

EFL Students' Writing Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance in a Senior High School: A Correlational Study

Maya Tri Astuti¹, Astri Hapsari²

^{1,2}*Department of English Language Education, Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia*

¹21322062@students.uii.ac.id

²astri.hapsari@uui.ac.id

Abstract: Although writing self-efficacy is essential for the development of second/foreign language learners' writing skills, there are still limited studies on EFL writing self-efficacy among senior high school students in the Indonesian context. This study aims to test the correlation between students' EFL writing self-efficacy and their performance in writing a procedure text in a senior high school. One hundred and sixty-three students agreed to participate in this correlational study with purposive sampling. The researchers used an Indonesian version of the Second Language Writing Self-Efficacy Scales by Teng et al. (2017). The result showed a significantly negative correlation ($r = -.089$) between students' self-confidence in writing and their actual writing performance, with a significance p value = .257, which it is greater than the significance level of Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted that there is no significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance. As it is limited to students from one school in grade 11 and procedural text, future research needs to be conducted with more participants and diverse text types to enrich the discussion and explore factors that contribute more substantially to these text types.

Keywords: correlational study, EFL writing, procedure text, senior high school students, self-efficacy

INTRODUCTION

The Merdeka Curriculum (or Emancipated Curriculum), which was first introduced in Indonesia in 2020 by the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, has been widely implemented. To this day, the Merdeka Curriculum is now under the responsibility of the Minister of Primary and Secondary Education (Mendikdasmen) led by Abdul Mu'ti (Sabrina, Saputra, Lahfi, & Fadhil, 2024). This curriculum aims to provide a more holistic approach to education, facilitating character development, creativity, and critical thinking, as well as academic achievement. The curriculum is also more inclusive, flexible, and responsive to each individual's needs, emphasizing a learner-centered approach and integrating technology into the learning process (Zidan & Qamariah, 2023; Krishnapatria, 2021), providing a variety of intracurricular learning opportunities, designed to optimize content so that every student has ample time to explore concepts and reinforce their skills (Ndari, Suyatno, Sukirman, & Mahmudah, 2023). This curriculum enhances a learning environment that support students' writing self-efficacy. When students have freedom in learning related to writing and sufficient time to explore deeper into writing strategies, they tend to be more confident about their writing abilities.

Writing, as a productive skill in English language learning, demands not only linguistic competence, such as mastery of vocabulary and grammar, but also critical thinking abilities, including the organization of ideas and the effective articulation of arguments in a clear and comprehensible manner (Korban, Jamiluddin, Budi, & Mertosono, 2024). The difficulties they

experience can negatively impact their academic writing performance (Nurdianingsih, Fitriati, Astuti, & Rozi, 2024). Several contributing factors influence these difficulties, including confusion about selecting appropriate vocabulary in the right situation (Korban et al., 2024), difficulties with expressing and organizing ideas, and a lack of grammatical knowledge (Harmawan, Pratama, & Fadilah, 2023), and writing anxiety (Nugroho & Ena, 2021), limited vocabulary range and inadequate grammatical understanding (Falihah, Rahmawati, & Baihaqi, 2022), as well as insufficient awareness of academic writing conventions in English (Pasaribu, Pasaribu, Siahaan, & Sitompul, 2024).

In research involving EFL secondary students, Hafizah et al. (2024) found that the students encountered difficulties in vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. These problems influence students' writing self-efficacy, which also affects their performance. The struggle arises due to several factors, including the habit of using the mother tongue rather than the English language, limited academic writing knowledge, insufficient knowledge about the topic, and limited access to reference materials (Ho, 2024). Therefore, students' writing self-efficacy is necessary to overcome challenges because it directly influences motivation, strategy, and writing results (Pajares, 2003). Besides that, writing self-efficacy can help students face challenges through several steps, such as lowering writing anxiety (Zhou, Wang, & Wang, 2022), increasing motivation and perseverance (Martono, Dian WP, Yulianto, Purwanta, & Dwiningrum, 2022), and enhancing writing qualities (Pajares, 2003).

