh, 2011). Considered as a technique in presenting learner-centered pedagogy with a socio-cultural notion, dialogue journal writing offered constant reading and writing interaction. This technique provides opportunity for learners to use this technique as a communicative method, and teachers can enhance their awareness in learners' desires and concerns. Also, continuous writing/reading activity in dialogue journal offered participants the opportunity to practice language and this practice results in fluency (Holmes and Moulton, 1997). However, Lee (2004) reported that even though many researchers have provided evidences and acknowledged the potential advantages of dialogue journal, this tool is not employed extensively in second language learning. Thus, more research-based studies are needed to explore dialogue journals' effectiveness in improving participants' reading performance. That is to say, to the author's best knowledge no study has been conducted to date to examine quantitatively on the effect of dialog journal writing on self-regulation and reading comprehension performance of EFL learners in language institute. To come to a closer identification of the mentioned problems, the researcher focused on dialogue journals writing in order to explore the effectiveness of it on both the EFL learners' self-regulation and reading comprehension performance.

Based on the given objectives, the following questions were addressed in the present study:

RQ1. Does teaching through dialog journal writing affect EFL learners' reading development?

RQ2. Does teaching through dialog journal writing affect EFL learners' self-regulation?

Literature Review

Empirical findings on journal writing have been found to play the role of data collection technique in language learning studies. Myers (2001), motivated by Baily's (1990) comment on re-reading the journal entry to obtain maximum benefit, explored the extent to which exchanging of and reflecting on each other's journals, hence building a written dialogue, can help learners recognize their language learning objectives. He concluded that such reflections based on Jamesian 'stream of thought' can increase learners' perceptions about strengths and weaknesses in terms of vocabulary, learning strategies, thinking skills and writing creativity. Another line of dialogue journal study focuses on the usefulness of journals as a writing tool in mastering writing recount text. Through using experimental design, it was revealed that inserting dialogue journal writing activity can enhance learners' performance in writing recount texts (Hidayat, 2011). While the studies mentioned above focused on dialogue journal writing as a research and writing tool, some studies tried to view journal writing as a classroom writing activity. A pioneering study in this regard was conducted by Marefat (2002) in which she asked 80 Persian speaking undergraduate English major participants who were taking their writing course to spend 5-10 minutes at the end of each session and write their comments, reactions and feelings about the session. Content analysis of the journals revealed the areas of interest and difficulty which could be led to syllabus revision. Marefat's study prompted other researchers to consider dialogue journal writing as a beneficial activity for writing courses.

Wafa, Syafei, and Riyono (2010), implementing experimental design, concluded that dialogue journal writing was an effective activity to develop participants' writing. Similar results were found by Tuan (2010) who investigated the possibility of simplifying writing complexities by engaging learners in writing journals. He found that post-test writing scores gained by learners who kept journals for thirteen weeks increased by 24.67%, while the writing scores of learners with no such writing activity increased by only 7.32% compared to their performance in pre-test. More specifically, the writing speed, measured by "the number of words produced within a limited length of time" (p.84), of the participants who wrote dialogue journals improved significantly in comparison with those who did not. In addition, the thirteen week of journal writing practice brought about a noticeable decrease in the average number of mistakes made by the participants

(64.46%) though such change was not observed in the participants who did not keep journals (29.70%). Dialogue journal writing has been compared to other approaches to writing instruction by different writing scholars.

In another study, Ezati, Ocheng, Sentamu, and Sikoyo (2010) implemented a study to explore the role of journal writing in enhancing participant teachers' learning during school practice. It analyses data from 22 participant teachers' journals and 23 questionnaires. The study focuses on the areas that participant teachers reflected on most, the nature of their reflection and the extent to which previous experiences informed their subsequent reflection and learning. Findings showed that participant teachers frequently reflected on handling indiscipline issues, procedures and outcomes of supervision, but less on their own learning. Inadequate reflection on their learning suggests that journal writing has not yet sufficiently promoted participant teachers' professional growth. Generally, the examination and cultural orientation in the Ugandan society influence participant teachers' journal writing. In the same year, Guvenc (2010) conducted a study to investigate the effects of cooperative learning and learning journals on teacher candidate participants' self-regulated learning. Eighty-four university participants (52 girls and 32 boys) participated in this research. A quasi pre-test/post-test experimental design with control group was utilized. Both groups were taught by cooperative learning. The experimental group wrote their reflection in learning journals. The research has concluded that there is a difference between the experimental and control groups in favor of the participants of the experimental group who have been affected more positively on self-efficacy for learning and performance, elaboration, organization, critical thinking, and meta-cognitive control strategy dimensions of self-regulated learning.

Hemmati and Soltanpour (2012) found a greater gain of grammatical accuracy in writing as well as overall writing performance in participants who were exposed to reflective learning portfolios (RLP) than those who wrote dialogue journals during a fourteen-session treatment. The authors discussed that RLP necessitates intentional reflection scaffolding by a collaborator while dialogue journal writing requires incidental learning in which the instructor responses without referring explicitly to the errors. Therefore, the greater efficacy of RLP in this study could have been due to the greater efficacy of intentional learning over incidental one.

