

Self-Efficacy and Writing: A Case Study at A Senior High School in Indonesian EFL Setting

Ida Yulianawati
Wiralodra University
idayulianawati90@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This case study aimed at investigating the role of self-efficacy in students' recount text especially in the area of writing as one of the most difficult skills in learning English. Writing difficulties faced by the students are not only based on their cognitive skill but also their own efficacy beliefs. Three problems can be found related to self-efficacy beliefs in English writing. They are related with confidence to write anxiety, and the third problem is about the students' interest. The participants of this study are three students from a Senior High School in Indramayu. The data were obtained from three data collection: questionnaire, writing test, and also the interview. The result of this study shows that the participants of this study perceived mastery experience accounted for the greatest proportion in their writing ability. It can be seen from how students rate their confidence and given overall feelings about the way to write successfully. Social persuasions and physiological states also were influential while working on writing. Meanwhile, the common experience did not predict too much in students' writing ability. Ultimately, the results of this research concluded that self-efficacy has an important role in students' ability in writing.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 26 March 2019
Accepted 30 April 2019

KEYWORDS

Self Efficacy; writing;
recount text

Introduction

The role of self-efficacy in students' writing has become focus of attention from many researchers because it has important roles in the classroom learning (Broaddus, 2012; Kirmizi, O., & Kirmizi, 2015; Pajares, F., Johnson, M. J., & Usher, 2007; Salem, M. S., & Al-Dyiar, n.d.; Stewart, G., Seifert, T. A., & Rolheiser, 2015; Usher, 2009) especially in students writing and the result of study provides a starting point for identifying factors might contribute to students' writing performance (Halm, 2018; Magogwe, J. M., Ramoroka, B. T., & Mogana-Monyepi, 2015) and teacher may consider writing self-efficacy as part of their teaching technique (Jalaluddin, Yamat, 2013)

Essentially, writing is to communicate between students and their needs in social interactions. Students can apply and express their ideas, emotions, and feelings with others through their writing results. Salem and Al Dyarsay that writing skill is

one of the most crucial of the four English language skills (Salem, M. S., & Al-Dyiar, n.d.). It is the productive skill that almost all people use to fulfill their goals in their daily activities. However, it is a hard skill to learn. Students should work hard to develop and improve their writing abilities. In contrast, students' writing difficulties are not only based on their cognitive skill but also their own efficacy beliefs. Magogwe et al. explained that Self-efficacy refers to people's specific judgments and beliefs about their abilities to perform a task such as writing an essay (Magogwe, J. M., Ramoroka, B. T., & Mogana-Monyepi, 2015).

Some problems can be found in students' learning activities related to self-efficacy beliefs in English writing. First, the problem that caused the students cannot write accurately is their lack of confidence to write. Pajares (2003) says that in some cases, items assess students' confidence in their ability to successfully perform grammar, usage, composition, and mechanical writing skills such as correctly punctuating a one-page passage or organizing sentences into a paragraph to clearly express a theme (Pajares, 2003). Kirmizi and Kirmizi added, "Those who have a reduced or low level of writing self-efficacy do not have sufficient confidence in the writing skill." (Kirmizi, O., & Kirmizi, 2015:58).

The second problem is the students' anxieties in their writing activities. The students will be able easily to write if they write without being afraid of the writing tasks. Stewart et al. (2015) said that another important emotional factor that appears to affect student writing is anxiety or the fear of failure. Anxiety is a particularly interesting construct for analysis, as it can be considered a consequence of low self-efficacy". (Stewart, G., Seifert, T. A., & Rolheiser, 2015)

The third problem is about the students' interest in the teaching and learning process, especially in their writing activity. A student who has a strong or weak motivation in learning writing is affected by their writing process and result. Broaddus (2012:48) stated that the strong connection between efficacy and motivation is clear (Broaddus, 2012). As students engage in motivated behavior, they gain knowledge, skills, and work towards their goals". And the last problem comes from how students assess their feelings towards writing itself. Students' perception of writing in English will be directly influent to their writing performance. Generally, students attribute a physiological condition in writing to an efficacy perception (Muretta, 2004:27). Self-efficacy concerns students' beliefs about their ability to do the task, not the linkage between their doing it and the outcomes. In an achievement context, it includes students' confidence in their cognitive skills to perform the academic task (Pintrich, 2003). Based on the problems above, the writer would like to find out the information related to students' self-efficacy.

Purpose of the Study

The objectives of this study are:

1. To know how students write recount text regarding their own efficacy beliefs.
2. To know the role of self-efficacy in students' writing recount text.

Literature Review

Writing

Writing is a productive skill. It is a complex process. Students in learning writing are expected to write with organizing persuasive paragraphs, specific ideas or feelings, and have an adequate vocabulary, also correctly in grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Printed products are often the result of thinking, drafting and revising procedures that require specialized skills (Brown, 2001:335).

