THE CORRELATION BETWEEN STUDENTS' SELF EFFICACY IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AND THEIR WRITING PERFORMANCE

Vika Syah Aldina
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
vika.18070@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Performa menulis merupakan aspek yang berkorelasi signifikan terhadap kemampuan menulis sebagai salah satu bagian penting dalam kurikulum sekolah. Sedangkan efikasi diri menulis adalah apa yang siswa yakini selama proses mereka terlibat dengan kegiatan menulis yang merupakan gabungan multi-dimensi dari efikasi diri linguistik, efikasi diri pengaturan diri, dan efikasi diri kinerja. Studi sebelumnya menunjukkan bahwa ada korelasi yang signifikan antara performa menulis siswa dan efikasi diri menulis mereka, tetapi tidak ada penelitian yang mengkajinya terhadap siswa tingkat menengah. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui tingkat efikasi diri menulis siswa sekolah menengah dan menganalisis adakah hubungan antara efikasi diri menulis siswa dengan performa menulis mereka di sekolah menengah, terutama dalam menulis teks deskriptif. Data dikumpulkan melalui tahap pengadaan survei L2WSS terhadap 20-40 siswa kelas sebelas SMA Negeri 1 Sumenep, tahap penilaian performa menulis peserta menggunakan Level-Specific Checklist of Binary Choice Items, dan terakhir pengujian korelasi antara efikasi diri menulis dan performa menulis menggunakan program SPSS 2016. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa nilai rata-rata efikasi diri menulis siswa adalah 4,83 dari rentang 1-2 sebagai tingkat rendah, 3-5 sebagai sedang, dan 6-7 sebagai tinggi, sehingga hasil ini tergolong ke dalam efikasi diri tingkat sedang. Sedangkan analisis korelasinya memberikan nilai signifikansi 0,602 yang lebih besar dari 0,05 (p>0,05), sehingga berarti bahwa tidak ada korelasi yang signifikan antara efikasi diri menulis dengan performa menulis siswa pada tingkat sekolah menengah khususnya dalam menulis teks deskriptif
Kata Kunci: Menulis, Performa Menulis, Efikasi Diri Menulis.

Abstract

Writing performance is an aspect correlated significantly to writing as one of the essential part in the school curriculum. While writing self-efficacy is what students believe in the way they engaged with writing activities which is a multi-dimension of linguistic self-efficacy, self-regulatory self-efficacy, and performance self-efficacy. Previous studies indicate that there is a significant correlation between students' writing performance and their writing self-efficacy, but there is no research discussing it at secondary level of students. Thus, the current study is aimed to find out the writing self-efficacy level of secondary students and analyze whether there is any correlation between students writing' self-efficacy and their writing performance at secondary level, especially in writing descriptive text. The data are collected through conducting L2WSS survey on 20-40 eleventh grade students from SMA Negeri 1 Sumenep, valuing their writing performance using a Level-Specific Checklist of Binary Choice Items, and finally examining the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance using SPSS 2016 program. The result shows that mean value of students writing self-efficacy is 4.83 from the range of 1-2 as the low level, 3-5 as the moderate, and 6-7 as the high, so it is considered as a moderate level of writing self-efficacy. While the correlational analysis shows significance value is 0.602 which is more than 0.05 (p>0.05), so that means there is no significance correlation between students writing self-efficacy and their writing performance at secondary level especially in writing descriptive text.
Keywords: Writing, Writing Performance, Writing Self-Efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Writing, which is one of the essential parts of the school curriculum, is a multipart cognitive and societal process containing an understanding shared with the reader about any purposes, forms, knowledge, etc. (MacArthur et al., 2016). The multipart cognitive process is clarified by the teaching writing process which are students directed to read and identify firstly the genre of text which they then

instantiate in their writing before they would solve by themselves the compositional problems consisting of overlapping processes and sub-processes as well as prewriting, drafting, revising and celebrating (Keen, 2017). While as a part of societal practice, writing is illustrated as one of the people's intentions to be involved in social situations (MacArthur et al., 2016). This intention then appears in the form of sharing certain purposes, understanding, information, etc. to the reader through writing creations, so in the socio-cognitive approach, the pedagogical principle of writing includes requiring the teacher to teach the intention or purposes of writing, and lecture the knowledge-transformation attitude which is covering the writing process of planning, organizing, writing, and revising (Cheung, 2016).

