

WRITING SELF-EFFICACY AND WRITING PERFORMANCE ACROSS GENDER IN VOCATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

Mariana Ulfah Hoesny¹, Umi Anis Ro'isatin², Mistianah³

¹English for Tourism Industry, Business Administration
Department, Politeknik Negeri Malang, ²Automotive Electronic,
Mechanical Engineering Department, Politeknik Negeri Malang,

³Biology Education, Faculty of Mathematics and Science,
Universitas Insan Budi Utomo

E-mail: ¹marianah.ulfah@polinema.ac.id, ²umi.anis@polinema.ac.id,
³mistianah@budiutomomalang.ac.id

Abstract: This study is aimed at investigating the level of writing self-efficacy and its correlation towards writing performance. In addition, it will determine the difference of writing self-efficacy and writing performance across gender. The participants were 75 students from Diploma IV Electronic Engineering study program of State Polytechnic of Malang. They got English II subjects which focused on speaking and writing. It is a quantitative study with ex post facto design. The instruments were writing self-efficacy questionnaire, writing test and writing assessment rubric. Qualitative data from students' writing will be also presented to show the profile of students with high writing self-efficacy. Correlational analysis will be done to find out the correlation of writing self-efficacy and writing performance. In addition, t-test was done to analyze the difference of writing self-efficacy and writing performance across male and female students. The results showed that writing self-efficacy has a medium positive significance correlation with writing performance. Moreover, male and female students were not different in terms of writing self-efficacy and writing performance.

Keyword: self-efficacy, writing, gender.

Introduction

Writing is a productive skill that is required in many fields, especially in workplace. This skill is assumed to represent

communication skills, which is seen as media to do various jobs related tasks such as writing report, email, and any other duties based on writing (Perinpasingam, 2015). In regarding to this, the skill is vital for vocational education students who are directed to work after they graduate. Mastering certain field of knowledge without developing English communication is said to lessen opportunities to get jobs (Meenu & Pandey, 2014). Since any workplace needs report writing and any other forms of duty that are based on writing in English (Durga, 2018). However, writing is perceived as complicated skill since it involves complicated cognitive process (Renandya et al., 2020). Due to the fact, students face many problems in writing such as content, organization, language use, mechanic, and grammar (Alisha et al., 2019; Muamaroh et al., 2020; Nurfidoh & Kareviati, 2021). Teachers' quality, schools' facilities, uninteresting teaching activities and methods as well as other demotivating factors also contribute to the teaching of writing and the results) (Ghadirzadeh, 2012) (Haryanto, 2018) (Khusyabaroh et al., 2018) (Kotut, 2016) (Ngubane, 2020) (Pineteh, 2014). Therefore, factors that influence the skills have to be taken into account. Among many factors revealed by Nguyen & et.al, (2014; El-Omari, 2016; Khasinah, 2014; Quezada-Sarmiento, 2017;), affective factors such as anxiety, self-confidence, motivation, fear of making mistakes and pressure were also mentioned (Alrasheedi, 2020; Cahyono & Rahayu, 2020).

Self-efficacy is one among those factors which influence language performance, as stated in some studies conducted by Raoofi et al., (2012; Anyadubalu, 2010; Genç et al., 2016; Tilfarlioglu, 2009). The studies infer that self-efficacy is a strong aspect to predict students' language performance. Furthermore, they also showed the significant role of self-efficacy in EFL learning, which later influence task accomplishment and all skills in language performance. Another study conducted by Zhu (2020) revealed that self-efficacy significantly related with language performance in Chinese university. It specifically predicts speaking and listening performance in Chinese university. More specifically, self-efficacy contributes to writing, speaking, reading strategy, and listening skill as stated by Canaran et al., 2020; Leeming, 2017; Hashemnejad et al., 2014; Hetthong & Teo, 2013; Kim & Kim, 2020; Putra, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020. The term self-efficacy is originally a construct proposed by Bandura in social cognitive theory. It is defined as beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of

action required to manage prospective situation. The construct is said to influence how people think, feel, motivate themselves and act (Bandura, 1997b). Thus, efficacy belief is a major basis of action. It is said that self-efficacy triggers one's action. When a person believes in his/her capability it may push him/her to perform action to achieve goals (Bandura, 1997a). Proceeding from this theory, self-efficacy is used to presume English language performance.

Gender is another factor assumed to contribute to language performance. Thus, this research is aimed at exploring the contribution of self-efficacy towards writing performance in a vocational higher education setting. There are questions formulated namely, is there any difference between students who have high and low self-efficacy towards their writing performance. Second, the research seeks to find about how self-efficacy is implied in students' writing. The result of this research is expected to provide knowledge on the impact of self-efficacy towards writing, especially in higher vocational education setting. It can shed light on how self-efficacy affect writing performance. Thus, in turn it can encourage teachers to pay attention to self-efficacy as one of reliable affective factors.