Some challenges that appeared in students' writing process when the researcher conducted the teaching internship were lack of grammar, limited vocabulary, and unorganized structure, for instance, confusion about choosing appropriate conjunctions. The EFL senior high school students were in grade 11. To overcome the challenges, the researcher made several efforts, such as asking students one by one and allowing them to open their smartphones for an important occasion, such as searching for references about conjunction words. Until the end of the meeting on procedural text, some students still have problems with grammar. Therefore, the researcher decided to conduct a study about the relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing performance. Writing self-efficacy refers to one's confidence in one's ability to succeed in English writing tasks (Hetthong & Teo, 2013). Confidence in English writing affects how students view writing in general; it influences whether they will try to master or avoid writing tasks. If students believe they can complete a writing task, regardless of their writing ability, they are more likely to work harder to overcome challenges while practicing or completing the task. When faced with difficulties, self-efficacy encourages students to remain committed and continue trying different strategies until they complete the task. Therefore, writing performance is influenced by writing self-efficacy. Similarly, in other research, writing self-efficacy refers to students' belief in their ability to complete writing assignments (Zhang & Zhang, 2024).

Pajares (2003) stated that writing self-efficacy is also related to other aspects, specifically writing anxiety, grade goals, depth of processing, and expected outcomes. Writing self-efficacy was positively related to several motivational factors, including the perceived importance of writing, one's self-concept, confidence in self-regulation abilities, goals focused on engaging with tasks, and goals aimed at achieving high performance. Research by Hetthong and Teo (2013) proved that writing self-efficacy plays a role in predicting students' writing performance. Students with higher writing self-efficacy tend to be more motivated, persistent, and confident when facing writing challenges. Writing skills are one of the important aspects of the English subject. However, in the implementation, some of the students still faced challenges, including a lack of understanding about the structure, limited vocabulary, and a lack

of social function and linguistic characteristics of the text (Irawaty, Yunanada, Simalango, Simanullang, & Lubis, 2024). Meanwhile, in the procedural text, students find the challenges, particularly focusing on the topic, choosing appropriate vocabulary, using conjunctions, using imperative sentences, the generic structure of paragraphs, and using punctuation (Tiyas & Kartikawati, 2024). One of the factors that contributes to these challenges is students' self-efficacy. This problem needs to get more attention because the difficulties that students experience negatively influence their writing performance. Therefore, it is important to identify the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance to get clear information about the correlation, especially in procedural text.

Husna, Setya, and Rohmah (2021) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between writing self-efficacy and students' performance in writing recount texts. The research involved 110 participants and utilized two primary instruments for data collection: the Self-Efficacy for the Writing Scale (SEWS), adapted from Bruning et al. (2013), and a writing task requiring students to produce a recount text of at least 200 words within a 60-minute timeframe. To evaluate writing performance, the researchers employed the EFL Composition Profile, developed by Jacobs et al. (1981), which assesses five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The study concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between students' self-perceived writing abilities and their actual writing outcomes in the recount task.

In contrast, Rudiyanto (2022) focused her investigation on the relationship between writing self-efficacy and performance in the context of descriptive texts. Her study involved a selected sample of 20 to 40 students from a larger group of 60 participants. Data were collected using the L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) by Teng, Sun, & Xu (2017), which evaluates learners' confidence in writing based on their linguistic competence, classroom experiences, and learning strategies. To assess writing quality, she utilized the Level-Specific Checklist of Binary Choice Items, created by Lukácsi in collaboration with the Euroexam International team, comprising 34 evaluation items aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Unlike the findings of Husna et al., Aldina's study revealed that in writing descriptive texts, secondary students generally demonstrate a medium level of writing self-efficacy. This statement is supported by findings showing average scores ranging from 4 to 5. Several factors, such as the variety of text types, the writing assignment, and the scoring rubric, can be the reasons for the differences in findings between Husna, Setya, and Rohmah (2021) and Aldina (2022). While Husna's study focused on recount texts and used a traditional composition profile, Aldina examined descriptive texts using a CEFR-aligned checklist that offered a more comprehensive and context-specific evaluation. Additionally, the use of different self-efficacy scales - SEWS in Husna's study and L2WSS in Aldina's - may have affected the results of the research.

However, Yuda, Rasuki, and Fathurrochman (2024) presented an alternative view, arguing that higher self-efficacy is associated with better writing performance and emphasizing the importance of developing self-efficacy in EFL learners to enhance their writing abilities. Yuda et al. (2024) utilizes a quantitative approach for data analysis. The students were asked to write a descriptive text and complete a self-efficacy questionnaire. The collected data were analyzed statistically to determine the relationship between their self-efficacy levels and writing ability scores Yuda et al. (2024). Previous studies on the correlation of writing self-efficacy and writing performance among high school students in the EFL context, particularly in Indonesia, focus on different types of text (Rudiyanto, 2022; Binnendyk, Patty, & Jamil, 2024; Hafizah

et al., 2024; Yuda et al., 2024). Therefore, this research aims to complement and expand existing studies by focusing on Indonesian senior high school students and exploring the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance, specifically in writing procedure text. The novelty offered in this research is that the students participated in this study have completed the module about writing procedure text with the theme financial literacy.