Writing performance, one of aspect that is correlated to the planning, design, and strategies of writing instruction (Hyland, 2003), is such an another important issue to be examined and studied continuously to improve writing (Barkaoui & Hadidi, 2020). Examining the changes of writing performance concept applied overtime could bring an understanding about the nature of English instruction and how its long-term impacts are, theoretically and practically (Barkaoui & Hadidi, 2020).

Writing performance is generally assessed by human-rating, human manual coding, and/or omputer-coding analysis (Barkaoui & Hadidi, 2020) that is traditionally set in form of assessment rubrics to describe more clear writing performance value by a lot of aspect such as content ideas, the association text and coherence, the structure and vocabularies, the expression used, and etc. (Shabani & Panahi, 2020). These rubrics are found so various, reflecting from numbers of literature and research studying rating scales/scoring method to assess writing (Lukácsi, 2021). It could adopt from international or national rubrics existed such as TOEFL, IELTS, CAE, CPE, TOEFL-iBT, GRE scores, and etc. or just from special rubrics developed in personnel (Lukácsi, 2021; Mo & Troia, 2017; Shabani & Panahi, 2020; Zhu et al., 2021). IELTS (The International English Language Testing System) is an English language test in English natives countries made especially for education, Jobs, or migration (IELTS, 2017). CAE (Cambridge English: Advanced), is an in-depth high-level qualifications under the development of Cambridge Assessment English which shows individuals' language skills (Cambridge Assessment English, n.d.-a). CPE (Cambridge English: Proficiency) is also under Cambridge English Qualification which shows how far your competencies in being an English speaker (Cambridge Assessment English, n.d.-b). TOEFL iBT is also one of largest-premier English communication test, to degree students' English-language skills to place them in the exact courses, observer

their progress, and etc. (Educational Testing Service, 2015). GRE scores are used as one of significant attachment in students scholar records, approval letters and other qualifications for graduate-level study admissions or fellowship (Educational Testing Service, 2015). The writing performance rubrics used by these five trusted International English tests cover almost similar assessment aspects, including grammatical accuracy, organization and coherence, range of vocabularies, natures of errors, and task accomplishment, but different focus of rubric intention, for instance, spelling, punctuation, and readers' satisfaction goals are plainly stressed in CAE and CPE while TOEFL iBT and GRE mentioned none of them. Instead, TOEFL iBT emphasized on idiomaticity and exemplification, while GRE listed "provide enough supporting ideas to discourse the topic and task" for its focus. Lukácsi and his International Euroexam team (2021) are one of the experts that currently develop themselves a new specific checklist item for assessing writing quality since they found that all various rating scales/rubrics from human-mediated assessment are not adequate yet to show clearly the differences between each degrees of ability which make it often hard to determine between 'pass' and 'fail'. They conduct a study to investigate whether it is possible to create a level-specific checklist of binary choice items that could reflect the EFL's ability in writing essay at level B2 with a higher validity and accuracy adapted from literature reviews with special emphasized to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF. They apply a mix method strategy of inquiry research which is a qualitative inquiry and quantitative analysis toward 14 writing examiner as the participants to rate up to 184 essays using the checklist.. This assessment rubric is proved to be useful enough for determining between low and high level score of writing performance in detail. It also brings out the assumption that writing performance rater mostly related to grammatical accuracy, orthographic control, vocabulary control, vocabulary range, coherence and cohesion, thematic development, and general linguistic range (Lukácsi, 2021).

Students writing performance is found that is capable to be affected by many variables (Bulut, 2017; Fathi, 2019; Graham et al., 2017; Sabti & Rashid, 2019; Shi et al., 2020; Soleimani et al., 2020). Writing self-efficacy is one issue predicted as one of variable that is able to significantly affect writing performance. This term defined as what students feel and believe in the way they engaged with a writing activity, following what Chamot and Harris (2019) state that self-efficacy is the concept of how pupils feel about themselves in a certain learning activity in which they will carry out an activity if they believe they might have an ability to survive in any challenges exist

