☰

Magister

Scientiae

Submit an Article

Vol 49, No 2 (2021)

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Article

Authors Guidelines

Focus and Scope

Editorial Board

Reviewer

Open Access Policy

Publication Ethics

Peer Review Process

Announcements

Contact Us

Visitors (since

November 13th, 2017):

Statcounter

View Magister Scientiae Stats

User

Username

Password

Remember me

pISSN : 0852-078X

Magister

Scientiae

Home / Editorial Board

Editorial Board

Chief Editor

Drs. YG Harto Pramono, Ph.D. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar

Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University

Managing Editor

Mateus Yumarnamto, S.Pd., M.Hum., Ph.D. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar

Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University

Submit an Article

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Authors Guidelines

Focus and Scope

Editorial Board

Reviewer

Open Access Policy

Publication Ethics

Peer Review Process

Announcements

Contact Us

Visitors (since

November 13th, 2017):

Statcounter

View Magister Scientiae Stats

User

Username

Password

Remember me

pISSN : 0852-078X

Magister
Scientiae

Submit an Article

Reviewer

Prof. Anita Lie, MA., Ed.D. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Prof. Dr. Veronica L. Diptoadi, M.Sc. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Dr. V. Luluk Prijambodo, M.Pd. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Dean A. Zollman - ID Scopus, ID Google Scholar — Kansas State University (USA)

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Authors Guidelines

Focus and Scope

Editorial Board

Reviewer

Open Access Policy

Publication Ethics

Peer Review Process

Announcements

Contact Us

Visitors (since

November 13th, 2017):

Adrian Rogers - ID Scopus, ID Google Scholar — Ohio State University (USA)

Willy Ardian Renandya - ID Scopus, ID Google Scholar — Nanyang Technological University, National Institute Of Education, Singapore

Dr. Ignatius Harjanto - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Dr. Hendra Tedjasuksmana, M.Hum. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Yohanes Nugroho Widyanto, M.Ed., Ph.D. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Dr. Bartholomeus Budiyono, M.Pd. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Dr. Ruruh Mindari, M.Pd. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

User

Dra. M.N. Siti Mina Tamah, M.Pd., Ph.D. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Username

Password

Dra. Susana Teopilus, M.Pd. - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya

Remember me

Djuwari - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar — STIE Perbanas Surabaya

Reviewer

Susanto - ID Scopus, ID SINTA, ID Google Scholar   Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Yohanes Setiawan Nietiadi - ID Scopus, ID Google Scholar   Instituto Superior Tecnico, Lisbon, Portugal

Juliana Wijaya - ID Scopus, ID Google Scholar   University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), California

A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN INDONESIAN UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS' PERCEIVED ANXIETY AND SELF-EFFICACY IN CRITICAL WRITING

Fidelia Ratih Widya Wardani (fideliarww@gmail.com)[1], Concilianus Laos Mbato (cons@usd.ac.id)[2]

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate students' perception on their writing anxiety and how they employed their writing self-efficacy as well as the relationship between writing anxiety and writing efficacy. This research was conducted toward 29 students from undergraduate and graduate EFL students in Yogyakarta who were taking critical writing course. This study used mixed-method research employing a close-ended questionnaire and interview to gather the data. The writing anxiety questionnaire statements were adopted from Cheng (2004), while the writing efficacy statements were adopted from Eby (2018). The data results were analysed using SPSS version 25 then described statistically, whilst the interview data were analysed using thematic analysis. The results showed that both undergraduate and graduate students had a high self-efficacy and anxiety in writing. A correlation test which was conducted and described in the discussion section to see the relationship between writing anxiety and writing efficacy indicates that all aspects of writing anxiety had a negative correlation but not significant with writing ability and behavior. However, not all aspects of writing anxiety such as somatic anxiety, avoidance behaviour, and cognitive anxiety had a negative correlation with writing ideas, writing conventions and self-regulation in writing. The interview result showed that the students who had good self-efficacy in writing felt anxiety as a means to explore themselves and foster a positive mind set to continue progressing in writing. The implication of this research is to expand knowledge related to writing practice in EFL context and educational psychology.

Keywords: Writing anxiety, writing self-efficacy, EFL student

INTRODUCTION

Writing academic text as well as non-academic text is not easy. In the writing process, the writers may face some challenges that may cause the failure in writing. The students must understand many principals of writing. Undergraduate EFL learners must understand vocabulary, tenses, and dictions. Other than that, they may experience some obstacles in writing in the form of laziness, procrastination, and other things that are manifestations of writing anxiety.