Foroutan, Noordin, and Hamzah (2013a) compared email dialogue journal writing with its paper-and-pencil counterpart in enhancing writing performance. Using quasi-experimental design, they concluded that email journal writing outperformed the paper-and-pencil version not only in overall writing but also the language use aspect. However, they reported no significance difference between the two groups regarding content, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics. A great disadvantage of their study is lack of inter-rater reliability index of writing test scores which can make their findings unreliable. In another study, Foroutan, Noordin, and Hamzah (2013b) compared the effect of dialogue journal writing with task-based writing on EFL learners' writing skills and its components. Using experimental method, they found significant improvement between pre- and post-tests in terms of content, vocabulary, organization, and language use, while no significant development was observed in overall writing performance. When the mean scores of each subcategory of writing performance were compared, it was found that task-based writing outperformed dialogue journal writing regarding organization and language use, while dialogue journal writing could result in better performance in terms of content and vocabulary. It should be mentioned that such comparisons could be done more accurately and with a more reliability if Solomon design (with two experimental and one control group) was utilized. This way, the researchers would be able to check if either of the methods were effective in improving writing performance. Most recently, Dabbagh (2017) conducted a six-month study on the effectiveness of dialogue journal writing with 84 intermediate Iranian learners. The experimental group was asked to write weekly journals and then received feedback on its content from the instructor while the control group experienced conventional instruction. The results indicated a significant difference between the experimental and control group, which confirmed the benefits of dialogue journals on the participants' improvement in overall writing performance.

Method

Design of the Study

An experimental pre-test, post-test research design was used to conduct the present study. The use of the dialog journal writing is the independent variable and reading development of the learners and their self-regulation are considered as the dependent variables of the study.

Participants

Sixty English pre-intermediate learners were the participants of the study. They were teenagers of both genders whose age ranged from 16 to 18 and had already studied English for 2 years in a language institute. The selection of the participants was done through convenient sampling in which the participants are chosen based on their availability.

Instrumentation

In order to gather the needed data, three instruments were employed in this study: placement test, pre- and post-test reading, and pre- and post-questionnaire.

Procedure

To conduct the study, at first 66 EFL learners were chosen as the participants from an English language institute. Then, to homogenize them a placement test was administered and 60 participants whose scores fell within ±1 standard deviation from the mean score, were selected as the participants. They were then divided into two groups two control and experimental groups and a reading test was administered as pre-test. Also, a pre-questionnaire was distributed among the the participants of the experimental group to obtain their views about the effectiveness of dialogue journal writing on self-regulation. Next, treatment was implemented in twelve, 60-minute sessions. The experimental group was required to read a short story each session. Then, the author asked a journal question in order for the participants to reflect on their journals. The journal questions varied from day to day but focused on important elements from the story including characters, setting, and plot. The participants were required to write about important themes from the story and analyze characters and character actions. After completing their written responses, each participant switched journals with another participant. This way, the participants had the opportunity to read each other's responses and respond to their journal entry. Then, the dialogue journals were returned to their original owners and the participants discussed what they wrote and their reactions to the responses of the others. This allowed them to think about what they were reading and reflect on what they read. It also exposed participants to other interpretations of the text they might not have considered. This reading instruction continued for four weeks. To produce the dialogic effect, the instructor commented on each journal entry to which the participants replied in a conversational manner. Following Taagart and Wilson (2005), the instructor did not correct

the participants' errors and mistakes in terms of grammar, punctuation and spelling. However, the instructor wrote back in the learners' journals and provide feedbacks on the content or message of their journal entries. On the other hand, the control group received the conventional method of the teaching reading skill. In fact, the control group did not receive any additional reading instruction in the form of oral discussions or the use of dialogue journals. After the treatment, a post-test of reading comprehension skill was run and all of the participants participated in it. The format of post-test was similar to the pre-test. After conducting the post-test, all the papers were corrected and the scores were written next to the pre-test scores for analyzing and identifying the possible differences between the two tests (pre- and post- tests). In the final step, post-questionnaire of self-regulation was given to the experimental group to investigate the participants' self-regulation through using dialogue journal writing.

Results

The results obtained from the analysis of the data showed that the mean scores of the control and experimental groups have increased in the post-test. However, the difference between the means of the pre- and post-test in the experimental group is noticeable. In other words, as table 1 below indicates. the mean of the post-test in the experimental group has increased more than the mean score of the control group.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of T-Tests

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control Group	Pre-test	16.07	30	2.732	0.475
	Post-test	16.13	30	2.272	0.435
Experimental Group	Pre-test	16.10	30	2.725	0.485
	Post-test	17.05	30	2.225	0.499

Table 2 below shows the differences between standard deviation and mean scores sample and the correlation.