Literature Review

English is an important language to compete in the job world. Therefore, learners are encouraged to master English as the language promises better job and career. However, to be proficient in English learners face some challenges. They have to undergo process, meet challenges and recognize some factors that influence English language performance. In general, language performance is influenced by age, aptitude, intelligence, attitude, motivation and personality (Khasinah, 2014). The opportunity and natural environment which provide meaningful context to practice English is one of factors that prevent learners from mastering English (Rabab, 2017). It happens since in some countries English is a foreign language. It is rarely used in daily communication, and mostly learned only in classroom. The environment in which learners can practice English is essential in improving their performance (Kessler, 2010). Some other factors that have to be taken into account are attitudinal, social, socioeconomic and extracurricular (El-Omari, 2016). These factors were found to have positive correlation with performance in English. Thus, learners' attitude towards English, materials and facilities provided in schools to

study English, as well as their social condition affect learners' performance. Additionally, the possibilities to practice their English is also a significant factor which impact performance. In addition to those factors, affective factors were also mentioned. Anxiety, shyness, peer pressure and fear of making errors are among those factors (Alrasheedi, 2020). Along with affective factors, self-efficacy is also referred to impact language performance in terms of positive impact, specifically English. Self-efficacy is found to be reliable in predicting achievement. It was confirmed that students with low self-efficacy also had low achievement in English. In general, it can be said that self-efficacy positively correlated with performance in language learning. It affects English language learners in acquiring language. (Alrabai, 2018; Wang & Sun, 2020). The role of self-efficacy in influencing language performance was identified in reading as well. Reading is said to be significant skill to master since it is a complex and active meaning-making process. Reading involves cognitive, motivation and affective factors as the activity covers interaction between learners and written text. It requires learners' former knowledge which is needed to interpret the text. Regarding to this, self-efficacy was found to play role in promoting reading. This factor impacts reading comprehension and reading strategy (Fitri, 2019; Kim & Kim, 2020). In addition, English listening self-efficacy was found to impact listening performance. The findings discovered by Chen (2007) after conducting research in a Taiwan university context demonstrated that listening self-efficacy was a strong predictor of listening performance.

In reference to writing, self-efficacy also emerges as one of affective factors that regulate that skill. Self-efficacy has been proved to predict writing achievement. Pajares, (2003) mentioned that self-efficacy projected writing performance. The study used writing skills self-efficacy and writing tasks self-efficacy to investigate writing performance. In addition, Putra (2020) investigated three aspects of writing self-efficacy and their contribution toward argumentative writing quality. It was found that only one aspect gives low contribution toward writing self-efficacy, which is ideation. It means that those three aspects –convention, self-regulation, and ideation- provide different contribution toward writing. In terms of gender, female students do better in writing when correlated with the level of self-efficacy (Zhu, 2020). The study also stated that there was a positive relationship between students' self-efficacy and language performance as a whole.

Research Method

Research method covers all techniques that are required to conduct research (Mishra & Alok, 2011). The techniques are managed systematically and directed to answer research problems that have been formulated. This research employs mixed methods which is defined as a method that can employ both qualitative and quantitative (Cresswell, 2003). Mixed method was implemented because this study intends to see in depth the contribution of self-efficacy in forms of statistical figure and descriptive data. The difference between high and low self-efficacy students and their performances were analyzed using independent t-test. Some evidences in the form of students writing transcription will also be presented. The writing transcription is used to demonstrate a more comprehensive understanding of how students with high and low self-efficacy perform writing.

Some instruments are used in this research. The first instrument is questionnaire to measure the level of self-efficacy towards writing performance. The instrument was developed based on Bandura scale of self-efficacy and aspects and writing. There are 41 statements in the questionnaire, with scale range from 0 until 10. 0 represents 'not certain', while 10 represents 'completely certain'. In addition, the statements in the questionnaire were graded from the easiest until the most difficult level. The statements were composed based on aspects of speaking and writing stated by (Brown, 2004). For writing there are three aspects used, namely; grammar, mechanics, content and vocabulary. In addition, the questionnaire was completed with example of texts, sentences and parts of speech. It is aimed at giving participants clear instruction and explanation of each statement. Before given to real participants, the questionnaire has been tested to 75 participants having similar characteristic with real participants.

Another instrument used in the study is writing assessment rubric. The rubrics were adopted from English Testing Service which create TOEIC test. The rubric is directed to assess writing test in TOEIC. TOEIC is an obligatory test for new students and those who are going to graduate in State Polytechnic of Malang. In addition, TOEIC sample test for writing was also used to examine students' writing performance. The test was adapted in part of writing a 300 words essay. Originally it asked test takers to write an opinion based on a topic. To match the objective of the study, students were asked to write a descriptive paragraph about an electronic object.