Student's writing anxiety brings out the low quality of writing product. Many studies have found students' anxiety in writing. Ho (2015) explored the writing anxiety among EFL graduate students in Taiwan. He used survey and interviews toward 218 engineering-related field graduate students at Taiwanese universities. The master and doctoral students showed a moderate level of writing anxiety in writing a research paper. This research was related to the student's source of anxiety, which comes from different sources such as psychological, behavioural, and cognitive levels. The research reveals that even on a graduate level, students feel anxious about negative feedback from the lecturer, time restriction, and inadequate English writing skills. A similar study was yielded by Wijaya & Mbato (2020), who researched English Education Master Program at an Indonesian

---

[1] *Lecturer of Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta*
[2] *Lecturer of Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta*

university. The research reveals that graduate students find anxiety in their academic writing. They tend to procrastinate their work when they grapple with difficulties and negative thought. The difficulties and anxiety in writing are not only faced by the graduate students but also the undergraduate students as a foreign language learners.

Writing is a skill that is as important as other language skills, namely reading, listening and speaking. For English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) students, writing is an important skill which is needed in the write up of their thesis before graduation and also a future career path. Therefore, during college, students undertake various types of writing subjects such as basic writing, paragraph writing, critical reading and writing, academic writing, and writing proposals as well as thesis. To be successful in writing, students should possess self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is one source of the inner motivation; it is one's belief toward his/her ability in doing something (Bandura, 1997). Writing self-efficacy refers to the student's confidence in writing. This theory is understood as the opposite of writing anxiety. Self-efficacy promotes students' belief toward their ability in something, in this case, in critical writing. The students who have a high degree of self-efficacy produce a better quality of writing. Lee & Evans (2019) investigated the importance of receiving and giving feedback toward writing self-efficacy in L2 learner. They stated that writing self-efficacy is "shaped through a dynamic interplay between receptive and productive mastery experiences, computer-mediated exchanges, social comparisons, and achievement goal orientations" (p. 1).

There were a lot of studies that explored the relationship between writing anxiety and self-efficacy in academic writing. Rezaei and Jafari (2014) researched the level, causes and types of writing anxiety toward Iranian EFL students. They used the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) and the Causes of Writing Anxiety Inventory (CWAI) as the research instrument. The research revealed that cognitive anxiety was the main type of students' writing anxiety. A similar study was conducted by Wahyuni and Umam (2017) on Indonesian EFL learners. They found that 54% of Indonesian EFL college students experienced a high level of writing anxiety that dominated by cognitive anxiety. It caused four main factors: hardship of linguistics, inadequate ability in writing, dread of negative feedback, and time pressure. Ho (2015) has explored Taiwanese graduate students' writing anxiety and self-efficacy. The result showed that graduate master and doctoral students have a moderate level of writing anxiety. They showed that higher self-efficacy makes the student less discomfort on writing. Eby (2018) in his research using the Self-efficacy for Writing Scale (SEWS) found that students with low self-efficacy interpret teacher feedback in their writing products as less positive and less encouraging than students with high self-efficacy.

From previous research, no one has investigated the perception of Indonesian undergraduate and graduate students on their writing anxiety and writing efficacy. Therefore, this research is a renewal of several previous studies using SWLAI by Cheng (2004) and SEWS by Eby (2018) as the instrument. The research was conducted on undergraduate and graduate Indonesian EFL students in Yogyakarta.

The researchers conducted the study to investigate the perception of the undergraduate sophomore students' writing anxiety and writing efficacy in their critical academic writing. The researchers chose this critical writing to examine more deeply the students' anxiety experiences in writing during online learning as well as to investigate the differences and similarities between undergraduate and graduate EFL students' perceptions of their writing anxiety and writing efficacy. The researchers conducted this research in Yogyakarta as an area that is easily accessible and has a large sample. Thus, this research is expected to be a new source of knowledge in the

world of education and learning psychology, especially in terms of writing, anxiety, and self-efficacy, and also to complement existing research. The researchers have formulated three research questions to be investigated in this research.

1. How do the students perceive their writing anxiety?
2. How do the students perceive self-efficacy in their writing?
3. What is the relationship between undergraduate EFL students' writing anxiety and students' self-efficacy in critical writing tasks?

    Question three lead to the following hypothesis:

    H_o: There is no positive and significant relationship between students' writing anxiety with self-efficacy in critical writing tasks.

    H_1: There is a positive and significant relationship between students' writing anxiety with self-efficacy in critical writing tasks.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The researchers try to elaborate on the review related literature that was used as the foundation theory in this research. The literature review discusses critical writing, writing anxiety, and self-efficacy in writing.