On the other hand, writing has an essential role for students in the social community. Interaction is not only through verbal communications, but the book also can deliver what students need clearly, expressing ideas, feelings, arguments, etc., based on the purposes. It is a reason why writing is seriously taught to the students. Hyland stated, "Writing is a social act, and to understand it fully we must go beyond the decisions of individual writers to explore the regular features of texts as the preferences of particular communities." (Hyland, 2009:34). Weigle explained, "To some extents, the ability to write indicates the ability to function as a literate member of a particular segment of society or discourse community, or to use language to demonstrate one's membership in that community." (Weigle, 2002)

Some components of writing also have to be considered by students when they write, like cohesive and coherent. As explained by Harmer, "Coherent writing makes sense because you can follow the sequence of ideas and points. Cohesion is a more technical matter since it is here that we concentrate on the various linguistic ways of connecting ideas across phrases and sentences".(Harmer, 2001:246)

Recount Text

a. Purpose of Recount Text

A recount is a text to inform the individual's experience in the past. Like Christie and Derewianka said, "the purpose of recount text is telling what happened." Retelling an activity that the writer has been personally involved in and may be used to build the relationship between the writer and the reader. (Christie, F., & Derewianka, 2010:7)

b. Generic Structure of Recount Text

The general structure of recount text, as follows:

1. Orientation: Introducing the participants, place, and time.
2. Events: Describing a series of the game occurred in the past.
3. Reorientation: It is optional. It is stating personal common of the writer to the story.

c. Language Features of Recount Text

Several language features of recount text, as follows:

1. Introducing personal participants; I, My friends, etc
2. Using chronological connection; then, first, etc
3. Using linking verb; was, were, etc
4. Using simple past tense; jumped (action verb), played, etc

Self-Efficacy

The idea of self-efficacy was exclusively first articulated by Albert Bandura. According to Bandura (1993), who perceived self-efficacy encompasses more than beliefs that effort determines performance. Judgments of one's knowledge, skills, strategies, and stress management also enter into the formation of efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1995:205). Hence, self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. Like in Wood and Bandura (1986:364) conveyed that perceived self-efficacy concerns people beliefs in their capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives (Muretta, 2004:6)

Related to the theories above, the role of self-efficacy beliefs would influence in students' writing ability. In other words, students' self-efficacy also was influential to their writing outcomes in educational achievement. Bandura (1995:203) affirmed, "How efficacy beliefs affect motivation to learn, effective response to these efforts, and ultimate academic attainment." (Bandura, 1997). It is likely, students who high self-efficacy beliefs tend to anticipate success scenarios while those with deep self-efficacy beliefs tend to dwell on pitfalls and anticipate failure. Like Holmes (2016:6) said, "Self-efficacy is domain-specific, and students can have high self-efficacy in some academic areas and low self-efficacy in others, which affects their achievement in these areas." And also from Broaddus said, "A person's self-efficacy is not universal, but rather individuals hold views of self-efficacy regarding certain tasks." (Broaddus, 2012:20). Thus, students evidently would guide their lives by their own beliefs of personal efficacy. It means that students' self-efficacy in their ability to write does not mean that person would feel the same efficiency in their ability to speak.

Sources of Students' Self-Efficacy

There are four main sources of influence on students' writing self-efficacy. They are mastery experiences, modeling, social persuasion and judgments of their physiological states”.

a. Mastery Experiences

The most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. Enactive mastery is based on experiences that are direct and personal and usually attributed to one's effort and skill. They provide the most authentic evidence of whether one can muster whatever it takes to succeed. Successes build a robust belief in one's efficacy. Failures undermine it, mainly if failures occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established. Developing an understanding of efficacy through mastery experiences is not a matter of adopting ready-made habits. Instead, it involves acquiring the cognitive, behavioral, and self-regulatory tools for creating and executing appropriate courses of action to manage ever-changing life circumstances. If people experience only accessible successes, they come to expect quick results and are easily discouraged by failure. A resilient sense of efficacy requires experience in overcoming obstacles through perseverant effort. Some difficulties and setbacks in human pursuits serve a useful purpose in teaching that success usually requires sustained effort.

b. Vicarious Experiences (Modeling)

The second influential way of creating and strengthening efficacy beliefs is through the common experiences provided by social models. Seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort raises observers' beliefs that they, too, possess the capabilities to master comparable activities. Observing others fail despite high effort lowers observers' judgments of their efficacy and undermines their level of motivation. The impact of modeling on beliefs of personal efficacy is strongly influenced by perceived similarity to the models. The greater the assumed similarities, the more persuasive are the models' successes and failures. If people see the models as very different from themselves, their beliefs of personal efficacy are not much influenced by the models' behavior and the results it produces.

c. Social Persuasion

Social persuasion is a third way of strengthening people's beliefs that they have what it takes to succeed. To the extent that persuasive boosts in perceived self-efficacy lead people to try hard enough to reach, self-affirming ideas promote the development of skills and a sense of personal efficacy. It is more challenging to instill high beliefs of personal effectiveness by social persuasion alone than to undermine them. Disappointing results of one's efforts quickly disconfirm unrealistic boosts in efficacy. But people who have been persuaded

that they lack capabilities tend to avoid challenging activities that can cultivate their potentialities, and they give up quickly in the face of difficulties. By constricting movements and undermining motivation, disbelief in one's capabilities creates its behavioral validation. Successful efficacy builders do more than convey positive appraisals.

d. Physiological States

People also rely partly on their physiological and emotional states in judging their capabilities. They interpret their stress reactions and tension as signs of vulnerability to poor performance. Mood also affects people's judgments of their efficacy. Positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy; depressed mood diminishes it. The fourth way of altering efficacy beliefs is to improve the physical status, reduce stress and negative emotional proclivities, and correct misinterpretations of physical states. It is not the sheer intensity of emotional and physical reactions that is important but rather how they are perceived and interpreted. For example, people who have a high sense of efficacy are likely to view their state of affective arousal as an energizing facilitator of performance, whereas those who are beset by self-doubts regard their arousal as a facilitator. Physiological indicators of efficacy play an especially influential role in health functioning and activities requiring physical strength and stamina. Affective states can have widely generalized effects on beliefs of personal effectiveness in diverse spheres of operation.