Table 2

Paired Sample T-Test

Group / Test		Paired Differences						df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		thet		
					Lower	Upper			
Control Group	Pretest-Posttest	-0.10	1.31	0.40	-0.62	0.28	-1.32	29	0.03
Experimental Group	Pretest-Posttest	-1.25	1.78	0.14	-2.42	-1.09	-4.21	29	0.00*

The scores of the tests in the experimental and control groups displayed the different means. In other words, as Table 1 shows, the mean scores of pre-test and post-test in the control group are reported as 16.07 and 16.13 respectively. The difference between the two means is 0.06, which indicates a slight difference between them (Table1), while the difference between the mean score of the experimental group is remarkable. According to received data, the mean of the pre-test in the experimental group is 16.10 and the mean of the post-test is 17.05. Therefore, a significant difference between them is considerable, which is 1.05. Furthermore, p-value in control group is 0.03, but in the experimental group is 0.00 which shows the mean score of the experimental group has changed significantly (Table 2). In this part descriptive statistics analysis was conducted in order to examine the items of pre-questionnaire towards participants' self-regulation.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Questionnaire

Items	Very Like me (1)	Like me (2)	Neutral (3)	Not Like me (4)	Not very Like me (5)

Rostami Ravari & Fatehi Rad: Impact of Dialogue Journal Writing on EFL Learners' Self-regulation…

1. I plan out projects that I want to complete.	10.0%	23.3%	16.7%	30.0%	20.0%
	3	6	2	12	7
2. If an important test is coming up, I create a study plan.	2	4	8	10	6
	6.7%	13.3%	26.7%	33.3%	20%
3. Before I do something fun, I consider all things that I need to get done.	3	3	1	11	12
	10.0%	10.0%	3.3%	36.7%	40.0%
4. I can usually estimate how much time my homework will take to complete.	3	3	5	14	5
	10.0%	10.0%	16.7%	46.7%	16.7%
5. Once I have a goal, I can usually plan how to reach it.	4	5	2	12	7
	13.3%	16.7%	6.7%	40.0%	23.3%
6. I keep track of how my projects are going.	3	6	2	12	7
	10.0%	20.0%	6.7%	40.0%	23.3%
7. I know when I'm behind on a project.	2	4	7	9	8
	6.7%	13.3%	23.3%	30.0%	26.7%
8. I track my progress for reaching my goal.	3	7	5	9	6
	10.0%	23.3%	16.7%	30.0%	20.0%
9. I know what my grades are at any given time.	3	6	2	12	7
	10.0%	20.0%	6.7%	40.0%	23.3%
10. Daily, I identify things I need to get done and track what gets done.	2	4	4	12	8
	6.7%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	26.7%
11. I remember all the things I need to accomplish.	4	5	2	7	12
	13.3%	16.7%	6.7%	23.3%	40%
12. I do what it takes to get my homework done on time.	4	6	2	11	7
	13.3%	20.0%	6.7%	36.7%	23.3%
	0	1	8	11	10

13. I make choices to help me succeed, even when they aren't the most fun right now.	0.0%	3.3%	26.7%	36.7%	33.3%
14. As soon as I see things aren't going right, I want to do something about it.	1	2	5	10	12
	6.7%	3.3%	16.7%	40.0%	33.3%
15. I keep trying as many different possibilities as necessary to succeed.	2	4	8	10	6
	6.7%	13.3%	26.7%	33.3%	20%
16. I have maintaining my focus on projects that take a long time to complete.	2	4	4	12	8
	6.7%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	26.7%
17. I'm good at finding different ways to get what I want.	2	5	4	12	7
	6.7%	16.7%	13.3%	40.0%	23.3%
18. I think about how well I'm doing on my assignments.	2	5	3	13	7
	6.7%	16.7%	10.0%	43.3%	23.3%
19. I feel a sense of accomplishment when I get everything done on time.	4	5	2	7	12
	13.3%	16.7%	6.7%	23.3%	40%
20. I think about how well I've done in the past when I set new goals.	3	3	5	14	5
	10.0%	10.0%	16.7%	46.7%	16.7%
21. When I fail at something, I try to learn from my mistake.	2	4	4	12	8
	6.7%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	26.7%
22. I usually decide to change and hope for the best.	3	3	5	14	5
	10.0%	10.0%	16.7%	46.7%	16.7%