The study was conducted in State Polytechnic of Malang, Electronic Engineering study program. State Polytechnic of Malang is one of higher vocational education in Indonesia. The participants of the study were 46 Diploma IV of electronic engineering students. The participants were taken from second grade students because they must have passed English 1 and English 2 subjects.

Data were analyzed in two ways, quantitatively and qualitatively. The contribution of self-efficacy toward writing performance was analyzed quantitatively. Students' score on self-efficacy were put into table then interval score was calculated to determine high and low score of self-efficacy. Following this, the students were grouped into low and high self-efficacy.

Students' writing performance were measured using test. After test scores were gained, the data then used to find the contribution of self-efficacy toward writing performance using t-test. Qualitative data taken from students' writing test. The qualitative data will be presented to show how high and low self-efficacy students perform in writing. These data were analyzed manually based on writing assessment theory proposed by (Brown, 2004).

Findings and Discussion
Quantitative Measurement on The Significance of Self-Efficacy towards Writing Performance

The following tables show the result of normality test of writing performance. These tests must be done as a requirement before t-test is conducted to examine the contribution of self-efficacy towards writing.

Table 1. Normality Test on Writing Performance

	<i>High Self Efficacy</i>	<i>Low Self Efficacy</i>
<i>Shapiro-Wilk</i>	0.901	0.859
Probability	0.000	0.029

According to the table, the result of normality test for writing performance of high efficacy students resulting Shapiro-Wilk statistic test 0.901 with probability 0.000. while the normality test for low efficacy students resulted 0.859 Shapiro-Wilk with probability 0.029. Therefore, the probability is lower than alpha (5%) which means the

data is not normal. Thus, the test selected to analyze was Mann-Whitney.

Table 2. The Level of Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-Efficacy	Male	36	275,14	43,753	7,292
	Female	10	269,80	54,123	17,115
Writing	Male	36	78,17	13,053	2,175
	Female	10	85,80	11,631	3,678

Table 2. shows that the mean score of male students' self-efficacy is 275, 14 and female students' self-efficacy is 269,80. Additionally, the table presents the mean score for writing. For male, the writing score is 78,17 while for female the mean score for writing is 85,80. Thus, male and female students' self-efficacy is not significantly differing. In terms of writing, female students score higher than male students.

Table 3. Normality Test

	Gender	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Writing	Male	,222	36	,000	,904	36	,004
	Female	,291	10	,016	,846	10	,053
Self-Efficacy	Male	,143	36	,059	,954	36	,140
	Female	,191	10	,200	,935	10	,495

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4. Self-Efficacy towards Writing Performance

The result of analysis on self-efficacy toward writing performance is presented in the following.

Self Efficacy	Average	Mann Whitney	Probabilty
High Self Efficacy	76.064	-0.643	0.520
Low Self Efficacy	74.143		

The test result showed in the table demonstrated that the probability is 0.520. It means the probability is bigger than level of significance ($\alpha=5\%$). Thus, it is stated that there is no significance difference between high and low self-efficacy students towards their writing performance. The average score gained by high self-efficacy students is 76.064, while students with low self-efficacy got 74.143 average score. It indicates that high and low self-efficacy students obtained different average score. However, the difference found was not significant.

Table 5. Correlation of Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance

		Writing	Self-Efficacy
Writing	Pearson Correlation	1	,346*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,019
	N	46	46
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	,346*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,019	
	N	46	46

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 6. The Result of T-Test Gender Toward Writing Performance

Leven e's Test for Equali ty of Varian ces	t-test for Equality of Means
	95% Confiden ce Interval of the

									Differen ce	
		F	Si g.	t	df	Sig .(2- tail ed)	Mean Diffe rence	Std. Error Diffe rence	Lo we r	Up per
Writ ing	Equ al varia nces assu med	,04 6	,8 3 1	- 1, 67 2	44	,10 2	- 7,633	4,566	- 16, 836	1,5 70
	Equ al varia nces not assu med			- 1, 78 6	15, 898	,09 3	- 7,633	4,273	- 16, 697	
Self- Effi cacy	Equ al varia nces assu med	1,0 41	,3 1 3	,3 24	44	,74 7	5,339	16,46 6	- 27, 847	38, 524
	Equ al varia nces not assu med			,2 87	12, 459	,77 9	5,339	18,60 4	- 35, 031	45, 708

Table 6 shows the result of homogeneity test with significance value $0,831 > 0,05$, therefore the data of writing performance is homogeny. The result of homogeneity test for self-efficacy has significance value $0,313 > 0,05$, it means the data of self-efficacy is homogeny. In addition, table 5 also presents the result of gender

differences using t-test. The significance value for gender difference in writing performance is $0,102 > 0,05$, thus hypothesis rejected. It means that male and female students are not different in terms of writing performance. The significance value of gender in self-efficacy is $0,747 > 0,05$, therefore hypothesis rejected. It means that male and female students do not have different level of self-efficacy.