This research has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the participants are limited to EFL students in a senior high school at Yogyakarta grade 11, who completed writing procedural text during the academic year 2024/2025. Therefore, this research probably cannot be generalized to wider populations. Second, this research only focuses on the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance, specifically on procedure text; therefore, it does not represent students' writing abilities as a whole. The research was conducted based on the following formulation of the problem: What is the correlation between students' writing self-efficacy and their writing performance? The primary objective of the study is to test and analyze the correlation between the writing self-efficacy of students and their writing performance at the end of the procedure text module. On empirical grounds, this study is important in contributing to a better understanding of the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance in writing procedure text. On the practical ground, the findings of this research are expected to help teachers and students identify the challenges and improve students' writing performance.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study was designed to analyze the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance for EFL senior high school students in grade 11 who have already learned about procedure text. This study implements quantitative research with two variables: the independent variable (X) indicates writing self-efficacy, and the dependent variable (Y) indicates writing performance. This study is a correlational design, which involves gathering information from individuals about two or more variables, then analyzing whether there's a relationship between them. A correlation shows how closely the variables move together, either in the same direction, which means a positive correlation, or in opposite directions, which refers to a negative correlation (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010). This concept is operationalized by using the Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) as a research instrument. The Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Teng et al. (2017) and utilized a 7-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 7 (very true of me). This construct was represented through a series of written items, each reflecting a statement about how confident learners feel during the process of learning to write. This instrument has been previously used in a study by Aldina (2022), although with a different type of text.

Meanwhile, the dependent variable (Y) is the students' performance. To assess students' writing performance, the study used the scoring rubric employed by the teacher at the school, which the teacher had previously validated. The rubric consists of four assessment criteria: content, organization of ideas, language use, and mechanics. The rubric assessment consists of content, organization, language, and mechanics. The table below shows how the rubric assessment is used to assess students' writing performance based on the English teacher's recommendation and consistent with the theory of writing performance by Weigle (2002).

Population and Sample

The target population of this study comprises all 11th-grade students at SMA N 9 Yogyakarta, specifically 36 students in a single class. The 11th grade has a population of 252 students, and 163 students agreed to participate in the study. Therefore, this research adopted purposive sampling, because all the participants were purposefully chosen as students who had been assessed on the learning outcomes in procedure text, and the researcher was already teaching grade 11 in this school at the teaching internship.

Table 3. 1 Participants Description

Grade	Gender	Age	English Level	Total Students
XI	66 Male 97 Female	16 years old = 25 students	CEFR A1 = 21 students CEFR A2 = 59 students	163
		17 years old = 117 students	CEFR B1 = 59 students CEFR B2 = 15 students	
		18 years old = 20 students	CEFR C1 = 7 students	
		19 years old = 1 student	CEFR C2 = 2 students	

Table 3. 2 Participants Gender

		Total	Percentage
Gender	Male	66	40.5%
	Female	97	59.5%
Total Respondent		163	100%

Table 3. 3 Participants Age

		Total
Age	16	25
	17	117
	18	20
	19	1
Total Respondent		163

Table 3. 4 Participants English Level

		Total
English Perception	CEFR A1	21
	CEFR A2	59
	CEFR B1	59
	CEFR B2	15
	CEFR C1	7
	CEFR C2	2
Total Respondents		163

Research Instruments

This research applies two instruments to gather the data. The first is the Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS), which measures the level of students' writing self- efficacy. The second one utilizes scoring rubrics to assess students' performance in writing procedural text.

1. Writing Self-Efficacy

To measure students' self-efficacy levels, a set of questionnaires was distributed directly to the students by the researcher through a Google Form. Participants accessed the form via a provided link or QR code, which included student identification, instructions, and 20-item questionnaires. The questionnaire, named the Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS), was initially developed by Teng et al. (2017), was modified by the researcher to suit the study's context. The questionnaire aimed to capture students' perceptions and beliefs regarding their writing abilities. The questionnaire is structured around three key dimensions of writing self-efficacy. It consists of seven items that assess linguistic self-efficacy, which refers to students' confidence in their language-related skills. Another six items focus on self-regulatory efficacy, measuring students' perceived ability to manage and control their writing processes effectively. The remaining seven items address performance self-efficacy, which reflects students' beliefs in their ability to produce successful writing outcomes.