Critical Writing

Complex skills are needed in completing a writing task. The skill of organizing the idea, thinking logically, finding the sources, constructing coherence and cohesion of each sentence and paragraph, and language feature mastery are some substantial skills needed in writing. This part elaborates on the course where the researchers conducted a research. Critical Writing is a course offered by the English department which promotes students critical thinking in reading and writing. In this research, the participants have taken the sequel or the advanced Critical Writing course. This course is offered for the sophomore at the university. This course aims to facilitate the student acquiring information by accessing a large amount of reading. Hence, the students are expected to have improvement and development of their critical reading and writing skills. This course promotes metacognitive strategy through planning, monitoring, and evaluating in reading and writing. This course also introduces the student to standardized writing and reading test. In addition, this course involves the skill to plan the building up and development of information, the skill to create mind mapping and the skill of note-taking, summary making, and synthesizing. Education issues in general, technology in education, education issues, and language education and classroom management are some integrated topics to develop student's critical reading skills.

Critical writing is an important skill in education, especially for students. The importance of creative writing is to bring up students to be able to produce critical writing according to the level of university students so that they are also able to present critical reading that is in accordance with university students' ability standards by showing their critical thinking. This course encourages students to convey ideas, opinions, and criticisms in their writing and train them in practicing self-reflection (Masoud & Mostafa, 2020). What is meant is that they are able to write with the condition that they are able to analyze, identify, and give arguments to them on the positive and negative angels they find. In critical writing, students are expected to practice writing effectively through the evidence and reasons they get (Ahmed, 2018).

Since critical writing involves complex skills and knowledge, it cannot be denied that students face some difficulties in writing. Some factors such as students' restlessness with unfamiliar topics, lack of ability to develop notions into paragraphs, difficulty analyzing and developing as higher-order thinking stages make them put about their writing skills. Furthermore, the challenges faced by students in critical writing are about how they grow questions that provoke their critical thinking, as well as the ability to build critical analysis that leads them to their critical thinking and critical writing skills (Bailey et al., 2015).

Writing Anxiety

Since writing needs complex skills as stated in the previous part, those provoke student's anxiety in writing. The feeling of anxiety becomes a hindrance to the writing process for the students tend to withdraw from writing practice. Some studies related to writing anxiety discovered that writing anxiety is common among EFL students. Cheng (2004) developed the Second Language Writing Anxiety Index (SLWAI) which has been used by many people. SLWAI consists of three sectors, which are somatic anxiety, avoidance behavior, and cognitive anxiety. Sabti, Rashid, Nimehchisalem and Darmi (2019) found that the student who has a high level of writing anxiety produce a lowly writing quality. They found that the students tend to limit their self and elude to English writing task. This might happen when the students have a negative experience in writing such as the limit of time in working on the task and negative feedback from the lecturer (Kırmızı & Kırmızı, 2015). It brings down students' nerve to practice writing so that they fall deeper into the writing anxiety. Procrastinating in writing is one of the traits that students experience writing anxiety. Ho (2015) found that the source of writing anxiety encompasses "insufficient writing skills in English, time constraints, and fear of negative comments." (p. 24). Daud, Daud, and Kassim (2016, p. 3) stated that student's anxiety is caused by a deficit or a lack of models. It makes the student frustrated in performing due to underdeveloped skills. Gupta (1998) argues that writing is a very complicated skill to acquire. This is what L2 students are afraid of because they have different backgrounds as reported by Levine (2003) that monolingual background students have more anxiety rather than those from bi or multilingual background. Basturkmen and Lewis (2002, as cited in Daud at al. (2016)) found that the idea of achievement in writing is analogous with "self-expression, the flow of ideas, expectations of outsiders, the growth of self-confidence and enjoyment of L2 academic writing" (p. 5-6).

Self-efficacy in writing

Self-efficacy becomes essential following the self-image. It leads us to achieve what we have set before of how we see ourselves in particular works. Educators and researchers currently highlighted the importance of self-efficacy in today's learning. Bandura, a social cognitive theorist, has sparked the self-efficacy theory (1997) which inspires many researchers to conduct studies about self-efficacy. He conveys that there are four sources of self-efficacy development namely mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and psychological arousal. Those factors lead someone to present behaviour and performance (Bandura, 1997).

There were many studies conducted related to self-efficacy on language skills in EFL. Eby (2018) conducted research on self-efficacy in writing and developing the Self-efficacy Writing Scale (SEWS) that was adopted as the instrument in this research. The SEWS includes writing behavior, ideation, convention, and self-regulation items. His research revealed that the students with low self-efficacy on writing tend to interpret the feedback as less positive and encouraging rather than those who have a high self-efficacy on writing. Ho (2015) conducted research related to writing anxiety and self-efficacy in Taiwanese students. He stated that self-efficacy

in writing includes micro-skills related to grammar and macro-skills related to the composition of writing. Wardani (2020) found that undergraduate student's reading efficacy can be improved by using the reader's log to maintain their language acquisition and their critical thinking. The strategy to use the reader's log is also used by some lecturers at the graduate level. Self-efficacy at the graduate level promotes better academic writing quality (Wijaya & Mbato, 2020) The student with good self-efficacy is capable to maintain their motivation and more resilient to confront the challenge.