along the activity done (Chamot & Harris, 2019). It is currently claimed as a combination of three major dimension which are linguistic self-efficacy that is related to students' judgment toward their linguistic capability, self-regulatory self-efficacy that is related to students' perception of their capability in metacognitive control to reach the learning goals of writing, and performance self-efficacy, related to students perceptions toward their capability to complete the tasks and comprehend knowledge from the course (Teng et al., 2017). By developing and piloting an L2WSS (second language writer self-efficacy scales) that could measure them all, Teng at al. (2017) validate this theory and correlate it with writing performance. It contains a series of stringent validation procedures on 609 undergraduate students in China. It applies a confirmatory factor-analysis using SEM (structural equation model) in advance, to propose that the three-dimensional structure of writing self-efficacy cover the term of linguistic self-efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and performance self-efficacy. This later apply a comparisons method toward the premise that writing self-efficacy is a multidimensional idea, in which those three factors are interrelated each other conceptually. Next they examine the internal and composite reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity which then opens up a satisfactory psychometric result of scales, and be continued by testing the synchronized validity and predictive validity by investigating the correlations of writing self-efficacy with motivational beliefs and writing performance. The result exposed that these three dimensions are correlated each other constructing general writing self-efficacy that are correlated also with writing quality at small to moderate level.

Correlating writing performance with writing self-efficacy also has been done by Daniels et al. in 2019 and Grenner et al in 202. Daniels et al. (2019) conduct a comparison study of writing self-efficacy within classroom intervention context by evaluate the effectiveness of a writing intervention combined with strategy instruction and CBT (SI-CBT) on improving the students' writing performance in secondary level including measure their writing self-efficacy, writing apprehension, and writing skill. The result shows that it improve words production and let students self-efficacy increased (Daniels et al., 2019). Grenner et al (2020) conduct research comparing between girls' and boys' writing self-efficacy before and after intervention toward their narrative writing skill. After conducting an observational class intervention in five lessons meeting, 55 fifth grade students directed to fill out an 18-items of self-efficacy questionnaire, later their writing performance correlated toward self-efficacy data itself. Their research bring a positive result which is both of boys and girls experience strong comparable self-efficacy but writing quality after intervention reached by the girls is higher than boys. While the correlation between self-efficacy and writing quality is significantly linked in moderate level (Grenner et al., 2020).

Bulut (2017) studied that writing self-efficacy and writing attitude are significantly correlated with the quality of summary writing toward 4th grade elementary student. Through doing an interpersonal survey model toward 335 participants for each of research variables, he results the evidence that writing self-efficacy together with writing attitude significantly affect students summary writing quality (Bulut, 2017) Correlating a same variables with Bulut (writing self-efficacy and summary writing) but different level of participants, is what has been studied by Golparvar & Khafi in 2021. In the level of undergraduate students, 119 participants are taken to do an integrated writing task, and fill out a questionnaire related to the term of self-efficacy beliefs, and summary writing strategy. Through SEM (Structural Equation Model), they show similar result with Bulut that writing self-efficacy predict significantly the summary writing performance (Golparvar & Khafi, 2021). In line with this, Graham et al (2017) conducted research toward elementary students examine whether strategic behavior, self-efficacy and attitude as the part of motivational variables together create an important contribution for writing quality. 227 fourth grade students required to wrote their personal narrative firstly, before they completed the questionnaire to value their strategic writing behavior, writing self-efficacy, and writing attitude. Then the result is they are significantly able to predict students writing quality (Graham et al., 2017).

While Soleimani et al., (2011) correlate writing self-efficacy with writing performance by their research on 129 undergraduate EFL learner of Iraqi Kurdistan English doing three types of lingua-affective questionnaires about writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety, writing motivation. Next, they are led to show up their writing performance in one session which would be evaluated by two different raters to build up inter-rater reliability. It shows that writing self-efficacy and writing motivation are significantly correlated in positive ways toward writing performance, while writing anxiety are significantly correlated in negative way (Soleimani et al., 2020).

By more complex discussion in the level of university students, Sabti & Rashid bring their correlational research together with its comparison model that comparing the differences of each variables correlation which the variables discussed are writing anxiety, writing achievement motivation, and writing self-efficacy, toward writing performance as the dependent variable. The questionnaire of Second Language Writing Anxiety

Inventory (SLWAI), Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS) and Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ) are distributed to 100 undergraduate students from two Iraqi universities in English Language major as the participants, and continued by a descriptive writing task. In conclusion highlighting the writing self-efficacy term, it gives the same result that *"……..the higher the writing self-efficacy and writing achievement motivation level, the better the writing performance."* (Sabti & Rashid, 2019).