Dynamics of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy has three dimensions: magnitude, strength, and generality. Muretta described, "First, magnitude describes the level of task difficulty. Second, strength described whether the conviction regarding magnitude is strong or weak. The last, generality describes the degree to which the expectation is generalized across situations" (Muretta, 2004). It means students who have high self-efficacy tend to choose tasks that level difficulty by their ability (level). Self-efficacy is the basis for students' ability to make a strong effort, even when encountering obstacles (strength). And students who have a high self-efficacy will be able to master several fields at once to complete a task. Students who have a low self-efficacy will learn probably only a few of the areas required to complete a task (generality).

Method of Research

This study used a qualitative approach upon a case study design because it deals with the study of an individual language learner as affirmed by Nunan and Duff (Duff, 2008; Nunan, 1992:74). Thus, a case study is to focus on a particular situation or phenomenon; in this case, the event is students' self-efficacy related to their writing

ability.

a. Place and Time of Research

This research was conducted at a senior high school in Indramayu from June to July 2018.

b. Participants

To specify the participant of this research, the writer purposely picked three students of a senior high school in Indramayu from different classes where they are studying to get information, like Cohen & Manion affirmed that the researcher handpicks purposive subjects on the basis of his/her estimate of their typicality (Nunan, 1992:142)

c. Instrumentation

This study used three kinds of instruments. They are a questionnaire, a writing test, and an interview.

Research Finding and Discussion

The data are obtained from three instruments that have been interpreted qualitatively. They are a questionnaire, a writing test, and an interview.

1. Data From Questionnaire

There were two kinds of closed-ended questionnaires adapted from Holmes (2006) used in this research. The first questionnaire was about students' confidence judgments in writing that consist of 15 items. They are: how they can spell, punctuate, write an incomplete sentence, write in a grammatically correct sentence, think of many ideas, put ideas into writing, think of many words to describe ideas. They also can avoid distractions and control frustration while writing process, start writing assignments quickly, think of writing goals before writing. They finally know to revise, keep writing even when it's difficult, write a good story and do what it takes to be a good writer.

The second self-efficacy questionnaire was about students' attitudes in writing. This questionnaire consisted of 5 questions that each participant should answer. Those questions were still related to problem research. In this chapter, the writer also would convert subjects of study by using a symbol. The writer converted the first participant to P1, second participant to P2, and third participant to P3. Thus, the research findings of the data gained from participants of the study were analyzed individually.

a. Confidence Judgments

Self-efficacy is concerned with perceived capability. Therefore, in this step, students are asked to rate the strength of their belief in their ability to perform each of the levels identified (Pajares, 2003:142). Because students' self-efficacy beliefs—the judgments that students hold about their capabilities to successfully perform writing tasks—are strong predictors of performance (Pajares, F., Johnson, M. J., & Usher, 2007:105). And based on the results, 15 items of confidence judgments in writing had to fill out by participants, and there was a difference among three participants in their confidence judgments rate. See in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Students’ Confidence Judgments in Writing

No	Participants	Confidence Judgments		
		P1	P2	P3
1	I can spell my words correctly.	4	5	7
2	I can write complete sentences.	5	5	8
3	I can punctuate my sentences correctly.	5	7	7
4	I can write grammatically correct sentences.	3	5	5
5	I can think of many ideas for my writing.	3	7	8
6	I can put my thoughts into writing.	4	5	7
7	I can think of many words to describe my ideas.	2	7	7
8	I can avoid distractions while I write.	5	5	5
9	I can start writing assignments quickly.	3	8	8
10	I can control my frustration when I write.	5	8	6
11	I can think of my writing goals before I write.	3	6	8
12	I can see where I need to revise my writing.	2	5	6
13	I can keep writing even when it's complicated.	5	7	7
14	I can write a good story.	4	7	7
15	I can do what it takes to be a good writer.	3	5	7
Total score		56	92	103
Percentile		37%	61%	68%

Table 1 indicated that P1 rated her confidence for her writing as 37% out of 100%. Meanwhile, P2 rated her faith for her writing as 61% out of 100%. And P3 rated his confidence for his writing as 68% out of 100%. In terms of it, writing self-efficacy scale with a 0 – 10 response format was active in researching self-efficacy (Pajares, 2003:144). That’s 0 (*Cannot do at all*), 1 – 2 (*Very little can do*), 3 – 4 (*Little can do*), 5 (*Moderately can do*), 6 – 7 (*Good can do*), 8 – 9 (*Very good can do*) and 10 (*Highly satisfied can do*). Participants had rated 15 items of confidence judgments in writing, and the results of participants’ confidence judgments in writing with 0 – 10 scales were explicitly described, as followed:

I can spell my words correctly: In spelling words, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on four scales. It means that she had a little courage to spell her words correctly. And P2 had rated her degree confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to spell her words correctly. Meanwhile, P3 had rated his degree of certainty on seven scales, where he had reasonable confidence to spell his words correctly.