Therefore this research is conducted to explore the phenomenon of writing anxiety that occurs in Indonesian undergraduate students as EFL students in online learning and to explore how they use self-efficacy when they experience anxiety in writing. This research used a mixed-method to provide descriptive statistic elaboration of the source of writing anxiety.

METHOD

This section elaborates on the method used in conducting the study. This research was to explore students' perception within their writing experience which includes their writing anxiety and writing-efficacy, also their writing competence while taking critical writing course as EFL students. This study adopted a mixed-method study that employed a questionnaire as the quantitative method and an interview as the qualitative way in gathering the data (see, Creswell & Plano Clark (2004, p. 4, as cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018, p. 32). This research used purposive sampling (see, Cohen 2018, pp. 218-9), where the participants were 16 undergraduate students and 13 graduate students of the English department in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. All the participants were students who took critical writing tasks. They previously had a critical reading task in a half-semester as the initial stage in the course. They were expected to be able to read critically as the provision of their next critical writing. Those 29 students answered the close-ended questionnaire, then six of the students were chosen to have an interview. They were chosen based on their average score in the close-ended questionnaire results which were a student of undergraduate and graduate with highest, middle, and the lowest average score on writing anxiety and writing efficacy. The sequential design (Creswell, 2012, p. 542) was done in gathering the data. The data were initially gathered by employing the questionnaire and continued by interview. The close-ended questionnaire was used to find student's degree of agreement toward the statement related to their writing anxiety and writing self-efficacy. The questionnaire used Likert's scale to provide the scale of agreement in four choices from (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree and (4) strongly agree. In investigating students' perception toward their writing anxiety that occur during their experience in taking critical writing course, the researchers distributed 20 close-ended statements. The 20 statements related to writing anxiety were adopted and adapted from Cheng (2004) about Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) encompassing student's somatic anxiety experience, avoidance behaviour, and cognitive anxiety experience in writing. The other 20 statements related to writing efficacy were adopted and adapted from Eby (2018), who developed Self-efficacy Writing Scales (SEWS). SEWS used to examine student's perception toward writing-efficacy that they developed during critical writing course. The interview section aimed to investigate their experience of writing anxiety and how they employed self-efficacy to overcome their writing journey. The data were gathered online due to the pandemic.

Figure 1. Sequential Design

The step after the data gathering was the data analysis. The quantitative data from the questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics. Cohen et al. (2018) argued that "Descriptive statistics do what they say: they describe so that researchers can then analyze and interpret what these descriptions mean." (p. 753). The researchers provided average scores of the data and standard deviation (σ) to measure the dispersal or range of scores. Then the interview data were generated to find the different views of the cause and effects of students' writing anxiety (cf. Cheng, 2004) and writing efficacy (cf. Ho, 2016).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researchers conducted a reliability test using SPSS as a form of consistency of research values. Based on the results of the calculation of all questionnaire items, Cronbach's Alpha value is > 0.60, which means that all items show reliable results.

Table 1. Reliability Items Value

No.	Label		Alpha Cronbach's	N of Item
1	Writing Anxiety	Somatic Anxiety	,830	6
2		Avoidance Behavior	,616	7
3		Cognitive Anxiety	,725	7
4	Writing Efficacy	Writing Behavior	,928	4
5		Ideation	,823	5
6		Convention	,731	6
7		Self-regulation	,805	5

The questionnaire statements were classified into seven labels. Three labels of writing anxiety included 6-item of somatic anxiety, 7-item avoidance behavior and 7-item cognitive anxiety (Cheng, 2004) and were followed by writing efficacy which includes 4-item writing behavior, 5- item ideation, 6-item convention, and 5-item self-regulation. The calculation results show that the value is above the reliability limit value of 0.6, which indicates that all 40-item of writing anxiety and writing efficacy have high and stable reliability values.

This study first aims to determine students' perceptions of writing anxiety. In this case, we present questionnaire data about their views on their writing anxiety. Based on the data obtained, both graduate and undergraduate students have a high level of writing anxiety. However, the high level of writing anxiety they experienced was not something that prevented them from writing. They stated that writing anxiety led them to develop themselves to be able to produce better writing. Both graduate and undergraduate students felt anxious about grammar and writing structure errors. According to Ho (2015) anxiety about grammar and diction is a manifestation of the weak students' micro-level writing skills and students' concerns about drafting ideas, including the weak students' macro-level writing skills. In addition, one of the students said that he felt he was thinking too much about what he was going to write.