Even all the previous studies before indicates that students writing self-efficacy is significantly predict the quality of writing performance, it has been becoming confusing since it is founded that there is still some studies show a contrary result, such as on the Laleeh Khojasteh's research toward Iranian EFL students and the Juhee Lee's research toward South Korea EFL students (Khojasteh et al., 2016; Lee, 2020). Khojasteh (2016) conducts research toward 59 EFL students of medical in Iran University which the data collected by requesting the participants to write an essay related to a topic that have been determined in advance, then asking them to fill out the writing self-efficacy questionnaires. While Lee (2020) conducts a study that examining the effect of linguistic aspect (grammar, vocabulary, etc.) and influential variables (writing motivation, writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, etc.) toward writing performance. He takes 270 middle school students as the participants and separated all by their gender, how often they do writing, and even their English proficiency to make more valid and reliable result. He asks them to complete a linguistic test, write an narrative, argumentative, and descriptive texts, and finally ask them to fill out the influential variables questionnaires but only give three items for measuring the writing self-efficacy. Both of two studies show insignificance correlation between students writing self-efficacy and their writing performance.

Thus, it must be necessary to re-investigate whether there is any correlation between students' writing self-efficacy and their writing performance especially in EFL classroom. Moreover, there is still very little previous research that discusses this issue at the level of secondary students and mostly not even focus on writing self-efficacy and/or writing performance issue (Daniels et al., 2019; Lee, 2020). Therefore the current research would be intended to examine whether there is any correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance at secondary students' level in EFL Classroom by using different instruments and different settings research to create a different possibility from previous studies. Additionally, all researches mentioned before are commonly done in the narrative, informative, or argumentative text genres, so it might be useful to conduct the study within another type of English text such as

descriptive text. Therefore these correlational studies would be conducted also in the areas of descriptive text writing lesson. Consequently, the current studies will answer some research questions below:

1. What is the level of secondary students' Self-efficacy in writing?
2. Is there any correlation between students' self-efficacy in writing and their writing performance?

This study would be significantly useful for pedagogical implications, especially in writing instruction in which teachers should consider what factors that are probably affect students' writing performance before directing students to write their writing draft, and also to motivate the lesson planner to design a better writing lessons syllabus. The other significance is to bring future research finding out more about any factors affecting writing performance and which factors giving a biggest effect on writing performance.

METHOD

Referring to the research objective which is this study will find out the correlation between writing performance and their writing self-efficacy among secondary students in EFL Classroom, it will take EFL learners at the secondary level at one public school in Sumenep to be the research participants. The population is all eleventh grade of three EFL classrooms which are KBD (Kelas Belajar Diatas Rata-Rata), KBP 1 (Kelas Belajar Prestasi 1), and KBP 2 (Kelas Belajar Prestasi 2) with the sample taken is about 20-40 students from the total around 60 students. The technique used to set up these samples is the convenience sampling technique which is an accidental sampling technique that chooses the participants who are accessible around, meet the certain conditions required, and are ready to be included, so the more reliable result of studies is reached (Etikan, 2016; Stratton, 2021; Taherdoost, 2018). It should be done randomly on different days or times to bring out the accidental circumstances (Stratton, 2021)

The instruments used are a writing self-efficacy questionnaire for collecting the data source of RQ one, and a scoring rubric to assess students writing performance to reach the data source needed for RQ two. As there are many kinds of assessment rubrics to evaluate writing performance, the researcher would apply writing assessment rubrics of a Level-Specific Checklist of Binary Choice Items developed by Lukácsi and Euroexam International teams which covers all writing assessment aspects from most of the common rubrics in form of 34 checklist items that have been successfully piloted. They design it by reviewing much relevant literature with put an emphasis on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) (Lukácsi, 2021). While the questionnaire used here is a new development of writing

self-efficacy questionnaire from the last 5 years of studies named the L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS), developed by Teng et al in 2017 to value self-efficacy beliefs of second language writers in their practice of self-classroom routine, linguistic knowledge, and principles of their learning process (Teng et al., 2017). This scale implements the multi-dimension theory of writing self-efficacy which are Linguistic Self-Efficacy, Self-Regulatory Self-Efficacy, and Performance Self-Efficacy. Teng et al. has validated this scale on 609 EFL learner at the university level which could be concluded that it is also useful to be used in the EFL context, according to the study. (Teng et al., 2017). It is a 7-point Likert scale consisting of 7 items statements for the linguistic self-efficacy dimension, 6 items for the self-regulatory self-efficacy dimension, and 7 items for the performance self-efficacy dimension.