The above table analyzed the items of the pre-questionnaire. As the table shows, half of the participants (50%) did not plan out their projects that they want to complete. Also, more than half

of them (53.3%) did not create a study plan for important test. Moreover, most of them (76.7%) did not consider all things that they need to get done. Once again, more than half of the participants (63.4%) could not estimate how much time their homework would take to complete, and could not usually plan how to reach a goal. Also, the nearly same percentage (63.3%) did not keep track of how their projects are going. More than half of the participants (36.7%) did not know when they were behind on a project, and 63.3% of the participants did not know about their grades. Again, more than half of the participants (66.7%), could not identify things they need to get done and track what gets done. In addition, 63.3% could not remember all the things they need to accomplish and exactly 60% of them did not do their homework done on time. Also, exactly 70% of the EFL learners could not make choices to help them succeed, and 73.3% did not want to do something about the things that were not going right. Besides, more than half of the participants (53.3%) did not keep trying as many different possibilities as necessary to succeed, and 66.7% did not focus on projects that take a long time to complete. Furthermore, most of the participants (63.3%) were not good at finding different ways to get what they want, and about 67% of them did not think about how well they were doing on assignments. As the previous item, 63.3% of the respondents did not feel a sense of accomplishment when they get everything done on time, and 63.4% did not think about how well they had done in the past. Finally, 66.7% of the participants did not try to learn from their mistakes, and also 63.4% did not decide to change and hope for the best.

Figure 1 below indicates the average of the participants' views on the items of pre-questionnaire. More than half of the participants (51.34%) selected the options of "not like me" and "not very like me". However, less than half of them (35.33%) selected "like me" and "very like me" options, and 13.33% of the participants selected the "Neutral" option.

Figure 1

Average Analysis of All Items of Pre-Questionnaire

Not very Like me	Not Like me	Neutral	Like me	Very Like me

Descriptive statistics analysis was conducted in order to evaluate the items of the questionnaire related to dialogue journal writing method on EFL learners' self-regulation. Like the pre-questionnaire, all the statements measured in a 5-point Likert scale (5), ranging from "Not very

like me" to "Very like me". Mean score, standard deviation, and percentage of each item were used in order to investigate every question. These results were displayed in the following tables and figures.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Item One

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
1. I plan out projects that I want to complete.	9	12	0	5	4
	30.00%	40.00%	0.00%	16.67%	13.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.65	4.6368	21.5	0	12	5.75735	5	30

1. Very like me; 2. Like me; 3. Neutral; 4. Not Like me; 5. Not very like me

As the above table indicates, most of the participants (70%) believed that they plan out projects that they want to complete. Whereas, 30% of them did not plan out their projects, and nobody gave the neutral answer to this item.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Item Two

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
• If an important test is coming up, I create a study plan.	11	12	1	4	2
	36.67%	40.00%	3.33%	13.33%	6.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.2	5.1478	26.5	1	12	6.39185	5	30

The second item analyzed the study plan for important test. As the table shows, almost 77% of respondents stated that if an important test is coming up, they create a study plan. While exactly 20% of them indicated their disagreements on the proposed item. Also, 3.33% of them had neutral idea.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Item Three

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
• Before I do something fun, I consider all things that I need to get done.	9	9	0	5	7
	30.00%	30.00%	0.00%	16.67%	23.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4.1	3.7416	14	0	9	4.64588	5	30

Based on the above table, 60% of the participants said that before they do something fun, they consider all things that they need to get done. However, 40% of them displayed their disagreements on this item and nobody showed the neutral idea on this item.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of Item Four

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
4. I can usually estimate how much time my homework will take to complete.	14	11	0	3	2
	46.67%	36.67%	0.00%	10.00%	6.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
2.9	6.1237	37.5	0	14	7.6036	5	30

As seen in table, data analysis highlighted that nearly 83.5% of respondents could usually estimate how much time their homework would take to complete. Whereas, a low percentage of

them (16.67%) of them demonstrated their disagreements on the mentioned item. Nobody stated the neutral perception on the sixth item.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics of Item Five

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
5. Once I have a goal, I can usually plan how to reach it.	14	8	0	5	3
	46.67%	26.67%	0.00%	16.67%	10.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.25	5.3385	28.5	1	14	6.62867	5	30

In table 8, descriptive analysis toward making plans illustrated that most of the EFL learners (nearly 73.5%) reported once they have a goal, they can usually plan how to reach it. Whereas, a low percentage (26.67%) of them could not plan to deal with it, and nobody had neutral idea on the mentioned item.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics of Item Six

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
6. I keep track of how my projects are going.	13	6	2	4	5
	43.33%	20.00%	6.67%	13.33%	16.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.35	4.1833	17.5	2	13	5.19425	5	30

In table 9, data analysis remarked that 63.33% of the participants stated that they keep track of how their projects are going. While, 30% of them disagreed and strongly disagreed with the above statement, and 6.67% indicated their neutral ideas toward this item.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics of Item Seven

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
7. I know when I'm behind on a project.	8	10	3	4	5
	26.67%	33.33%	10.00%	13.33%	16.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.9	2.9154	8.5	3	10	3.62004	5	30

Based on the related table, exactly 60% of the participants considered that they know when they are behind on a project. However, 30% of them showed their disagreements toward this item, and 10% of them had a neutral idea toward the above question.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics of Item Eight