"I have an overthinking when write writing because I worry about the expectation from the readers." (U2)

Wahyuni and Umam (2017) state that cognitive anxiety grows because of students' bad expectations and experiences in writing. Cognitive anxiety can harm students' writing processes. Some students felt that their writing anxiety made them feel lazy and delay their work because they could build a clear idea.

"I am not able to delineate clearer ideas, not confident enough in writing and feel hopeless" (G1)

They also felt that they produced a low quality of writing. Even so, undergraduate students tried to build a positive response to their writing anxiety.

"I think my anxiety leads me to be more careful about my writing because I want to give the best of my writing." (U2)

"The fact that it pushes me to do more in my writing process, I find many new things and it makes me enjoy it." (U1)

Not all students responded to anxiety in themselves as a bad thing; they tried to be positive and prepare themselves to write better than before. Schunk and Bursuck (2015) stated that the success of learning comes from social factors such as peers, teachers, family and others. A student said that she believed in her ability in writing if she could read and understand what she would write.

As statistical evidence of their views on the writing anxiety experience, we present the following data.

Table 2. Writing Anxiety Questionaire Results

No	Statements	Undergraduate		Graduate	
		Mean	σ	Mean	σ
1.	My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under a time constraint.	3,13	,342	3,08	,954
2.	I often feel panic when I write English compositions under a time constraint.	2,88	,806	2,92	,954
3.	I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	2,44	,814	2,46	,967
4.	I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under a time constraint.	2,69	,873	2,54	,776
5.	I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	2,63	,719	2,08	,862
6.	My mind often goes blank when I start to work on English composition.	2,88	,957	2,38	,870
7.	I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	2,81	,834	2,62	,961
8.	Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.	3,25	,577	3,38	,870
9.	I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	2,75	,447	2,92	,954
10.	I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.	3,06	,772	3,31	,947
11.	I usually do my best and never avoid writing English compositions.	2,63	,806	3,08	,760
11.	If I have a choice, I would use English to write compositions.	2,69	,793	3,08	1,038
12.	I do my best and accept situations in which I have to write in English.	2,69	,704	3,54	,660
13.	I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions.	2,88	,619	2,85	,987

14.	I'm not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor	2,38	,806	2,62	1,121
15.	I don't worry that my English compositions are a lot worse than others.	2,38	,892	2,77	,927
16.	I'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	2,44	,704	2,77	1,013
17.	While writing in English, I'm not nervous at all.	2,31	1,014	3,15	,555
18.	If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade.	2,50	,894	3,08	,945
19.	While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	3,13	,885	2,77	,927
	Average	2.71		2.87	

The responses to the Second Language Writing Anxiety Index (SLWAI) of undergraduate and graduate students show that both undergraduate and undergraduate students had a high degree of writing anxiety. The undergraduate students (2.8) had an average somatic anxiety score higher than graduate students (2.6) (see statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6). Undergraduate students' somatic anxiety was higher because they had less writing experience than graduate students. They show somatic symptoms in the form of trembling, panic, confused thoughts, faster heart beating when they were faced with writing time limits. While undergraduate students had an average score of avoidance behavior (3.1), which was higher than undergraduate students with an average result of avoidance behavior (2.8).

The statements in the SLWAI table are important to note. The graduate students show higher writing anxiety because of the heavy-duty writing demands and requirements. Graduate students usually write for publication while undergraduate students write for academic purposes. This makes them avoid trying to write more optimally. Items number 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, which identify avoidance behavior are written in a positive statement, which shows that graduate students have more maximum effort in academic writing. While undergraduate students tend to avoid the maximum writing process. The avoidance behavior is like the habit of writing ideas in L1, the habit of writing outside class hours to avoid writing, and the habit of allowing themselves to limit his writing.

The last classification of writing anxiety is cognitive anxiety. The result shows that the graduate students had an average score on cognitive anxiety (2.9) and was greater than the average of undergraduate students' cognitive anxiety (2.5). Items number 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are represented as statements of cognitive anxiety. Graduate students show higher cognitive anxiety than undergraduate students. They would worry if other people knew their writing was of low quality. Thus they have a higher standard of perfection in writing, which will later encourage them to produce better quality writing.

Some questions were asked related to the causes and effects of their writing anxiety and also the causes and effects of their self-efficacy on writing. Here we provide the summary of the interview results. We investigated the causes of the students' anxiety and self-efficacy during their writing process and then continued by investigating the effects of their writing anxiety and writing efficacy. Most of the students who had good self-efficacy believed in their ability in writing, and over time, the practice would encourage them to produce better quality writing. The better writing quality was meant that the writers were able to construct more structured sentences, along with the confidence they had. Self-efficacy encourages them to build consistency and persistence in writing practice. It would lead the writers to become writers who were able to produce good quality writing.