The data collection procedure was conducted by doing private consolidation with the English teacher/tutor regarding the research. Then, the researcher asks teachers for having a copy of the participants' final draft of descriptive text at the end of the descriptive text writing lesson. After collecting the draft, participants' writing performance are being evaluated using a writing assessment form adapted from the Level-Specific Checklist of Binary Choice Items by Lukácsi as mentioned before. All of the evaluation results are collected and noted one by one in a form of spreadsheets followed by noting the class they belong to. Next, the final scores are valued by converting the total of the assessment checklist labeled as "yes", into percentage values since the rules of the Euroexam test, which is the participant will consider as has been passed the test if they reach a minimum score of at least 40% (Lukácsi, 2021). Finally, it is transferred into the *SPSS Data Statistic 2016* program.

Next, the L2WSS survey is conducted that the questionnaires are a 7-point Likert scale from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic still suffer, the researcher holds a discussion with the teacher a day before, to decide how the survey procedures will be done (offline or online) and plan the schedule. Then it is decided to conduct an offline survey procedure while students have the offline teaching-learning activity called PTM (Pembelajaran Tatap Muka) for one days for each EFL classrooms. On the day planned, Researcher delivers the purpose of their meeting and the survey rules before it is conducted, later explains of how to fill out the questionnaires to help students answer it easily and effectively, in order to create validity and reliability of the data. Participants are requested to answer the questionnaire honestly based on what they feel toward themselves since the score would not affect to their academic record so cheating is prohibited. After the

participants understand what they are going to do with the survey, they are directed to fill out the questionnaires by circling the rating number on the scale which describes themselves the most. Name, grade, and gender are required to be inputted in advance to collect participants' demographic data. Then, all the participant's answers are collected to be computed later into *SPSS Data Statistic 2016* program.

The data are analyzed after computing the data into SPSS data statistic 2016 program. Firstly, the researcher explore the descriptive analysis information of both data continued by examining what is the level of writing self-efficacy by referring to the mean value in which mean value of 1-2 considered as "low", 3-5 as "medium", and 6-7 as "high". Next, the researcher checks the normality of all of the data using a descriptive analysis feature by a consideration that if the data is normal (significance value of the Kolmogorov Smirnov and the Shapiro Wilk is >0.05) the correlation analysis used is Pearson Product Moment, while if it is not normal (significance value of Kolmogorov Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk is <0.05) the correlation analysis used is Spearman Rank. Then the correlation is analyzed by checking for the coefficient and significance values, if the significant value (p) shows $p<0.05$, it means the data are significantly correlated, while the opposite means are not significantly correlated ($p>0.05$).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the final scores of writing performance collected, it shows the distribution value of entire classes are started from 46 to 91. Later it has a mean value of 72.25 for KBD class, 78.41 for KBP 1 class, and 74.25 for KBP 2.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Writing Performance Data

Class	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
KBD	63	83	72.25	8.46
KBP 1	46	91	78.41	11.17
KBP 2	57	86	74.25	13.2

According to Euroexam International (2015), the writing performance score required to be considered as able to write an essay is not less than 40, so these scores are considered as fittable with the requirement since the minimum value is 46. Therefore it defines that secondary students have had an adequate competencies to write descriptive text essays in their target level.

While writing Self-Efficacy data in descriptive analysis format shows the distribution value of 3 as the minimum and 7 as the maximum. It also shows that the mean value is 4.83 with a standard deviation of 0.838.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Writing Self-Efficacy Data

Class	Mean	Std. Deviation
KBD	4.51	0.333
KBP 1	4.8	0.904
KBP 2	5.36	0.415

Depending on the range level of distribution in which the mean value of 1-2 defines low level, 3-5 defines moderate level, and 6-7 defines high level, this data is considered a moderate level. It is concluded that secondary students have a moderate level of writing self-efficacy since the mean value of the data is 4.83.