I can write complete sentences: In writing complete sentences, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to write complete sentences. The same with P1, P2 also had rated her degree confidence on five scales. Compared to P1 and P2, P3 had rated his degree of certainty on eight scales. It means that he had perfect confidence to write complete sentences.

I can punctuate my sentences correctly: In punctuating sentences, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to punctuate her sentences correctly. Meanwhile, P2 had rated her degree confidence on seven scales, where she had reasonable confidence to

punctuate her sentences correctly. The same with P2, P3 also had rated his degree of certainty on seven scales.

I can write grammatically correct sentences: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on three scales. It means that she had a little courage to compose grammatically correct sentences. Meanwhile, P2 had rated her degree confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to write grammatically correct sentences. The same with P2, P3 also had rated his degree of certainty on five scales.

I can think of many ideas for my writing: In thinking of ideas, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on three scales. It means that she had a little courage to think of many ideas for her writing. Meanwhile, P2 had rated her degree confidence on seven scales. It means that she had reasonable confidence to think of many ideas for her book. And P3 had rated his degree of certainty on eight scales, where he had absolute confidence to think of many ideas for his writing.

I can put my ideas into writing: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on four scales. It means that she had a little confidence to put her thoughts into writing. P2 had rated her degree confidence on five scales, where she had moderate confidence to put her ideas into writing. Meanwhile, P3 had rated his degree of confidence on seven scales. It means that he had reasonable confidence to put his thoughts into writing.

I can think of many words to describe my ideas: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on two scales. It means that she had very little confidence to think of many words to express her ideas. Meanwhile, P2 and P3 had rated the same scale, where they rated on seven scales. It means that they had reasonable confidence to think of many words to describe their ideas.

I can avoid distractions while I write: In avoiding distractions, all participants had rated on the same scale, that was five scales. That means that P1, P2, and P3 had moderately confidence to avoid distractions while they write.

I can start writing assignments quickly: In starting writing assignments, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on three scales. It means that she had a little confidence to begin her writing assignments quickly. Meanwhile, And P2 had rated her degree confidence on eight scales. It means that she had absolute confidence to start her writing assignments rapidly. The same with P2, P3 also had rated his degree of confidence in starting his writing assignments quickly on eight scales.

I can control my frustration when I write: In managing frustration, P1 had rated her degree of confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to control her disappointment when she writes. Meanwhile, P2 had rated her degree confidence on eight scales, where she had absolute confidence to manage her frustration when she writes. And P3 had rated his degree of certainty on six scales. It means that he had reasonable confidence to control his frustration when he writes.

I can think of my writing goals before I write: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on three scales. It means that she had a little confidence to think of her writing goals before she writes. And P2 had rated her degree confidence on

six scales. It means that she had reasonable confidence to think of her writing goals before she writes. Meanwhile, P3 had rated his degree of certainty on eight scales. It means that he had perfect confidence to think of his writing goals before he writes.

I can see where I need to revise my writing: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on two scales. It means that she had very little confidence to see where she need to change her writing. And P2 had rated her degree confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderate confidence to see where she need to revise her essay. Meanwhile, P3 had rated his degree of certainty on six scales, where he had reasonable confidence to see where he need to edit his writing.

I can keep writing even when it's complicated: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on five scales. It means that she had moderately confidence to keep writing even when it's complicated. Meanwhile, P2 and P3 had the same scale on their confidence. They had rated her degree confidence on seven scales. It means that they had good confidence to keep writing even when it's difficult.

I can write a good story: P1 had rated her degree of confidence on four scales. It means that she had a little confidence to write a good story. Meanwhile, P2 and P3 had the same scale on their confidence. They had rated their degree confidence on seven scales. It means that they had reasonable confidence to write a good story.

I can do what it takes to be a good writer: In how it takes to be a good writer, P1 had rated her degree of confidence only on three scales. It means that she had a little confidence to do what it takes to be a good writer. And P2 had rated her degree confidence on five scales, where she had moderate confidence to do what it takes to be a good writer. Meanwhile, P3 had rated his degree of confidence on seven scales. It means that he had good confidence to do what it takes to be a good writer.

b. Attitudes

It was about how participants gave their perceptions and overall feelings in writing. Attitude is one of the crucial factors that influence whether the student could deal with academic requirements or not. Attitude can be seen as the parameter of how essentially students can maintain their mindset and habit to promote good work. And based on the results, five items of attitudes in writing had to fill out by participants. See in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Percentiles of Students' Attitudes about Writing

No	Participants	Attitudes		
		P1	P2	P3
1	Writing is a very important skill for me.	4	5	5
2	Writing is not a very difficult skill for me.	2	4	4
3	I like to write.	3	5	5
4	I enjoy during a writing activity.	2	4	4
5	I do not feel bad when I write.	3	4	4
Total score		14	22	22
Percentile		56%	88%	88%

Table 2 indicated that P1 had shown 56% for her attitude about writing. Meanwhile, P2 had shown 88%, and the same with P2, P3 also had shown 88% for her attitude in writing. Participants had rated five items of attitudes about writing above based on what they as the natural writers, were feeling in writing. Under this condition, it is likely, whether they have strong or weak efficacy beliefs is probably impact on their writing ability. Because strong efficacy antecedents are believed to correlate to higher self-efficacy while adverse precursors are considered to relate to lower self-efficacy forgiven a task to know it all, it could be proved by their ability in writing test sections.(Muretta, 2004:30)

2. Data from Writing Test

The description of the writing test would be able to prove how far participants' writing ability based on their confidence judgments and attitudes about writing. The writer asked all participants to write a personal letter, which encouraged them to express their interesting experience based on what it had happened in their life in the past. In this section, the first data had been analyzed by the writer based on analytical scoring, which is adapted from Heaton (Heaton, 1988). Second, the writer analyzed the data based on the purpose, general structure, and language features of recount text itself. And the last, the writer also analyzed the data based on structures of their letter. Here, the results of participants' writing test (see Appendix 9) were explicitly described, as followed:

a. Analytical Scoring

An analytical scoring adapted from Heaton (Heaton, 1988) consists of several subcategories. They are the content of a writing, organization of writing, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, with using scales such as; *Excellent very good, Good to average, Fair to poor* and *Very poor*.