This can be obtained by reading and understanding the desired writing, for example research articles and other information needed as reference examples to enable them to understand the structure and meaning of the writings they read. Furthermore, the practice of writing by looking at the analysis of the structure of the texts read before and comparing the texts encourages them to produce critical writings that can be easily and clearly read by readers. Their writing practice includes paraphrasing and sumarizing sentences, arranging paragraph structures, laying out clear writing ideas, and conducting self-monitoring.

A student who had low self-efficacy felt unsure about her ability stated:

"I don't know, I'm unsure about my writing. I may be not confident enough in writing but I try my best." (U3)

Street (2010) stated that success is achieved by personal encouragement, environmental support, habits, and course factors. Therefore, teachers must build good relationships with students to reduce excessive anxiety and encourage students' self-confidence to continue to develop their academic writing skills.

The data below were the result of the questionnaire that the researchers distributed as the data presented statistically related to the writing efficacy experience in critical writing.

Table 3. Writing-efficacy Questionaire Results

No	Statements	Undergraduate		Graduate	
		Mean	σ	Mean	σ
1.	I like to write.	3,13	,85	3,31	,630
2.	I enjoy writing.	3,25	,683	3,31	,630
3.	Writing is fun.	3,06	,772	3,38	,650
4.	I feel good when I write.	2,88	,719	3,00	,816
5.	I can think of many ideas for my writing.	2,94	,680	3,08	,760
6.	I can put my ideas into writing.	3,06	,574	3,23	,725
7.	I can think of many words to describe my ideas.	2,69	,704	2,85	1,068
8.	I can think of a lot of original ideas.	2,81	,655	3,00	,913
9.	I know exactly where to place my ideas in writing.	2,69	,602	2,92	,954
10.	I can write a well-organized English text.	2,25	,683	2,92	,641
11.	I can write a good introduction for an essay	2,56	,629	3,00	,707
12.	I can write up a nice body section for an essay	2,50	,6,32	3,00	,707
13.	I can properly paraphrase or summarize others' ideas in my own words in English.	3,13	,500	3,15	,555
14.	I can write up a good conclusion for my essay	3,00	,516	3,08	,641
15.	I can clearly state the importance and purpose of my essay in written English	3,19	,403	3,15	,689
16.	I can focus on my writing for at least one hour.	2,75	,775	2,77	1,166
17.	I can avoid distractions while I write.	2,31	,704	2,31	1,182
18.	I can start writing assignments quickly.	2,31	602	2,61	1,193
19.	I can control my frustration when I write.	2,61	,619	2,77	1,092
20.	I can think of my writing goals before I write.	3.00	,516	3,08	,862
	Average	2.80		3.00	

Student's writing habit in the form of their perception of the writing process affects the writing product. Both graduate and undergraduate students demonstrate a high level of writing efficacy. The results of the questionnaire on self-efficacy in writing show that graduate students had a greater writing anxiety score than undergraduate students. They generally had good writing habits and writing abilities such as ideas, conventions,

and self-regulation. Item statements 1, 2, 3, 4 show their writing habits and what they felt in general in writing. The Graduate students had an average writing habit value of 3.25 while undergraduate students' was 3.08. Their perception of the enjoyment of the writing process encourages them to improve their self-efficacy in writing and their writing quality. Students who have a high interest in writing will be able to convey the results of their thoughts well.

When we read an article we will find the author's ideas conveyed in his writing. In an article, we will see that good writing is well-organized and has a clear main idea. The questionnaire results showed that graduate students had an average ideation value of 3.02 and undergraduate students of 2.84. Ideation is forming writing ideas such as thinking about the main ideas, describing the main ideas, developing writing, placing ideas in writing. The questionnaire items 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 represent the students' ideation statements.

The next aspect in writing efficacy was the conventions of the writing. In academic writing, graduate and undergraduate students must write sequentially from the introduction, body, and conclusion accompanied by clear sources of information and maintain their originality. The graduate students had a greater average convention scale, which was 3.03 compared to the undergraduate students, which was 2.69. The convention aspect in writing includes the ability to write the introduction clearly, producing well-organized writing, paraphrasing and summarizing, and making a conclusion of writing as items 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The importance of self-regulation in writing, which is planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategy leads the students to produce a better writing product. The self-regulation aspect in writing can be seen in items 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. Self-regulation in writing includes students' ability to regulate themselves to focus on writing and ignore distractions around them. Students who have good self-regulation firstly set their goals of writing. In addition, mental readiness and environmental support play an important role in the writing process. If a student is able to avoid the distraction and focus on their goals of writing they will be able to set the writing strategy to support them to write quickly with a good writing quality.

Subsequently, we looked for the influence of each writing anxiety aspect on writing efficacy aspects. The researchers examined the regression coefficient and correlation coefficient using SPSS to find the direction of the influence of each aspect. The test results were displayed as follows.