Qualitative Data on Students' Writing Performance towards Self-Efficacy

High Self-Efficacy Students and Writing

The following data reveal students' writings. These writings belong to those who have high self-efficacy

Student A1 (HIGH SE, writing score 70)

Lamp : lamp is electronics object, this object good for use brightening room and any room for life. We usually find it in many rooms. The best object for human life in the world.

Student A2 (High SE, writing score 80)

Smartphone have a rectangular shape, which have a touch screen or keypad for the oldest phone. And have funtion to make phone call or message to family or friends. This day smartphone have more than 3 color. If you want to make call just pick the phone icon and insert the number that you want to call.

Student A3 (High SE, writing score 110)

Sharp Blender type EM-125L (W) has a white color, the shape is like the other common blender in general. The specification of this blender type are weight is around 2600 gr, height is around 40 cm. Blade material made from stainless steel, it has dual speed pulse, the capacity can 1,5 liter use, power source is use 220-240 volt. There are also several supporting or special parts such knife with many types, tube, spoon, and there are various blender systems for each type of ingredient or material. So that is the explanation from Physical appearance and specification of the blender.

Based on (Brown, 2004) there are five aspects to assess writing. The aspects are organization, content, grammar, mechanics and vocabulary. In reference with these aspects, student A1 didn't meet organization and content as required in the test. Introduction wasn't completely built which also happened to the content. The development of idea was incomplete, which may be caused by lack of vocabulary and knowledge in grammar. While students A2 and A3 did quite good introduction, however student A2 didn't develop his content well. It was shown through incomplete description of the object as well as the

procedures to operate the object. Student A3 did much better in terms of content, grammar, mechanics and vocabulary. He made a short introduction, but developed complete idea of the object he described. Various vocabularies, minimum mistakes in grammar and spelling in the description demonstrated his ability in writing the paragraph. Unfortunately, student A3 missed explaining the procedures of how the object was operated.

1. **Low Self-Efficacy Students and Writing**

The following part presents students' writing. These writings were taken from students who have low self-efficacy.

Student B1 (Low SE, writing score 70)

Laptop is development by a computer. Laptop can be portable and that is more flexible than computer. Laptop is shape with the built in keyboard. You can use laptop just like you use computer.

Student B2 (LOW SE writing score 80)

Stand mixer

How to use a stand mixer. First dont forget to read the book of stand mixer, second put the bowl in stand mixer , third dont forget to press the on button to turn on the mixer and connect the mixer cable to the socket. The function a stand mixer is mix ingredient food and make a cake.

Student B3 (LOW SE writing score 100)

Camera is the most popular tools in photography activities. camera derived from camera obscura, Latin for "dark room". In the world of photography, a camera is a tool for forming and recording portrait images on a sheet of film. The camera has a square shape and has a lens in the middle of the camera, the lens is tubular. Cameras are divided into two types, namely analog cameras and digital cameras. In this day and age there are many kinds of cameras and many types.

As explained previously, the analysis on students' compositions were based on five aspects proposed by (Brown, 2004). In relation to the aspects, student B1 and B2 didn't make any introduction and didn't develop their ideas completely. Student B1 wrote three sentences to describe the object, while B2 only explained the procedures of how the object was operated. Both students made mistakes in grammar and mechanics. It was shown by misspell of 'don't' and didn't use the correct form of verbs. On the other hand, B3 did quite well in making introduction and developed idea on describing the object. In terms of grammar, vocabulary and mechanics there were no mistakes found. Instead, the sentences built clear and meet the criteria according to

grammar rules. However, B3 didn't explain the procedure of how to use the object, which meant he missed the aspect of content.

Discussion

The discussion of the results is arranged based on the order of research question. The discussion begins with the difference of students writing performance regarding their level of self-efficacy. Then the discussion on how self-efficacy implied in students' writing is discussed.