1. Content

In the content of a writing, P1 got 17 points (Fair to poor). It means that she had limited knowledge to think of many ideas for her writing. It could be seen in how she organized information in her writing. And P2 got 22 points (Good to average) in the content of writing because she had adequate range to think of many ideas for her writing. Meanwhile, P3 got 26 points (Good to average) in the content of a writing, because he had some knowledge to think of ideas in his writing. Therefore, compared to P1, P2 and P3 in their content writing results were not too limited information.

2. Organization

In the organization of writing, P1 got 10 points (Fair to poor), because her ideas were confused and disconnected. Such as, when she only wrote, "suddenly we crash, but we laugh together. It is so fun". It is likely, and the reader will ask (why?). She didn't explain the reason for detail why they could laugh, and where it happened exactly. It means that she couldn't put any ideas into her writing.

Meanwhile, P2, she got 15 points (Good to average). Although

she had loosely organized in her writing, her main ideas stand out. And P3 got 18 points (Excellent to very good) in the organization of writing because he clearly stated his ideas. He tried to give the detail information to the reader.

3. Vocabulary

In vocabulary, P1 got 9 points (Very poor), because she had a little knowledge of English vocabulary and virtually translation. It is likely when she wrote, "I and my friends." And P2 got 17 points (Good to average) in vocabulary because she had adequate ranges to describe her ideas. Meanwhile, P3 got 18 points (Excellent to very good) in vocabulary, because he also used effective word/idiom choice and usage. Such as when she wrote an exclamatory sentence, "What a shocking news!". In exclamatory sentences beginning with *what* and having countable nouns. (Wishon, George E, & Burks, 1980: A-8)

4. Language Use

In language use, P1 got 11 points (Fair to poor). It means that she had some significant problems in a simple construction. Such as when she wrote, "I joined some extracurricular paskibra activities at school" rather than "I joined an extracurricular activity, that was Paskibra." Because it was only one activity, Paskibra. She made frequent errors in using the past tense, and based on the result of her writing, it is likely, she didn't know about the past tense structure and how to use it. Such as when she wrote, "I go to home" rather than "I went home." Then when she wrote, "we crash but we laugh" rather than "we crashed, but we laughed", and "My friends and I ride bicycle together" rather than "My friend, and I rode a bicycle together" (after P1 finished her writing test, the writer asked P1 about her writing, and she clarified that actually she and her friend rode in the same bicycle). And P2 got 17 points (Fair to poor) because she also had many major problems in simple construction, especially in using the verb of past. Such as when she wrote, "make me happy" rather than " made me happy" and "I don't know" rather than "I didn't know." She used double verbs, such as "When I was went back to home" rather than "When I went back to home." In using linking verb of past, such as "you are so brave to the front of your class" rather than "you were so brave to sing in front of class", then "I am so surprised" rather than "I was so surprised", and "I am happy" rather than "I was happy". Indirect speech error, when she wrote, "He said, I got a gift from someone" rather than, "He said, "You get a gift from someone." The same with P2, P3 also got 17 (Fair to poor) in language use. He also had many major problems in simple construction, especially in using the past tense. Such as when she wrote, "I choose that song" rather than "I chose that song," then "I feel very very nervous" rather than "I felt very very nervous," and "I never imagine" rather than "I never imagined." In using linking verb of past, such as "that is singing contest" rather than "that was

singing contest," "the audiences are so many" rather than "audiences were so many," and "I'm pretty happy" rather than "I was pretty happy," etc. He also used double verbs, such as "I'm very loved that song a lot" rather than "I really loved that song a lot," and "I still grateful for that" without linking verb *was*.

5. Mechanics

In mechanics, P1 got 3 points (Fair to poor), because she made errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization frequently. In spelling, when she wrote, "extra-curricular" rather than "extracurricular," "bycle" rather than "bicycle" and "Oke" rather than "Ok." In punctuation, when she wrote in greeting and complimentary close without a comma, such as only "Dear sally" and "Best regards." In capitalization, such as when she wrote the name of person fictional, "sally" rather than "Sally." She didn't begin the first word of a sentence with capital, such as "suddenly we crash but we laugh together" rather than "Suddenly we . . ." then "one day, I go . . ." rather than "One day, I . . ." and she also didn't state the comma, when she wrote, "suddenly we crash but we laugh together" because according to Wishon and Burks (1980: A-29), "Statements or clauses connected by a coordinate conjunction (and, but, for, or, etc.) are separated by the comma. And P2 got 4 (Good to average) because she made occasional errors of spelling. Such as when she wrote, "extracurricular" rather than "extracurricular," "leanguage" rather than "language" and "comunity" rather than "community". Meanwhile, P3 got 5 points (Excellent to very good) in mechanics, because he demonstrated mastery of conventions.