Table 3. 5 L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS)

Items	Statements	Domain
LSE 1	I can correctly use parts of speech (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives) in writing.	Linguistic Self-Efficacy
LSE 2	I can write a simple sentence with grammatical structure.	
LSE 3	I can write compound and complex sentences with grammatical structure.	
LSE 4	I can write a composition with a clear organisation or structure.	

LSE 5	I can revise wordy or confusing sentences of my writing.	
LSE 6	I can revise my composition to make it better organized.	
LSE 7	I can revise basic grammar errors in my writing.	
SRE 1	I can realise my goal to improve my writing.	Self-Regulatory Efficacy
SRE 2	I can think of my goals before writing.	
SRE 3	I can think of different ways to help me to plan before writing.	
SRE 4	I can evaluate whether I achieve my goal in writing.	
SRE 5	I can evaluate my strength and weakness in writing.	
SRE 6	I can evaluate whether a composition is good or bad.	
PSE 1	I can understand the most difficult material presented in writing courses.	Performance Self-Efficacy
PSE 2	I can understand the basic concepts taught in writing courses.	
PSE 3	I can understand the most complex material presented by the instructor of writing courses.	
PSE 4	I can do an excellent job on the assignments in writing courses.	
PSE 5	I can master the writing knowledge and strategies being taught in writing courses.	
PSE 6	I can use the writing knowledge and strategies being taught in writing courses.	
PSE 7	Considering the difficulty of the writing course, the teacher, and my skill, I can perform well in writing courses.	

Students were asked to respond to each statement using a seven-point Likert scale, as introduced by Teng et al. (2017). The Likert scale served as a tool to evaluate the writing self-efficacy of eleventh-grade Senior High School students at Yogyakarta. The 7-point Likert scale was divided into intervals reflecting relatively equal differences in responses, as illustrated in the table below.

Table 3. 6 7-point Likert scale

Scale	Description
1	Not at all true of me
2	Mostly not true of me
3	Somewhat not true of me
4	Neutral / Neither true nor untrue of me
5	Somewhat true of me
6	Mostly true of me
7	Very true of me

Validity refers to how accurately an assessment tool measures the specific concept it is designed to measure (Obilor & Miwari, 2022). Validity of the instrument of writing self-efficacy was carried out by checking the validity value of the original instrument by Teng et al. (2017). This instrument has also been used in a previous study by Aldina (2022) in the context of high school learning, but with different types of text. The researcher conducted two types of validity test of instrument. The first one is content validity, which means the researcher translated the instrument into Indonesian to suit the Indonesian context and the various English language abilities of students. During translated the instrument, the researcher consulted with the undergraduate thesis supervisor to make sure that the translated sentences do not changes the meaning. The second one is criteria validity, and the instrument was tested using Pearson's Correlation. A whole set of items is valid as proved by the value of Pearson's Correlation is greater than the R-Table.

Research by Taber (2017) explained that Cronbach's Alpha is classified into 17 categories of reliability, ranging from low to excellent. In these classifications, Cronbach's Alpha, with a value of .977, is included in the category of excellent.

2. *Writing Performance*

To assess students' performance, the students are given various assignments, with the last one being a writing procedure text. The assignment is given once at the end of the lesson. After completing the assignment, it is submitted and assessed using the scoring rubric recommended by the English teacher at that school. The scoring rubric has four aspects that will be assessed, such as content, organization of ideas, language use, and mechanics that which have has its scoring provisions for each aspect. This instrument has been validated by experts, including the supervisor who supervised the teaching practice at the school being studied and the English teacher from the school being studied. Additionally, the rubric assessment also arranged based on writing performance by Weigle (2002). The rubric assessment is shown in the following table.