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
8. I track my progress for reaching my goal.	12	11	1	4	2
	40.00%	36.67%	3.33%	13.33%	6.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.15	5.1478	26.5	1	12	6.39118	5	30

The above table reflected the attitudes of the participants on the given item. As it can be seen, a great percentage of them (76.67%) declared that they track their progress for reaching their goal. However, 20% of them indicated their disagreement on the item, and 3.33% of them had a neutral idea on it.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics of Item Nine

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
9. I know what my grades are at any given time.	7	10	2	5	6
	23.33%	33.33%	6.67%	16.67%	20.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4.15	2.9154	8.5	2	10	3.62004	5	30

As it can be seen, more than half of the participants (56.66%) claimed they know what they grade are at any given time, but 36.67% did not aware of the mentioned item. Also, 6.67% of them indicated their neutral opinion.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics of Item Ten

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
10. Daily, I identify things I need to get done and track what gets done.	11	11	2	3	3
	36.67%	36.67%	6.67%	10.00%	10.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum

| 3.3 | 4.5825 | 21 | 2 | 11 | 5.69001 | 5 | 30 |

Descriptive analysis of the above table illustrated that almost 73.5% of participants mentioned that every day they identify things they need to get done and track what gets done, but a low percentage of them (20%) did not agree on the above statement. Also, 6.67% had a neutral attitude.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of Item Eleven

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
11. I remember all the things I need to accomplish.	7	13	1	4	5
	23.33%	43.33%	3.33%	13.33%	16.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.85	4.4721	20	1	13	5.55289	5	30

The analysis showed that most of the EFL learners (66.66%) remember all the things they need to accomplish, but 30% of them disagreed and strongly disagreed on the proposed item. A low percentage of them (3.33%) had a neutral opinion.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics of Item Twelve

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
12. I do what it takes to get my homework done on time.	13	10	0	4	3
	43.33%	33.33%	0.00%	13.33%	10.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count

								Sum
3.2	5.3385	28.5	0	13	6.62867		5	30

To analysis the above item, 76.66% of the participants do what it takes to get their homework done on time. In other words, only 23.33% did not observe the statement, and nobody illustrated the neutral perception.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics of Item Thirteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
13. I make choices to help me succeed, even when they aren't the most fun right now.	10	9	0	6	5
	33.33%	30.00%	0.00%	20.00%	16.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.85	3.9370	15.5	0	10	4.88843	5	30

Moreover, as the above table revealed, 66.33% of them noted that they make choices to help them succeed, even when they aren't the most fun right now. However, 36.67% noted they did not enough support in the class.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics of Item Fourteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
14. As soon as I see things aren't going right, I want to do something about it.	9	9	1	5	6
	30.00%	30.00%	3.33%	16.67%	20.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4	3.3166	11	1	9	4.11813	5	30

According to the above table, exactly 60% mentioned that as soon as they see things aren't going right, they want to do something about it. Whereas, 36.67% of them remarked their disagreement on the above statement, and 3.33% had a neutral idea.

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics of Item Fifteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
15. I keep trying as many different possibilities as necessary to succeed.	11	9	0	4	6
	36.67%	30.00%	0.00%	13.33%	20.00%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.75	4.3011	18.5	0	11	5.34059	5	30

As it can be understood from the table above, a high majority responded (66.67%) keep trying as many different possibilities as necessary to succeed, but 33.33% of them stated that they did not try, and nobody had neutral idea on the given item.

Table 19

Descriptive Statistics of Item Sixteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
16. I have maintaining my focus on projects that take a long time to complete.	9	9	0	5	7
	30.00%	30.00%	0.00%	16.67%	23.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4.1	3.7416	14	0	9	4.64588	5	30

According to the above table, exactly 60% maintaining their focus on projects that take a long time to complete, whereas, 40% of them remarked their disagreement on the above statement, and nobody had a neutral idea.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics of Item Seventeen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
17. I'm good at finding different ways to get what I want.	9	12	0	5	4
	30.00%	40.00%	0.00%	16.67%	13.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.65	4.6368	21.5	0	12	5.75735	5	30

As the above table shows, exactly 70% of the participants mentioned that they are good at finding different ways to get what they want, but 30% showed their disagreements on the mentioned item, and nobody had neutral idea.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics of Item Eighteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
	9	9	0	5	7

18. I think about how well I'm doing on my assignments.	30.00%	30.00%	0.00%	16.67%	23.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4.1	3.7416	14	0	9	4.64588	5	30

Data analysis toward the above statement indicated that exactly 60% of the participants think about how well they are doing on their assignments, while 40% of them did not think about their homework, and nobody had neutral opinion.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics of Item Nineteen

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
19. I feel a sense of accomplishment when I get everything done on time.	8	10	3	4	5
	26.67%	33.33%	10.00%	13.33%	16.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.9	2.9154	8.5	3	10	3.62004	5	30

The above table indicated that 60% of the respondents feel a sense of accomplishment when they get everything done on time. However, 30% of them showed their disagreements toward this item, and 10% of them had a neutral idea.