Test of Data Normality shows that Writing Performance has a significance value of 0.013 for the Kolmogorov Smirnov, and 0.002 for the Shapiro Wilk. While Writing Self-Efficacy shows a significance value of 0.120 for Kolmogorov S. and 0.675 for the Shapiro W..

Table 3. Test of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]	Shapiro-Wilk
	Sig	Sig
Writing Performance	0.013	0.002
Writing Self-Efficacy	0.120	0.675

Due to the requirement of normality that is the significance value must afford more than 0.05 (p>0.05), this table brings the fact that writing performance data is not normally distributed, and Writing Self-Efficacy data is normally distributed. The significance value of Writing Performance in both Kolmogorov S. Test and Shapiro W. are less than 0.05, while oppositely Writing Self-Efficacy shows more than 0.05. It leads to the assumption that this study should be continued through Spearman Rank Correlational method to find out the relationship. The result analysis by SPSS 16.0 using Spearman Rank method, shows the data as follows:

Table 4. Spearman Rank Correlation result (Spearman's rho)

		Writing Performance	Writing Self-Efficacy
Writing Performance	Corr. Coeff.	1.000	0.089
	Sig. (2-tailed)	-	0.602
	N	37	37
Writing Self-Efficacy	Corr. Coeff.	0.089	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.602	-
	N	37	37

This table shows that the significance value of correlation is 0.602 with a correlation coefficient of 1.000 for writing performance, and 0.089 for writing self-efficacy. As the standard required, two variables would be considered as correlated to each other if the significance value is less than 0.05. Thus, this result means that there is no significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance.

This is not linear with many previous studies that show students writing self-efficacy is significantly correlated with writing performance (Bulut, 2017; Daniels et al., 2019; Golparvar & Khafi, 2021; Graham et al., 2017; Grenner et al., 2020; Sabti & Rashid, 2019; Soleimani et al., 2020), but it matched with Khojasteh (2016) and Lee (2020) studies.

CONCLUSION

This study is intended to examine what is the level of secondary students' writing self-efficacy and whether there is any correlation between students writing self-efficacy and their writing performance at secondary level, as the result of there is no previous studies in last 5 years covering specifically that areas. Writing Self-Efficacy is defined as students believe in the way they engage with writing lesson which is multi-dimensions of linguistic self-efficacy, self-regulatory self-efficacy, and performance self-efficacy. Writing performance is an essential part of writing that generally assessed by writing assessment rubrics with various writing aspects to measure.

After conducting research on 37 high school students of SMA Negeri 1 Sumenep in three EFL classrooms, the result shows that students have a moderate or medium level of writing self-efficacy at secondary level especially in writing descriptive text. It is determined from the mean value of three classes that are around 4 to 5 categorized as the moderate level.

Next, the correlational analysis by Spearman Rank method, shows that there is no significant correlation occur between students' writing self-efficacy and students' writing performance specifically in writing descriptive text. It is proven by the significance values that is shown p>0.05. This value means that both variables are not correlated to each other.

Any limitation occurs as this research only covering the areas of students writing self-efficacy and their writing performance, especially in descriptive text writing. It also investigates only the research questions determined which is merely on EFL learners at secondary level. Thus, it could not expect the other possibility at different secondary schools. It is also limited to EFL learners in Indonesia so might be less useful to predict the result within other EFL countries. Even more, there are no gender factors, IQ, or other additional variables put as the part of consideration to figure out the result being more complicated.

REFERENCES

Barkaoui, K., & Hadidi, A. (2020). *Assessing Change in English Second Language Writing Performance*. Taylor \& Francis. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=BtQHEAAAQBAJ

Bulut, P. (2017). The Effect of Primary School Students ' Writing Attitudes and Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Their Summary Writing Achievement. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2017236123

Cambridge Assessment English. (n.d.-a). *C1 Advanced | Cambridge English*. https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams-and-tests/advanced/

Cambridge Assessment English. (n.d.-b). *C2 Proficiency _ Cambridge English*.