The result of the research question is students with high self-efficacy have better writing performance compared to low self-efficacy students. It was observed from the probability value gained from Mann Whitney test that was 0.520. The value indicated that the difference is not significance. In addition, the average score also demonstrated not quite far range of those with high and low self-efficacy. The average score gained by high self-efficacy students is 76.064. While students with low self-efficacy got 74.143 average score. It indicates that high and low self-efficacy students obtained different average score. However, the difference found was not significant. For this result there are many factors that can be explained further. There are some factors that contribute to poor academic writing skills among university students (Chokwe, 2013). These factors include under-preparedness caused by ineffective teaching of writing at school level, socio-economic issues and inadequate reading. Consequently, these factors affect the quality of student writing at tertiary level. First, under-preparedness is caused by a number of factors (Chokwe, 2013). Student's may be unprepared because of inadequate schooling experiences, competing family and work demands, lack of English language competency or unfamiliarity with how the college works. Secondly schools play a critical role in developing students' writing skills. If student writing is not addressed adequately at school level, the higher education sector will always be inundated with students who are academically under-prepared. Notably, it is clear that what students learn in high school either prepares or under-prepares them for university studies.

Moreover, socio-economic factors contribute negatively to student learning, particularly to academic writing. Van Rensberg and Lamberti (2004 in Chokwe, 2013) argue that it is widely understood that students who attended under-resourced rural and township

schools are under-prepared and will have difficulty with writing at university. Poor student writing cannot only be attributed to the poor schooling system but also to universities. Writing cannot be discussed in isolation from reading. Research has shown that the two complement each other (Rose, 2004). For example, Rose (2004) argues that parent-child reading before school is the first stage in a curriculum of reading skills that underlies the content and processes of teaching and learning in each stage of schooling. He found that parent-child reading is not practiced in rural areas where the indigenous people of Australia live (Rose, 2004).

Also, the difference results of this research with the results of previous studies may be due to several things which will be described further. The first is the "cultural influence" of our learners. Although it has been assumed that the students had answered the questionnaire reasonably, seemingly they tended to answer by referring to what they expect but not based on their reality. As a consequence, the result of self-efficacy questionnaire tended to be very good.

Furthermore, a non-significant effect of self-efficacy and writing performance may be caused partly by using inventory which is not always effective for gathering data. It could happen because students looked in a hurry and were not wishfully when they were filling out the questionnaires. This result is consistent with Zubaidah et al., (2018) found that one reason for the insignificant relation between reading interest and critical thinking skills may be due to a lack of effectiveness in using the reading questionnaires. The questionnaire is the most common instruments used to measure variables in education and psychology. However, the use of questionnaires raised concerns about the lack of response bias. Response bias is a systematic tendency to respond the questionnaire items on some fundamental things rather than specific content item (Paulhus, 1991). The data collection process is a complex process in which the possibilities are many differences emerged between the data to be revealed by researchers and the responses of the respondents. The difference is known as response bias. The most common response bias is a response to the expectations of the social, namely the tendency to provide answers that make respondents look good or good. Hasan et al., (2014) found that when students filled out the questionnaire, they conveyed what his hopes, not his realities. Based on those explanations, it is known that the use of questionnaire has some weaknesses. According to Milne (1999) there

are some disadvantages of questionnaire as follows: 1) questionnaire has been standardized so it is impossible to explain each point of question that may confuse students, 2) students are not serious in answering the questions especially when the questionnaire requires a long time to complete and 3) students do not fill out the questionnaire honestly because they did not want to reveal the information or they think that they do not get any benefit by completing the questionnaires. From the research result it is also found that the students' writing performance is in weak quality. These weaknesses were in line with the data determined by Wigati (2014) where English Department of University of Singaperbangsa Kerawang had troubles expressing their ideas due to lack of vocabulary, inability to write with good grammar, and unsuitability between the chosen of descriptive essay with schematic structures. In addition, Wigati (2014) also adds that the students' text organization was not coherent because of lack of vocabularies and inability to use the appropriate English grammar.

The weakness in language aspect is mainly found in applying correct grammar and language functions. There are many errors in the application of basic grammar, such as subject and verb agreement, singular and plural nouns, tenses, and article. Similarly, almost all respondents have a disadvantage in terms of unity and coherence. From some aspects above, the aspect of language becomes decisive to determine students' ability to write a thesis well and correctly. Writing is a complicated process which involves a number of cognitive and metacognitive activities, for instance, brainstorming, planning, outlining, organizing, drafting and revising. Cognitive aspects of writing have received a particular attention, as investigators have attempted to understand the thought process underlying the compositions of students. According to Byrne (1995; Mundriyah & Parmawati, 2016) there are three factors which influence writing process, they are: (1) psychology problem, a lecturer is expected to be able to write his/her own without the possibility of interaction or feedback, and itself makes the act of writing difficulties; (2) linguistics problem, a lecturer must keep the communication through his/her own efforts and to ensure, both through his/her choice of sentences structure and by the way his/her sentences are linked together and sequenced, that the text he/she writes or produces can be interpreted on its own; (3) cognitive problem, a lecturer has to master the written form of the language and

to learn certain structures which are important for effective communication in writing.