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics of Item Twenty

Item	VL	L	N	NL	NVL

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20. I think about how well I've done in the past when I set new goals.	9	9	0	5	7
	30.00%	30.00%	0.00%	16.67%	23.33%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
4.1	3.7416	14	0	9	4.64588	5	30

The above table analyzed the participants' views on how well they have done in the past. As the related table highlighted, more than half of them (60 %) mentioned that they think about how well they've done in the past when they set new goals. but, 40% of them displayed their negative view on this item and nobody showed the neutral idea on this item.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics of Item Twenty-one

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
21. When I fail at something, I try to learn from my mistake.	12	11	1	4	2
	40.00%	36.67%	3.33%	13.33%	6.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
3.15	5.1478	26.5	1	12	6.39118	5	30

The above table analyzed the participants' fail at something. As the table shows, a most of the participants (76.67%) uttered hat when they fail at something, they try to learn from their mistake. but, 20% of them indicated their negative attitude on the item, and 3.33% of them indicated their neutral idea on it.

Table 25

Descriptive Statistics of Item Twenty-two

Item	VL (1)	L (2)	N (3)	NL (4)	NVL (5)
22. I usually decide to change and hope for the best.	14	11	0	3	2
	46.67%	36.67%	0.00%	10.00%	6.67%

Mean	SD	Variance	Min	Max	Confidence Level (95.0%)	Count	Sum
2.9	6.1237	37.5	0	14	7.6036	5	30

Finally, the last item analyzed the participants' decisions and hopes. According to the data, a great percentage of the EFL participants (83.5%) reported that they usually decide to change and hope for the best. While, a low percentage of them (16.67%) did not decide to change, and nobody showed neutral idea on the item. Additionally, the following table, analyzed mean, variance, SD of all the items of the questionnaire. That is to say, the table illustrated the scale statistics of the 22 items of the questionnaire.

Discussion

The questions guiding the research are evaluated here. The first search question explored the impact of employing dialog journal writing on EFL learners' reading comprehension.

Q1. What is the effect of dialog journal writing on EFL learners' reading development?

Descriptive statistics illustrated the participants' improvement in reading comprehension ability by implementing dialogue journal writing method. Based on the related table (4.1), the means of participants' scores in the control group were 16.07 and 16.13 in pre-test and post-test. However, in experimental group the mean of pre-test is 16.10, and the post- test is 17.05. In fact, the EFL learners of the experimental group had better performance in reading comprehension post-test (16.13<17.05). Findings of the study proved that there was statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre and post-test. Due to the careful analysis, the first null hypothesis "using dialog journal writing does not have any significant effect on EFL learners' reading development" is completely rejected here. It is worth mentioning that the results of the present study are in contrast with the results by Baker (2014). The study analyzed the impact of dialogue journals on participant achievement in the area of reading comprehension

for fourth graders. The measurement tools for this study were the 2012-2013 Baltimore County Fourth Grade Fall and Winter Benchmark Assessments. The null hypothesis was supported for this study as there was no significant gains made by the group using the dialogue journals. However, the results of the present study are partial in line with the study by Dabbagh (2017). He explored the effect of dialogue journal writing on a language skill (writing performance). Participants were the EFL intermediate learners who were selected based on their performance on Oxford Placement Test and divided randomly into experimental and control groups. Findings of independent sample t-test located a significant difference between the experimental and control group regarding the overall writing performance, as well as the sub-components of content, organization, and vocabulary in the post-test. Moreover, the results of the present study support previous studies by different researchers as Lagan (2000) and Uduma (2011) which indicates the importance of dialogue journal writing in enhancing the quality of writing performance. In addition, findings of this research confirm the findings of the studies by Peng, (2007); Larrotta, (2008); Tuan, (2010); Wafa et al., (2010). This might be traced back to the three fundamental features of dialogue journal writing, namely the freedom in choosing the content to write about, writing a lot about those interested topics in a stress-free environment, and the dialogic individual feedback by the teacher (Mlynarczyk, 2013).

Q2. What is the effect of using dialog journal writing on EFL learners' self-regulation?