Table 3. 8 Assessment Rubrics

Aspect	Criteria	Score
Content (15-30)	The topic is clearly defined, with an engaging and original approach to presenting the procedure. The steps are supported by accurate information and relevant details, ensuring clarity and completeness. The procedure is thoroughly explained, well-structured, and demonstrates reflective understanding. It also offers new insights or perspectives related to the process being described.	25-30
	The topic is clearly stated, and the procedure is presented in an interesting and original way, supported by some relevant facts and information. However, the steps are incomplete, lack detail, are not thoroughly explained, and offer limited value or insight into the process.	20-24
	The procedure is unengaging and appears to be purely fictional, without any factual support. It lacks detail, is incomplete, and does not provide meaningful value or practical insight into the process.	15-19
Organization of Ideas (10-20)	The text follows a clear structure, it includes a title, tools, and steps. Ideas are organized into distinct paragraph units or points and presented in a logical sequence.	16-20
	The text includes a title and tools, but lacks a step. Some steps contain more than one main idea, and the sequence of time is occasionally inconsistent.	13-15
	The structure is not organized at all, with no clear title, tools, or steps. It does not follow a logical sequence of time.	10-12
Language (15-30)	The paragraphs or points are cohesive and coherent, with effective and communicative sentences. Standard sentence structures are used, supported by accurate and varied diction. The meaning is unambiguous, and conjunctions are applied appropriately throughout the text.	27-30
	Some paragraphs or points lack cohesion, and there are sentences that are ineffective and ambiguous. There is inappropriate word choice, as well as incorrect use of conjunctions.	21-26

	Many paragraphs or points lack cohesion, and there are numerous sentences that are ineffective and ambiguous. There is a high frequency of inappropriate word choices, as well as frequent incorrect use of conjunctions.	17-20
	The paragraphs or points are disjointed, and the sentences are ineffective. The majority of sentence structures are incorrect, with limited and inappropriate word choices. The use of conjunctions is also improper.	15-16
Mechanics (8-20)	There are no spelling errors at all; if handwritten, the writing is neat and clearly legible. There are no typos, and the choice of font type and size is appropriate. Margins are perfectly set.	17-20
	There are some spelling errors; handwriting is neat. A few typos are present. The selection of font type, size, and margins is appropriate.	13-16
	There are quite a number of spelling errors and typos. Handwriting is somewhat untidy. The font type, size, and margins are inconsistent.	10-12
	Spelling is neglected, handwriting is very untidy, and there are numerous typos. The choice of font type, size, and margins is arbitrary and inconsistent.	8-9
Score		100

Data Collection and Analysis

The researchers carry out several steps in analyzing data in this study:

1. Reviewed the literature to understand the construct and content of the instrument.
2. Adopted a questionnaire Teng et al. (2017) L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) as an instrument in this study with a 7-point Likert scale.
3. Translated the items of the instrument into Indonesian to suit with participants' background of the language.
4. Reviewed the content of the writing self-efficacy instrument by consulting with the undergraduate thesis supervisor to obtain expert judgment on the items. Meanwhile the scoring rubric for procedure text writing was validated by the first researcher teacher supervisor.
5. Distributed the questionnaire to students in grade 11 at the school being researched.
6. Presented the data tabulation by using Microsoft Excel and analyzed the data by using Jamovi and SPSS to conduct normality test, linearity test, validity test, reliability test, and correlational analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

A normality test is conducted using Jamovi and SPSS. Then, tested using the Shapiro-Wilk test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used for comparing two samples (Yang & Berdine, 2021). In this normality test, data is considered not normally distributed if the p-value is less than the chosen alpha level. In contrast, if the p-value is greater than the chosen alpha, then the data is normally distributed, considering that $\alpha = 0.05$. Meanwhile, in this research, Writing Performance showed that the p-value is at < 0.001 and the

p-value of writing self-efficacy is at 0.050, which is tested by Kolmogorov-Smirnov and 0.035 by Shapiro-Wilk.

Table 4. 1 Normality Test of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Mean Writing Self-Efficacy	.070	163	.050	.982	163	.035
Writing Performance	.295	163	<.001	.784	163	<.001

Even though the data was not normally distributed, the researcher tried to conduct a linear test. The linearity test was conducted by regression analysis using Jamovi. The result showed the p-value of writing self-efficacy at 0.254.

Table 4. 2 Model Coefficients – Writing Self-Efficacy

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p
Intercept	95.31643	0.54095	176.20	<.001
Writing Self-Efficacy	-0.00622	0.00543	-1.15	0.254

Linearity testing was also conducted with the form of Correlation Matrix, which used Spearman's.