Finally, guided from Heaton's theory, the writer and based on his viewpoint in scoring writing had analyzed for each number of subcategories. And Based on the results above, the total scores for each participant could be identified. Whereby P1 got the score to 50 points, meanwhile P2 got the score to 75 marks, and P3 got the score to 84 points. Furthermore, the result of participants' writing test would be analyzed based on other facets, such as how the purpose, general structure, and language features of recount text itself, and how their structures of a personal letter (Heaton, 1988).

b. Recount Text

1. Purpose

In the purpose of recount text, for each participant expressed about their exciting experience to the reader through a personal letter. It was based on what had been happened in their life in the past. The text that the participants wrote belong to personal recount, which means that they told an activity that has been done. They had a different purpose of writing, such as P1 re-told her story, like a joke with her friend, P2 re-told her special birthday, and P3 re-told his appreciation to perform in the singing contest.

2. Generic Structures

The construction of recount text is formed with orientation, the sequence of events, and reorientation. In the direction, the writers should give necessary information about what they did, when and where it has happened. In the sequence of events, the writers should tell the chronological order, which encourages them to write the events that have been occurred in the place where they experienced the story. And in reorientation, the writers should give a conclusion about how it was. Re-orientation also is optional. Based on the results of a writing test, all participants had decided what they should write on their recount text.

In the orientation, P1 only stated what she did, and when it has happened. She said that she and her friend rode a bicycle when they went home. She didn't explicitly state where it has happened. The same with P1, P2 precisely only said what she had done, and where it has happened. She told me that she got a special birthday at school. She didn't state when it has explicitly happened.

Meanwhile, P3 said more entirely enough. He stated what he had done, when and where it has happened. He told me that he followed the singing contest in the school when he was in IX grade. It can be identified such as when she wrote, "I followed the contest for my class, that is IX F."

In the sequence of events, P1 stated the series of events only on a few words. The information about her story was confusing and disconnected. Different from P1, P2 completed enough to the sequence of facts about her special birthday. First, she got a gift from someone when she walked towards her class. Second, she took and brought it into the course. Then, without a simple reason, she felt that her teacher was always angry with her. The last, her friend and teacher give her a birthday cake, and it made her so surprised. The same with P2, P3 also completed his sequence of the event into his letter. First, he stated that he followed the singing contest for delegation his class. Second, he chose the first song. Third, he stands on the stage; then he expressed that he felt so nervous and panic. Fourth, he felt so grateful because he could perform in the final round. Fifth, he prepared and decided to the next song. The last, he affirmed that he only got on runner-up position. Therefore, compared to P1, P2, and P3 had given the reader more detail information about their letter.

In the reorientation, all participants closed with a conclusion about their exciting experience. P1 stated that her story with her friend was fun, such as when she wrote only, "It is so fun." P2 closed her story by stating that it was a nice birthday, she wrote, "But, that's so fun. I am happy". And for P3, although he only gets a runner-up position, he expressed in his conclusion by stating that he was pleased and proud of his ability in singing. Seen when he wrote, "But, I'm pretty happy and grateful."

3. Language Features

The language feature of recount text is one of the critical components that should be involved in. The use of language feature can create a natural feeling and expression of the writer, for example, the use of nouns and pronouns to identify people or things involved, the use of past action verbs to refer the events, and the use of past tense to located events in relation to speaker's or writer's time. The use of conjunctions and time connectives to sequence the event, the use of adverb and adverbial phrases to indicate place and time, and the use of adjectives to describe nouns.

Not all participants used those language features in their recount text. Participants just included the involvement of language features that they thought were correspondent to the need for what they, as the writer, wanted to share to the reader. Like P1 tended to be inconsistent with the use of past action verb in her recount, such as the use of the word "go" rather than "went", "ride" rather than "rode", "crash" rather than "crashed", and "laugh" rather than "laughed". She also was inconsistent with the use of linking verb of past, such as "*it is so fun*" rather than "*it was so fun.*" She also didn't state the use of the serial connection in her letter. P2 also tended to be inconsistent with the use of linking verb of past in her recount, such as when she wrote, "you are so brave" rather than "you were so brave." She also used "*I'm so surprise*" rather than "*I was so surprised,*" and "*I am happy*" rather than "*I was happy*" and without linking verb *was*, such as when she wrote, "*your story so funny.*" She made errors in using verb of past occasionally, such as the use of the word "make" rather than "made" and "don't know" rather than "didn't know", and also used double verbs of past, such as when she wrote, "I was want back to home" rather than "I went back home". Different from P1, P2 used the chronological connection *then*, such as when she wrote, "Then, I took the gift, and I brought it." The same with P1 and P2, P3 also tended to be inconsistent with the use of linking verb of past in his recount, such as when he wrote, "that is singing contest" rather than "that was singing contest", and "I'm pretty happy" rather than "I was pretty happy", etc. She also didn't use linking verb *was*, such as when he wrote: "I still grateful for that." He also made errors in using the verb of past occasions, such as the use of the word, "choose" rather than "chose," "feel" rather than "felt," and "imagine" rather than "imagined." The same with P2, P3 also used a double verb of past, such as when he wrote, "I'm very loved that song a lot" rather than "I really loved that song a lot." And the same with P2, P3 also used the chronological connection *then*, such as when he wrote, "Then, I stood on the stage."