However, the result of this current study was relevant with the studies of Ariyanti & Fitriana, (2017; Aunurrahman et al., 2016; Eliwarti & Maarof ,2014) reported that the writing ability of Indonesian university EFL students had poor quality in essay academic writing performance. Beside their low ability in writing aspects, they were also lack of writing practice, disliked writing, low writing motivation, felt writing anxiety, negative writing perception, time limitation in conducting the writing test, and teaching writing taught by their lecturers. Basically, these facts appeared on the students' reasons because of their negative perception toward writing. Therefore, they experienced writing anxiety (Huwari & Abd.Aziz 2011; Fareed et al., 2016). In which, the factors that cause writing anxiety of Indonesian EFL students were difficulties in linguistics, worry of teachers' negative comments, inadequate writing technique and practice, lack of topic knowledge, and time pressure (Wahyuni & Umam, 2017). Additionally, low ability and writing anxiety of students were pressured by some factors such as untrained writing instructors, ineffective teaching methods of writing, insufficient system of writing examination, lack of reading and writing practice, big classes, low motivation, and limited ideas (Fareed et al., 2016). Other than that, apprehensive in writing activities and negative attitude toward academic writing also become factors that determine EFL students' difficulties in writing. The facts show that writing is a difficult skill to be studied (Fareed et al., 2016). Therefore, these problems need solution in order to improve EFL students' ability in writing especially in essay writing such as comparison and contrast essay (Toba et al., 2019).

Muamaroh et al., (2020) also found that some factors inhibiting and improving the students' writing skills. Based on the result of interview, supported by the results from open-ended questionnaire, it was found that one of several aspects inhibiting the students in English writing included not being confident with their writing, did not have strong English vocabulary, did not properly master English grammar, and lack of practice in English writing. Moreover, the students who learns to write English has not only cope with the mechanical problems connected with the script of the language but also with the problems of ease and fluency of expression, of grammatical and lexical accuracy and of the appropriateness of the style of writing

as demanded by the occasion or situation. by using an appropriate model, the process of teaching learning will be more interesting for both, teachers and learners, they can build a good interaction during teaching learning process, they can create a pleasant environment, the students can memorize easily what they have learnt, and apply them in their activity (Larekeng, 2018). Furthermore, Alisha et al., (2019) indicate that students lack of vocabulary mastery and grammar become the most difficult problem during writing process. The findings indicate 77.84% of respondents got difficulties in writing because of their lack of vocabulary. They face problem during generating ideas, the weakness of vocabulary mastery made them felt confused to share their ideas. They also felt hesitate in choosing the words and they need to look up their dictionaries when they are writing in English. Moreover, based on the data collected, the majority of participants (75.68%) said that usually face some difficulties when constructing sentence, because of their lack of ability using in grammar.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, the conclusion is self-efficacy doesn't contribute significantly to writing performance. The students' writings revealed that both high and low self-efficacy has medium ability. Students with high self-efficacy have better writing performance compared to low self-efficacy students, but the difference is not significant. In addition, the average score also demonstrated not quite far range of those with high and low self-efficacy. It indicates that high and low self-efficacy students obtained different average score. However, the difference found was not significant. There are some factors regarding the results, including under-preparedness caused by ineffective teaching of writing at school level, socio-economic issues, inadequate reading, cultural influence, less effective questionnaires, psychology problem, linguistics problem, and cognitive problem.

Daftar Rujukan

- Alisha, F., Safitri, N., & Santoso, I. (2019). Students' Difficulties in Writing EFL. *Professional Journal of English Education*, 2(1964), 20–25.
- Alrabai, F. (2018). The Association between Self-efficacy of Saudi Learners and Their EFL Academic Performance. *Theory and*

- Practice in Language Studies*, 8(10), 1351.
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0810.14>
- Alrasheedi, S. (2020). Investigation of Factors Influencing Speaking Performance of Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 11(4), 66–77. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.5>
- Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self Efficacy, Anxiety and Performance in the English Language among Middle-School Students in English Language Program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 39, 1043–1048.
- Ariyanti, A., & Fitriana, R. (2017). *EFL Students' Difficulties and Needs in Essay Writing*. 158(Ictte), 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iccte-17.2017.4>
- Aunurrahman, Hamied, fuad A., & Emilia, E. (2016). Exploring an Academic Writing Class in an Indonesian University Context. *Language Circle - Journal of Language and Literature*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v11i1.7842>
- Bandura, A. (1997a). *Self-Efficacy The Exercise of Control*. WH Freeman and Company.
- Bandura, A. et. a. (1997b). *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EVER.2017.7935960>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice. In *Book*. Pearson Education.
- Cahyono, B. Y., & Rahayu, T. (2020). EFL Students' Motivation in Writing, Writing Proficiency, and Gender. *Teflin Journal*, 31(2), 162–180. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i2/162-180>
- Canaran, Ö., Bayram, İ., Doğan, M., & Baturay, M. H. (2020). Causal Relationship Among the Sources of Anxiety, Self-Efficacy, and Proficiency in L2 Listening. *International Journal of Listening*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2020.1793676>
- Chen, H.-Y. (2007). *The Relationship Between EFL Learners ' Self-Efficacy Beliefs and English Performance* [The Florida State University].