In the previous chapter, descriptive statistics illustrated the participants' attitudes by 22 items on the effectiveness of using dialogue journal writing on participants' self-regulation. Based on the achieved results of the post-questionnaire, more than half of the participants of the experimental group knew when they are behind on a project, planed out projects and they created a study plan in an important test. In their ideas, they consider all things before they do something and they kept track of how their projects are going. Also, they focused on projects that take a long time to complete, thought about how well they are doing on their assignments and wanted to do something as they see things aren't going right. Most of the participants thought about how well they have done when they set new goals and felt a sense of accomplishment when they get everything done on time. Moreover, the participants remembered all the things they need to accomplish, tried as many different possibilities as necessary to succeed and made choices to help them succeed. In

addition, a high percentage of them identified things they need to get done and could usually plan to reach a goal as well as tracked their progress for reaching their goal. They also reported that they were good at finding different ways to get what they want, and tried to learn from their mistake. Finally, a great percentage of the participants could estimate how much time their homework would take to complete and they did their homework done on time. More importantly they usually decided to change and hope for the best. Considering the above discussion, the second null hypothesis on "using dialog journal writing does not have any significant effect on EFL learners' self-regulation" cannot be accepted here. The findings of the present study are compatible with some of the previous studies as Jado (2015). The study investigated the effect of using learning journals on self-regulated learning among a sample of 61 pre-service teachers. Self-regulated learning and reflective thinking scales were applied after verifying their psychometric properties on the study sample. The results revealed that there are remarkable differences between the means of the responses on the domains of the reflective thinking scale in the pre and post-tests in favor of the experimental group. The findings also showed that there are significant differences among the means of the responses on the domains of self-regulated learning in the pre and post-tests in favor of the experimental group. Similarly, in a study by Maftoon and Tasnimi (2014) investigated the effect of self-regulation on EFL learners' reading comprehension. 149 Iranian EFL language learners were selected based on their performance on TOEFL PBT test and randomly put into two experimental and control groups. The results concluded that self-regulation has a significant effect on reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. Also, the findings of this study are similar with a study by Zarei et al., (2016) which evaluated the relationship between self-regulated learning strategies and reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. The participants were asked to respond to the Self-Regulation Trait Questionnaire. The results showed that from among the six components of self-regulated learning strategies, only planning and effort components were significant predictors of reading comprehension.

Conclusion

Dialogue journal writing method presented the advantages over the ordinary method in improving reading comprehension skills. Analysis of the data in previous chapter illustrated that this difference was due to the mentioned method of teaching since the researcher previously controlled

all extraneous variables. This large effect can be attributed to instructional activities, techniques and teaching aids which aimed at developing reading comprehension skill. Additionally, these differences were due to the fact that dialogue journal writing method emphasized on group and pair work and the teacher's assistance which was removed gradually. Furthermore, the result was also attributed to the positive interaction and participation of the participants themselves who showed motivation and because they were given enough assistance and support by the teacher at the beginning stages until they proved mastery. In conducting the present study, the experimental group showed a noticeable improvement from the pre-test to the post-test, this is likely due to the dialogue journal writing instruction they received. In fact, the treatment group which received additional reading instruction incorporating the use of dialogue journals indicated greater gains than the control group receiving traditional reading instruction. Accordingly, the study concluded that using dialog journal writing have significant effect on EFL learners' reading development.

Moreover, received data from the post-questionnaire proved that using dialog journal writing has a significant effect on the EFL learners' self-regulation. The results of this research highlighted the importance of dialogue journal writing in EFL self-regulation and reading instruction. In fact, dialogue journals provide regular practice which can lead EFL readers to make connections to what they are reading on their topic of interest. As the results of the study indicated, such a repeated practice can result in development of participants' reading performance. Applying dialogue journal writing improves what teachers hope to gain by directing their attention on introducing the facilitation of learners' understanding and conceptualization of learning. As Herbert et al., (2013) mentioned, extended writing improved reading comprehension better than question answering on measures where comprehension was examined using an extended writing activity. These activities prepared learners for recalling information from the text when they had to write about the text for a longer period of time. Also, using writing journals provide learners with a particular means of self-representation (Pavlenko, 2002). In Ivanic's (1998) idea, they provide opportunities to negotiate socially available possibilities for selfhood. Reading instructors are suggested to add dialogue journal writing as a right practice outside the class to help participants promote their language skills especially in a meaningful context. Taking the results of the present study into account, a number of implications seems possible for the practice of teaching reading skill. As a

part of the study, the researcher gathered information about the impact of implementing journal writings on reading comprehension and self-regulation at language institute

References

Anderson, N.J. (2001). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies.* Boston: Heinle& Heinle.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. (2014). *Introduction to Research in Education,* Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Bailey, K.M. (1990). The use of diary participant in teacher education programs. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp.215-226). Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Baker, K. (2014). *The Effect of Dialogue Journals on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of Fourth Graders.* M.A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Education

Block, E. (1986). The comprehension strategies of second language readers. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (3), 463–494.

Brown, D. H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd Ed.). New York: Longman.

Carrell, P. L. (1988). SLA and classroom instruction: Reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 9* (2), 223–242.

Dabbagh, A. (2017). The Effect of Dialogue Journal Writing on EFL Learners' Descriptive Writing Performance: A Quantitative Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, Vol. 6* No. 3, ISSN 2200-3592 (Print), ISSN 2200-3452.