Hence, it was believed that all participants had accomplished what they were supposed to do in writing a personal letter, which is focused on recount text. An based on the analytical scoring system and

what it should be written on recount text above, all participants seem still to have difficulty in the mastering of a grammatically correct sentence.

3. Data from Interview

Data from the interview was described for sharpening and completing information about participants' own efficacy beliefs. This data would be connected with the results of participants' closed-ended questionnaires and writing test. There were ten questions, and for each question was based on sources of students' self-efficacy in writing that are influencing their confidence judgments and attitudes in their writing. Bandura hypothesized that all four of sources are salient for the writers, because individuals gather efficacy information from their previous experiences or mastery experiences, the common experiences of others, social persuasion from others, and personal physiological states (Bandura, 1997). The results are accurately described, as followed:

a. Mastery experiences

1. Do you like to do any writing outside of school? Why?

The first question led participants to respond to how often they took the time to write. In terms of it, P1 stated that she liked to write, but actually, it is not in English. She claimed that her skills in English were not good enough. Therefore, she didn't like to write outside of school. It was different from P2, and she stated that she liked more about English. It could be known where she preferred to know English than others. Because of it, she wanted to write English outside of school. And P3 also stated that he liked to write, especially in his free time activities. He said that even though the writing was not his hobby, but he wanted to write a lot. He stated that he had some references to help him in writing and one of those references such as a diary. In his closing, he also said that he has a dream to be a writer.

The results on the first question indicated that all participants whether they liked or disliked, often or seldom to take time in writing outside of class were based on what they were feeling and what it had been done about their writing.

2. If you were asked to rate your ability to write a great essay on a scale of 1(lowest) to 10 (highest), where would you be? Why?

This question tried to know how participants rated their ability in writing English on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest). And this question showed that all participants rated on a different level. Like P1 stated that her ability in writing still was in low-level. Hence, she rated for her knowledge in writing on four scales. P2 rated for her talent in writing on 6. She stated that sometimes she liked to take extra time in studying English, such as rewriting, including reading. Perhaps it was a reason that made her rate on that scale. And P3 rated for his ability in writing on 7. He stated that most of his classmates rewarded him,

like a compliment to his writing results. His classmates said that he was good at creating words into a sentence/s. Because of it, he declared that his ability on seven scales.

The results on this question indicated that all participants could rate their ability in different scales. It could be seen that they had evaluated for their skill in writing based on their writing experiences as the senior high school writers.

3. Tell me about a time you experienced a setback (the difficulty/s) when writing an essay. How did you deal with it?

This question tried to know how participants found a solution in their difficulties during a writing activity. And each participant responded to this question in a different answer. Like P1 stated that she absolutely would ask her classmates, who knew more about English. And P2 noted that she only tried to believe for her ability, herself, and did it. Whereas P3, he stated that he tried to be more focus to write, and he usually ignored his classmates who made a noise.

The results on this question indicated that all participants based on their experiences in writing had different way to face their difficulty/s during writing activity, like P1 who used a help from her classmates, P2 who tried to believe in her ability, and P3 who wanted to keep focus on his writing from the distraction.

- b. Vicarious experiences

4. How about the rest of the students in your class? (gifted vs. non-gifted)

In this question, each participant gave perception about their classmates in writing ability, that was between gifted vs. non-gifted, where they were studying in the same class. P1 stated that her classmates were not gifted in writing ability. She said that most of her classmates had lack motivation to write; they frequently complained to do writing assignments. P2 explained that her classmates were divided into two kinds, they were students who worked hard to study English, and they were students who didn't do at all. She didn't explicitly state in dominant from gifted or non-gifted for her classmates in writing ability. And the same with P1, P3 also said that most of his classmates were not gifted in writing ability, and most of them didn't understand in English.

The results on this question indicated that what participants talked-about their classmates in writing ability virtually based on their experience in English class where they were studying.

5. What could your teachers do to help you feel more confident in your writing abilities?

This question tried to know how participants explained what their English teacher could do to help them more confident in their writing ability. Like P1 stated that her teacher usually would give her

writing assignments, then asked her to write in whiteboard when it was finished. The same with P1, P2 also stated that her teacher usually would give her writing assignments, and did it to homework. And different with P1 and P2, P3 precisely said that he felt more confident to his writing ability when his teacher gave motivation and reward, like a compliment to his writing results.

The results of this question indicated that all participants explained how their teacher helped them to be more confident in their writing ability. And what they had stated was only perceived by participants own self.

c. Social Persuasions

6. Can you describe how most of your classmates do on writing assignments?

This question tried to know how participants described how most of their friends do on writing assignments. P1 stated that most of their classmates didn't like to do on writing assignments. She also said that they complained about it because they assumed that English was a challenging skill. Meanwhile, P2 stated that if somebody didn't understand what he/she should do on a writing assignment, he/she would ask her and vice versa. Different from P3, he stated that most of his classmates only asked him to get the answer or reference to their writing assignment. The results of this question indicated that all participants described how most of their classmates did on writing assignments. And what they had explained it, it was based on what they knew and believed.

7. What do your classmates say about writing?

This question tried to know how participants described their classmates' attitudes about writing. P1 stated that writing in English was a complicated skill for her classmates. Because of it, most of them didn't like to write in English. P2 also stated that writing was a difficult skill for their classmates. Not only writing was a very difficult skill, but P3 also stated that writing was boring to do, especially in grammar and spelling. The results of this question indicated that all participants described how their classmates' feelings about writing. And what they had said, it was based on their interaction with their classmates during writing class activities.