Chamot, A. U., & Harris, V. (2019). *Learning Strategy Instruction in the Language Classroom: Issues and Implementation*. Channel View Publications. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=ycaqDwAAQBAJ

Cheung, Y. L. (2016). Teaching Writing. In W. A. Renandya & H. P. Widodo (Eds.), *English Language Teaching Today: Linking Theory and Practice* (pp. 179–194). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-38834-2_13

Daniels, S., Mccurdy, M., Whitsitt, L., Christopher, H., Schwartz-micheaux, J., White, J., Daniels, S., Mccurdy, M., Whitsitt, L., Christopher, H., Schwartz-micheaux, J., & White, J. (2019). Evaluating the Effects of a Writing Self-Efficacy Intervention on Writing Quantity in Middle School Students Evaluating the Effects of a Writing Self-Efficacy Intervention on Writing Quantity in Middle School Students. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *0*(0), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1618226

Educational Testing Service. (2015). *ETS Home*. http://www.ets.org/

Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Fathi, J. (2019). The Role of Self-Assessment and Peer-Assessment in Improving Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Students. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, *07*(03), 01–10.

Golparvar, S. E., & Khafi, A. (2021). The role of L2 writing self-efficacy in integrated writing strategy use and performance. *Assessing Writing*, *47*(September 2020), 100504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100504

Graham, S., Kiuhara, S. A., Harris, K. R., & Fishman, E. J. (2017). The Relationship among Strategic Writing Behavior, Writing Motivation, and Writing Performance With Young Developing Writers. *The Elementary School Journal*, *118*(1). https://doi.org/10.1086/693009

Grenner, E., Johansson, V., Weijer, J. Van De, & Sahlén, B. (2020). Effects of intervention on self-efficacy and text quality in elementary school students ' narrative writing. *Logopedics Phoniatrics Vocology*, *0*(0), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/14015439.2019.1709539

Hyland, K. (2003). Assessing student writing. In *Second Language Writing* (pp. 212–244). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251.011

IELTS. (2017). IELTS: Home of the english language test. In *International English Language Testing System (IELTS): Research Reports 1999*. https://www.ielts.org/

Keen, J. (2017). Teaching the Writing Process. *Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education*, *24*(4), 372–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2017.1359493

Khojasteh, L., Shokrpour, N., & Afrasiabi, M. (2016). The relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing performance of Iranian EFL students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.4p.29

Lee, J. (2020). Effects of linguistic and affective variables on middle school students' writing performance in the context of English as a foreign language: an approach using structural equation modeling. *Reading and Writing*, *33*(5), 1235–1262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-019-10007-2

Lukácsi, Z. (2021). Developing a level-specific checklist for assessing EFL writing. *Language Testing*, *38*(1), 86–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220916703

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2016). *Handbook of Writing Research, Second Edition*. Guilford Publications. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=99GMDAAAQBAJ

Mo, Y., & Troia, G. A. (2017). Predicting students' writing performance on the NAEP from student- and state-level variables. *Reading and Writing*, *30*(4), 739–770. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9698-9

Sabti, A. A., & Rashid, S. (2019). *The Impact of Writing Anxiety , Writing Achievement Motivation , and Writing Self-Efficacy on Writing Performance : A Correlational Study of Iraqi Tertiary EFL Learners*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019894289

Shabani, E. A., & Panahi, J. (2020). Examining consistency among different rubrics for assessing writing. In *Language Testing in Asia* (Vol. 10, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00111-4

Shi, B., Huang, L., & Lu, X. (2020). Effect of prompt type on test-takers' writing performance and writing

strategy use in the continuation task. *Language Testing*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220911626

Soleimani, H., Hussien, H., Beway, H., & Saheb, M. (2020). *L2 Writing Anxiety , Writing Self-efficacy and Writing Motivation as Correlates of Global L2 Writing Performance*. *1997*, 156–165.

Stratton, S. J. (2021). Population Research: Convenience Sampling Strategies. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, *36*(4), 373–374. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X21000649

Taherdoost, H. (2018). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *5*(2), 18–27. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035

Teng, L. I. N. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2017). *Conceptualizing Writing Self-Efficacy in English as a Foreign Language Contexts : Scale Validation Through Structural*. *0*(0), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.432

Zhu, X., Li, G. Y., Cheong, C. M., Yu, G., & Liao, X. (2021). Secondary school students' discourse synthesis performance on Chinese (L1) and English (L2) integrated writing assessments. *Reading and Writing*, *34*(1), 49–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10065-x