Ezati, B. A., Ocheng, M. K., Ssentamu, P. N., & Sikoyo, L. N. (2010). Enhancing quality of participant teachers' practices through reflective journal writing during school practice. *Perspectives in Education, 28* (2), 31-40

Foroutan, M., Noordin, N., & Gani bin Hamzah, M.S. (2013a). Use of e-mail dialogue journal in enhancing writing performance. *Asian Social Science, 9*(7), 208-217.

Foroutan, M., Noordin, N., & Gani bin Hamzah, M.S. (2013b). How can dialogue journal language context? *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 7*(2), 35-42

Ghonsooly, B. & Ghanizadeh, A. (2011). Self-efficacy and self-regulation and their relationship: A study of Iranian EFL teachers. *Language Learning Journal 41*(1), 1-17.

Grabe, W. (2004). Research on teaching reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 44-69.

Gray, D. E. (2004). *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: SAGE Publications.

Guvenc, H. (2010). The effects of cooperative learning and learning journals on teacher candidates' self-regulated learning, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 10* (3), 1477-1487.

Halbach, A. (2000). Finding out about participants' learning strategies by looking at their Halliday, M.

Hashemi, Z., & Mirzaei, T. (2015). Conversations of the mind: The impact of journal writing on enhancing EFL medical participants' reflections, attitudes, and sense of self. Procedia: *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199,* 103-110.

Hashemnezhad, H. (2012). Qualitative Content Analysis Research: A Review Article. *Journal of ELT and Applied Linguistics, 3* (1).

Hemmati, F., & Soltanpour, F. (2012). A comparison of the effects of reflective learning portfolio and dialogue journal writing on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy in writing performance. *English Language Teaching, 5*(11), 16-28.

Holmes, V. L., & Moulton, M. R. (1997). Dialogue journals as an ESL learning strategy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 40*,616-621.

Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and Identity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jarvis, H., & Atsilarat, S. (2004). Shifting Paradigms: From communicative to context-based approach. *Asian EFL Journal, 6* (4), Article 8.

Jado, S. (2015). The Effect of using Learning Journals on Developing Self-Regulated Learning and Reflective Thinking among Pre-Service Teachers in Jordan. *Journal of Education and Practice, Vol.6*, No.5.

Lagan, J. (2000). *College writing skills*. London: Longman.

Larrotta, C. (2008). Written conversations with Hispanic adults developing English literacy. *Adult Basic Education and Literacy Journal, 2* (1), 13–23.

Lee, J. F., & Van Patten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Madhkhan. M & Mousavi, S.A. (2017). The Effect of Implementation of TBLT in Reading Comprehension Classes of Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching, 10*, No. 11; 2017 ISSN 1916-4742.

Maftoon, P., & Tasnimi, M. (2014). Using Self-regulation to Enhance EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 5*, No. 4, pp. 844-855.

Marefat, F. (2002). The impact of diary analysis on teaching/learning writing. *RELC Journal, 33*(1), 101-121.

Mlynarczyk, R. W. (2013). *Conversations of the mind: The uses of journal writing for second-language learners*. New York: Routledge

Mori, S. (2004). Significant motivational predictors of the amount reading by EFL learners in Japan. *RELC, 35*(1), 63-81.

Myers. J.L. (2001). Self-evaluations of the "stream of thought" in journal writing. *System, 29* (4), 481-488.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). Poststructuralist approaches to the study of social factors in L2. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user*, pp. 277-302. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Perels, F., Gurtler, T., & Schmitz, B. (2005). Training of self-regulatory and problem-solving competence. *Learning and Instruction, 15* (1), 123139

Perry, E. P., Hutchinson, L., & Thauberger, C. (2007). Mentoring participant teachers to design and implement literacy tasks that support selfregulated reading and writing. *Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 23*(1), 27-50.

Porter, P.A., Goldstein, L.M., Leatherman, J., & Conrad, S., (1990). An ongoing dialogue: Learning logs for teacher preparation. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 227-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, H., & Harbon, L. (2018). Self-regulation in second language learning: An investigation of the kanji learning task. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*(1), 96-107.

Souvignier, E., & Mokhlesgerami, J. (2006). Using self-Regulation as a framework for implementing strategy instruction to foster reading comprehension. *Learning and Instruction, 16* (1), 57-71.

Stoeger, H., & Ziegler, A. (2008). Evaluation of a classroom-based training to improve self-regulation in time management tasks during homework activities with fourth graders. *Metacognition and Learning, 1* (24), 207-230.

Tuan, L.T. (2010). Enhancing EFL learners' writing skill via journal writing. *English Language Teaching, 3*(3), 81-88.

Uduma, E. O. (2011). Journal keeping in an ESL classroom: An innovative approach in language learning. *Journal of Education and Practice, 2*(6), 59–63.

Wafa, A., Syafei, M., & Riyono, A. (2010). Keeping journal writing to improve the writing ability of the tenth- grade participants of SMA N1 Jekulo Kudus in the academic year 2009/2010. ISSN: 1979-6889.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. *Educational psychologist, 25*(1), 3-17.