8. How do you think your classmates would describe you as a writer (your writing ability)?

In this question, each participant described themselves as a writer based on their classmates' assumption related to their writing ability. P1 stated that perhaps her classmates assumed to her writing ability still was not good enough. P2 noted that probably her classmates believed to her writing ability was good enough. She also stated that she could help her classmates to do on writing assignments.

And P3 also said that perhaps his classmates assumed to his writing ability was good enough, and they often gave support to make himself better in English. The results of this question indicated that all participants described how their classmates assumed to their writing ability based on their perception and recognition as the writers.

d. Physiological response to writing

9. When you are given an essay writing assignment, how does that make you feel?

This question tried to know how participants described how their feeling when they got writing assignments. P1 stated that sometimes she felt annoyed or distempered when she heard that her teacher gave her writing assignments. Meanwhile, P2 noted that she liked to get a writing task. She also stated that she usually could finish her writing assignment quickly. And P3 also said that he wanted to do writing assignments. The results of this question indicated that all participants described their physiological responded when they got a writing appointment from their English teacher based on their feelings.

10. How do you feel when you sit down to write?

And the last question tried to know how participants' physiological arousal when they sit down to write. Like P1 stated that she sometimes felt challenging to focus on her writing assignment, nervous, but she tried to keep calm and did it. Meanwhile, P2 noted that she enjoyed during her writing activity because the writing was familiar to her. And P3 noted that he could feel panic, but it was only in a few minutes.

The results of the last question indicated that all participants expressed how their physiological arousal when they responded to write individually. In facts, regarding participants' clarifications in this interview section, it was based on their own efficacy beliefs.

Conclusion

The study showed that the participants' previous performance or mastery experience was the most important source in helping them to create self-efficacy beliefs related to their writing ability. And the results from participants in verbal persuasion and their physiological states in writing also were successful in helping them in creating their own efficacy belief. Meanwhile, in this research, the source of common experience was weaker than others in helping create self-efficacy beliefs. All the discussions about students' self-efficacy related their ability in writing based on the questionnaires, a writing test, and interview tended to have a positive value. Thus, the writer hope, these findings of the research will give new insight and knowledge

of students' self-efficacy beliefs, which can help them developed in English writing ability.

References

- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Excercise of Control.o Title*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Broaddus, M. B. (2012). *Students ' writing self-efficacy, motivation, and experience : Predictors in journalism education*.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd ed.)*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415773>
- Christie, F., & Derewianka, B. (2010). *School Discourse Learning to write across the years of schooling Title*. British Library.
- Duff, A. P. (2008). *Case Study Research in Applied LinguisticsNo Title*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halm, D. (2018). *Writing Success and Self Efficacy: The Student PerspectiveNo Title*. Retrieved from Journal of International and Social Development website: <http://www.ibii-us.org/Journals/JESD>.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex, England: Longman.
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Pearson Longman Group UK Limited.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and Researching Writing (2nd ed)*. UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Jalaluddin, Yamat, Y. (2013). *ESL Writing Self-Efficacy: Contribution to ESL Writing Skill Development*. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 2(1), 34–47. Retrieved from www.iosrjournals.org
- Kirmizi, O., & Kirmizi, 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), on Friday, March 31st, 2017.

- Retrieved from <http://www.sciedu.ca/journal/index.php/ijhe/article/download/6468/3894>
- Magogwe, J. M., Ramoroka, B. T., & Mogana-Monyepi, R. (2015). *Developing Student-Writers' Self-efficacy Beliefs*. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 5(2), Accessed on Wednesday, April 5th, 2017. Retrieved from learning.coventry.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/joaw/article/download/132/280
- Muretta, J. R. J. (2004). *Exploring the Four Sources of Self-Efficacy*. Retrieved from <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/EffMuretta.pdf>
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pajares, F., Johnson, M. J., & Usher, E. L. (2007). *Sources of Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Elementary, Middle, and High School Students*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 42(1). Retrieved from <http://sites.education.uky.edu/motivation/files/2013/08/PajaresJohnsonUsh%09erRTE2007.pdf>
- Pajares, F. (2003). *Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Motivation, and Achievement in Writing: A Review of the Literature*. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(1397158). Retrieved from <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/Pajares2003RWQ.pdf>
- Pintrich, P. (2003). *Motivation and Classroom Learning*. In *Handbook of Psychology, Educational Psychology*. (Vol. 7). Canada: John Wiley & Sons. Inc.
- Salem, M. S., & Al-Dyiar, M. A. (n.d.). *Writing Anxiety as a Predictor of Writing Self-Efficacy in English for Special Education Arab Learners*. *International Education Studies*, 7(6). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1070055.pdf>
- Stewart, G., Seifert, T. A., & Rolheiser, C. (2015). *Anxiety and Self-efficacy's Relationship with Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of the use of Metacognitive Writing Strategies*. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(1). Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1201&context=cjsotl_rcac%09ea

Usher, E. L. (2009). *Sources of middle school students' self-efficacy: A qualitative investigation*. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), 275–314. Retrieved from <http://www.sci epub.com/reference/5764>

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wishon, George E, & Burks, J. M. (1980). *Let's Write English (revised ed)*. New York: American Book Company.