<https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu%3A254251>

- Chokwe, J. M. (2013). Factors Impacting Academic Writing Skills of English Second Language Students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 377–383. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p377>
- Clement, A., & Murugavel, T. (2018). English for the Workplace: The Importance of English Language Skills for Effective Performance. *The English Classroom*, 20(1), 41–50.
- Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Durga, M. V. S. S. (2018). The Need of English Language Skills for Employment Opportunities. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 1–5. <http://www.jrspelt.com>
- El-Omari, A. H. (2016). Factors Affecting Students' Achievement in English Language Learning. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 6(2), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.5901/jesr.2016.v6n2p9>
- Eliwarti, & Maarof, N. (2014). The Effects of types of writing approaches on EFL students' writing performance. *Selt*, 11–12(June), 112–119.
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL Learners' Writing Skills: Problems, Factors and Suggestions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Fitri, D. R. et. al. (2019). The Correlation between Reading Self-Efficacy and Reading Comprehension. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 26(3), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11273-020-09706-3>
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2017.09.008>
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.117919>
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coldregions.2020.103116>
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jweia.2010.12.004>

- Genç, G., Kuluşakli, E., & Aydin, S. (2016). Exploring Prospective EFL Teachers' Perceived Self-Efficacy and Beliefs on English Language Learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.4>
- Ghadirzadeh, R. et. a. (2012). Demotivating Factors for English Language Learning Among University Students. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2012.189.195>
- Haryanto, E. et. a. (2018). The Demotivating Factors of English Language Learning Among Madrasah Tsanawiah Students: The Case of One Madrasah in Jambi City. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 5(1), 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v5i1.2045>
- Hasan, A., Zubaidah, S., & Mahanal, S. (2014). Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Reading Map Student Teams Achievement Divisions untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berfikir Kritis dan Hasil Belajar Biologi Peserta Didik Kelas X IPA SMA Insan Cendekia Shalahudin Malang. *Biologi, Sains, Lingkungan, Dan Pembelajarannya. Seminar NasionalXI, Prodi Pendidikan Biologi FKIP Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta.*, 11(1), 810–817.
- Hashemnejad, F., Zoghi, M., & Amini, D. (2014). The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance across Genders. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(5), 1045–1052. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.5.1045-1052>
- Hetthong, R., & Teo, A. (2013). Does writing self-efficacy correlate with and predict writing performance? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(1), 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.157>
- Huwari, I. F., & Abd.Aziz, N. H. (2011). Writing Apprehension in English among Jordanian Postgraduate Students at Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM). *Academic Research International*, 1(2), 190–198.
- Isleem, H. A. H. (2012). *A Suggested Program Based on Individualized*

Activities for Developing Palestinian Sixth Graders' Writing Skills.
Islamic University-Gaza.

- Keirstead, J., Mehta, S., Webb, S., Silveira, L., & Khikhol, H. (2016). *English at Work: Global Analysis of Language Skills in The Workplace* (Issue November). <http://englishatwork.cambridgeenglish.org/%0Awww.cambridgeenglish.org/images/english-at-work-full-report.pdf>
- Kessler, G. (2010). Fluency and anxiety in self-access speaking tasks: The influence of environment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(4), 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.512551>
- Khasinah, S. (2014). Factors Influencing Second Language Acquisition. *Englisia Journal*, 1(2), 256–268. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v1i2.187>
- Khusyabaroh, L., Widiati, U., & Anugerahwati, M. (2018). Demotivating factors in learning English for elementary school students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 6(3), 134–144. http://www.kapee.or.kr/data/board/b21_62.pdf
- Kim, H., & Kim, H. (2020). The Mediating Effects of Self Efficacy on Learners' Reading Strategy Use and Reading Proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal*, 24(3), 73–98.
- Kotut, J. B. (2016). *Factors Influencing Performance Of English As A Subject In Kenya Certificate Of Primary Education In Nakuru Town, East Sub-County, Kenya* [University of Nairobi]. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/100318>
- Larekeng, S. H. (2018). Spices Learning Model in Maximizing the Students' Writing Skill. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(11), 243–249. <https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/monthly-editions-new/2018-teaching-articles/volume-20-issue-11-2018/index.htm>
- Leeming, P. (2017). A Longitudinal Investigation into English Speaking Self-Efficacy in a Japanese Language Classroom. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0035-x>