Table 4. Correlation and Regression between
Writing Anxiety Aspects and Writing Ability and Behaviour

	Somatic Anxiety	Avoidance Behavior	Cognitive Anxiety
Pearson Correlation	-,317	-221	-,098
Sig. (2-tailed)	,094	,250	,614
Standard coefficient (β)	-,261	-,131	-,166
N	29	29	29
*Correlation is significant at the level 0.05 level (2-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the level 0.01level (2-tailed)			

Based on the tests that have been carried out, Table 4 shows the correlation and regression value between writing anxiety aspects and writing ability and behavior. The correlation value of students' somatic anxiety was negatively weak and not significant ($r= -,317; p=,094$), avoidance behaviour was negatively weak and not significant ($r=-,221; p=,250$), and cognitive anxiety was negatively very weak and not significant ($r=-,098; p=,614$) in relation with writing ability and behavior. In consequence, the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected. The regression value has shown that students somatic anxiety ($\beta=-$

,261), avoidance behaviour (*β=-313*) and cognitive anxiety (*β=-,166*) had a negative impact on writing ability and behaviour.

Table 5. Correlation and Regression between Writing Anxiety Aspects and Writing Ideation

	Somatic Anxiety	Avoidance Behavior	Cognitive Anxiety
Pearson Correlation	-,422*	-,240*	,417*
Sig. (2-tailed)	,023	,209	,024
Standard coefficient (β)	-,464	,152	,421
N	29	29	29
*Correlation is significant at the level 0.05 level (2-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the level 0.01level (2-tailed)			

Table 5 shows the result of correlation and regression value based on the test that has been carried out between writing anxiety aspects and writing ideation. The correlation value of students' somatic anxiety was moderate and significant (*r= -,422, p=,023*), avoidance behaviour was weak and significant (*r=-,221, p=,209*), and cognitive anxiety was moderate and significant (*r=,417, p=024*) in relation with writing ideation. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted for somatic anxiety and avoidance behaviour aspects in relationship with writing ideation. While the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted for cognitive anxiety aspect in relationship with writing ideation. This means that the greater the somatic anxiety and avoidance behavior inhibits the ideation process the greater the cognitive anxiety could lead students to build their effort in developing ideas. Thereafter, the regression test has shown that somatic anxiety had a negative effect (*β=-,464*) while avoidance behavior (*β=,152*) and cognitive anxiety (*β=,421*) had a positive impact on ideation. Avoidance behavior and cognitive anxiety were often used by students to expand their ideas outside the classroom, in a free and unlimited place.

Table 6. Correlation and Regression between Writing Anxiety Aspects and Writing Convention

	Somatic Anxiety	Avoidance Behavior	Cognitive Anxiety
Pearson Correlation	-,279	-,333	,325
Sig. (2-tailed)	,143	,078	,086
Standard coefficient (β)	-,168	-,156	,257
N	29	29	29
*Correlation is significant at the level 0.05 level (2-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the level 0.01level (2-tailed)			

The correlation and regression between writing anxiety aspects and writing convention is shown in Table 6. The correlation value of students' somatic anxiety was negatively weak and not significant (*r=-,279; p=,143*) with writing convention, also the correlation of students' avoidance behaviour was negatively weak and not significant (*r=-,333; p=,078*). That means that the null hypothesis (H_0) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected for somatic anxiety and avoidance aspect in writing anxiety. While the correlation between cognitive anxiety and writing correlation was weak and not significant (*r=325; p=,086*). This shows that that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was accepted for cognitive anxiety aspect in relation with writing convention. The regression test shows that somatic anxiety (β= -,168) and avoidance behaviour (β= -,156) had a negative impact on writing convention. This means that the greater the somatic anxiety and avoidance behavior that students had, the more ideas they would come up with in writing. On the other hand, writing convention was positively affected by cognitive anxiety (β=,257). The fear that arose because they had not been able to write well would encourage students to try their best in writing.

Table 7. Correlation and Regression between Writing Anxiety Aspects and Self-regulation in Writing

	Somatic Anxiety	Avoidance Behavior	Cognitive Anxiety
Pearson Correlation	-,574**	-,107	,045
Sig. (2-tailed)	,001	,580	,819
Standard coefficient (β)	-,747	,330	,079
N	29	29	29
*Correlation is significant at the level 0.05 level (2-tailed)			
** Correlation is significant at the level 0.01level (2-tailed)			

Table 7 indicates the correlation and the regression value between students' writing anxiety aspects and students' self-regulation in writing. The result shows that somatic anxiety had negative moderate value but significant ($r=-,574; p=,001$) in correlation with self-regulation in writing. The avoidance behaviour had very weak value and not significant ($r=-,107; p=,580$) in correlation with self-regulation in writing. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0.) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) was rejected for somatic anxiety and avoidance behavior aspect in relation with self-regulation in writing. Meanwhile cognitive anxiety had a very weak correlation with self-regulation in writing, but not significant ($r=,045; p=,819$).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This mixed-method research investigated the relationship between writing anxiety and writing efficacy of graduate and undergraduate students in an English department in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The researchers employed questionnaires and a short interview aiming to investigate their perception on their writing anxiety and writing efficacy in academic writing, and the correlation between writing anxiety and self-efficacy.