- Meenu, P., & Pandey, P. (2014). Better English for Better Employment Opportunities. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approaches and Studies, Volume 1*(August), 96–103.
- Milne, J. (1999). Online questionnaires: Advantages and disadvantages. *Evaluation Cookbook*, [cited 2010 August 05].
- Mishra, S. B., & Alok, S. (2011). *Handbook of Research Methodology*. Education Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00003465-199001000-00018>
- Muamaroh, M., Mukti, V. C., & Haryanti, D. (2020). The Process and Problems of EFL Learners in English Writing. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 7(2), 405–418. <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.215>
- Mundriyah, M., & Parmawati, A. (2016). USING THINK-PAIR-SHARE (TPS) TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING CREATIVITY (A Classroom Action Research in the Second Semester Students of STKIP Siliwangi Bandung). *P2M STKIP Siliwangi*, 3(2), 84. <https://doi.org/10.22460/p2m.v3i2p84-91.630>
- Ngubane, N. I. et. a. (2020). Writing Approaches and Strategies Used by Teachers in Selected South African English First Additional Language Classrooms. *Reading and Writing (South Africa)*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4102/RW.V11I1.261>
- Nguyen, H. T., & Et.al. (2014). Factors Affecting English Language Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. *English Language Teaching*, 7(8), 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n8p94>
- Nurfidoh, S., & Kareviati, E. (2021). An Analysis of Students' Difficulties in Writing Descriptive Text. *Professional Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.30736/ej.v7i1.260>
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Motivation, and Achievement in Writing: A Review of the Literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222>

- Paulhus, D. (1991). *Measurement and Control of response Bias*.
- Perinpasingam, P. T. et. a. (2015). Needs Analysis on the Importance of English Language Skills for Workplace: Trainee Architects. *International Review of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 3(10), 129–137. www.irbas.academyirmbr.com
- Pineteh, A. (2014). The academic writing challenges of undergraduate students: A South African case study. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v3n1p12>
- Putra, I. D. G. R. D. et. al. (2020). The Predicting Power of Self Efficacy on Students' Argumentative Writing Quality. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(2), 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.10.463>
- Quezada-Sarmiento, P. A. et. a. (2017). Teachers' Factors that Influence the English Language Teaching-Learning Process in Ecuadorian High Schools in The Context of E-Education and Society. *Iberian Conference on Information Systems and Technologies, CISTI*, December 2019. <https://doi.org/10.23919/CISTI.2017.7975819>
- Rabab, G. (2017). Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3(1), 180–197.
- Rao, C., & Durga, S. (2018). Developing Students' Writing Skills in English-A Process Approach. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 1–5. <http://www.jrspelt.com>
- Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-Efficacy in Second/Foreign Language Learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p60>
- Renandya, W. A., Tangkiengsirisin, S., & Floris, F. D. (2020). *Bridging the Reading- Writing Gap in Second Language Learning* (pp. 1–20). <https://willyrenandya.com/bridging-the-reading-writing-gap-in-second-language-learning/>

- Rose, D. (2004). Sequencing and pacing of the hidden curriculum: How Indigenous learners are left out of the chain. *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein, January 2004*, 91–107. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203461877>
- Tilfarlioglu, F. T. C. (2009). Self- Efficacy in EFL: Differences among Proficiency Groups and Relationship with Success. *Novitas Royal*, 3(2), 129–142.
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The Current Issues of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing Skills: Ability, Problem, and Reason in Writing Comparison and Contrast Essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Wahyuni, S., & Umam, M. K. (2017). AN ANALYSIS ON WRITING ANXIETY OF INDONESIAN EFL. *JEELS*, 4(1), 103–126.
- Wang, C., & Sun, T. (2020). Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Language Proficiency: A Meta-Analysis. *System*, 95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102366>
- Wigati, F. A. (2014). Kesulitan Pada Aspek-aspek Writing Mahasiswa Dengan English Proficiency Levels yang Berbeda. *Jurnal Ilmiah Solusi*, 1(3), 46–57.
- Zhang, X., Ardasheva, Y., & Austin, B. W. (2020). Self-Efficacy and English Public Speaking Performance: A Mixed Method Approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, 59, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.02.001>
- Zhu, Y. et. a. (2020). The Relationship Between English Self-Efficacy and English Language Performance among Chinese University Students. *European Journal of Molecular and Clinical Medicine*, 07(03), 2331–2346.
- Zubaidah, S., Corebima, A. D., Mahanal, S., & Mistianah. (2018). Revealing the relationship between reading interest and critical thinking skills through remap GI and remap jigsaw. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(2), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1124a>