The results showed that on average graduate and undergraduate students had high levels of writing anxiety and self-efficacy. Students show somatic anxiety because they face new challenges in writing. Compared to graduate students, undergraduate students have higher somatic anxiety because they are at the stage of learning about English academic writing. They need more time to become used to writing in a foreign language. In this study, avoidance behaviour, which is a form of anxiety in writing as indicated by the habit of delaying or avoiding writing activities, is expressed in positive sentences. Students tend to choose free time to find and develop their writing ideas. In terms of anxiety, students with high self-efficacy will be encouraged and challenge themselves to be better. Meanwhile, students with low self-efficacy tend to be immersed in their anxiety. It should be highlighted that anxiety does not necessarily have a negative impact on one's personal development. Anxiety becomes a challenge for those who want to try and bring positive impacts. This research has implications for increasing knowledge of EFL writing experience and also educational psychology.

Regardless of the positive outcomes, this research has a limitation particularly in terms of the sample. It involved a small number of participants (N=29). Further researchers could conduct research using a larger sample. They may also examine strategies so that students can overcome anxiety and increase confidence in using English language.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, K. (2018). Teaching Critical Thinking and Writing in Higher Education: an Action Research Project. *TEAN Journal, 10*(1), 74-84.

Bailey, A., Zanchetta, M., Velasco, D., Pon, G., & Hassan, A. (2015). Building a scholar in writing (BSW): A model for developing students' critical writing skills. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *15*(6), 524-529.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of second language writing*, *13*(4), 313-335.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Daud, N. S. M., Daud, N. M., & Kassim, N. L. A. (2016). Second language writing anxiety: Cause or effect?. *Malaysian journal of ELT research*, *1*(1), 19.

Eby, K. E. (2018). Effects of students' writing self-efficacy on interpreting instructor feedback.

Gupta, R. (1998).Writing with a different tool. In C. S.Ward and W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Computers and Language Learning*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center.

Ho, M. C. (2016). Exploring Writing Anxiety and Self-Efficacy among EFL Graduate Students in Taiwan. *Higher education studies*, *6*(1), 24-39.

Kırmızı, Ö., & Kırmızı, G. D. (2015). An investigation of L2 learners' writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety and its causes at higher education in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *4*(2), 57–66.

Lee, M. K., & Evans, M. (2019). Investigating the operating mechanisms of the sources of L2 writing self-efficacy at the stages of giving and Receiving Peer Feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(4), 831-847

Levine, Glenn S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire survey. *Modern Language Journal,* 87:3, 343-364.

Masoud, A., & Mostafa, H. (2020). Implementing Generative Learning Model to Enhance 2nd year English Majors' Critical Reading and Writing Skills. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, *6*(1), 115-148.

Mitchell, K. M., McMillan, D. E., Lobchuk, M. M., Nickel, N. C., Rabbani, R., & Li, J. (2021). Development and validation of the situated academic writing self-efficacy scale (SAWSES). *Assessing Writing*, *48*, 100524.

Rezaei, M., & Jafari, M. (2014). Investigating the levels, types, and causes of writing anxiety among Iranian EFL students: A mixed method design. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1545-1554.

Sabti, A. A., Md Rashid, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Darmi, R. (2019). The Impact of writing anxiety, writing achievement motivation, and writing self-efficacy on writing performance: A correlational study of Iraqi tertiary EFL Learners. *SAGE Open*, *9*(4), 2158244019894289.

Schunk, D. H., & Bursuck, W. D. (2015). Self-efficacy, agency, and volition: Student beliefs and reading motivation. In *Handbook of Individual Differences in Reading* (pp. 72-84). Routledge.

Street, H. (2010). Factors influencing a learner's decision to drop-out or persist in higher education distance learning. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *13*(4).

Wahyuni, S., & Umam, M. K. (2017). An analysis on writing anxiety of Indonesian EFL college learners. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *4*(1), 105-128.

Wardani, F. R. W. (2020) *The contribution of readers` logs to undergraduate English language Education Study Program Students` Self-efficacy in Reading.* Skripsi thesis, Sanata Dharma University. http://repository.usd.ac.id/37690/

Wijaya, K. F., Mbato, C. L. (2020). Graduate Students' Perceptions on their Self-Efficacy in Writing Academic Papers. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 31-41.