Table 4. 3 Correlation Matrix

		Writing Self-Efficacy	Writing Performance
Writing Self-Efficacy	Spearman's Rho	-	-.089
	df	-	163
	p-value	-	.257

Writing Performance	Spearman's Rho	-.089	-
	df	163	-
	p-value	.257	-
Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$			

In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, the data is not normally distributed. Therefore, the analysis is continued using a non-parametric correlation test, that is Spearman's Rho. This test is used to test whether or not there is a correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance. Based on Spearman correlation analysis, the number of correlation coefficients is $r_p = -.089$ with significance ρ value = .257. The (ρ value = .257) is greater than the significance level of Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table 4. 4 Correlation between Writing Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance

			Mean Writing Self-Efficacy	Writing Performance
Spearman's Rho	Mean Writing Self-Efficacy	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.089
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.257
		N	163	163
Writing Performance	Writing Performance	Correlation Coefficient	-.089	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.257	.
		N	163	163

Before conducting the test, two hypotheses were formulated: the null hypothesis (H_0) and the alternative hypothesis (H_1). H_0 states there is no significant correlation between the two variables tested. In contrast, H_1 states that there is a significant correlation between two variables. The finding shows that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In conclusion, there is no significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance in the context of procedural text type.

Discussion

The purpose of this research is to test the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance in grade 11 senior high school students. The result of the study is not similar to the previous studies, which shows a significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance (Binnendyk et al., 2024; Yuda et al., 2024). The differences in results can be caused by several factors, such as: mismatching between students' belief about writing and their writing skills, diverse classroom instructions experienced by the students to complete the writing module, possibility inter-rater reliability in scoring students' performance (because some of the students were not scored by the first researcher).

However, this study is in line with another study by Rudiyanto (2022) and Husna, Setya, and Rohmah (2021) found no significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing

performance. In Aldina's study, she did not explain the factors that caused the insignificance of her research. However, Aldina mentioned limitations and several factors that probably influenced her research results, such as participants who only focused on EFL, especially Indonesian high school students, gender factors, IQ, and additional variables.

Meanwhile, Husna, Setya, and Rohmah (2021) stated that one of the factors that influences the differences in research findings is the difference in writing strategies between students, the rubric assessment used, the participants, and the object being measured. The better writing performance is produced by appropriate writing strategies. If the students have better writing results, it will increase students' writing self-efficacy. The successful experiences in writing that students have had are one source of student self-efficacy. Nevertheless, this study is not about writing strategies therefore, it can't be the same measurement as Husna's.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to test and analyze the correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance in grade 11 of EFL senior high school in Yogyakarta. A total of 163 students agreed to participate. The measurement of L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) revealed that the profile of students' writing self-efficacy from the highest to the lowest mean score is: self-regulated efficacy, performance self-efficacy, and linguistic self-efficacy. The findings of the research indicate that the correlation coefficient is: $r_{xy} = -.089$ and the p value = .257 that has been measured by Spearman's Rho. It means that there is no significant correlation between students' writing self-efficacy and their writing performance in this research. There are several limitations in this study. One of them is the type of text used, which is a procedural text, so the findings cannot be generalized to other types of texts. In addition, the participants in this study were English learners in an EFL country at the senior high school level. Because of that, the results might be different if the participants were from other groups, especially from EFL learners in different countries. In addition, the researcher suggests that the next study will provide more discussion on the factor that causes an insignificant correlation between writing self-efficacy and writing performance.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th edition). Belmont, CS Wadsworth.
- Binnendyk, S., Patty, J., & Jamil, A. (2024). Self-efficacy as a predictor of writing performance: A correlational study of Indonesian secondary school students. *J-Shelves of Indragiri*, 6(2), 129–148. <https://ejournal-fkip.unisi.ac.id/shelves/article/view/285>
- Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029692>
- Falihah, N., Rahmawati, E., & Baihaqi, A. (2022). EFL students' difficulties in writing narrative text. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Cultural Studies*, 5(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.48181/jelts.v5i1.15026>
- Hafizah, W., Husna, N., Sunengsih, N., & Maulidya, R. A. (2024). High school students' difficulties in writing descriptive text. *Jurnal Imiah Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 8(1), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jipp.v8i1.66730>
- Harmawan, V., Pratama, V. M., & Fadilah, R. (2023). The challenges of writing academic

- article: Voices of higher education students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(2), 402–408. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v12i2.120892>
- Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2015). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, Vol. 18, pp. 66–67. BMJ Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102129>
- Hetthong, R., & Teo, A. (2013). Does writing self-efficacy correlate with and predict writing performance? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(1), 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.157>
- Ho, T. L. U. (2024). Problems with academic writing encountered by EFL postgraduate students at a university in the Mekong Delta. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 3(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24311>
- Husna, A., Setya, A., & Rohmah, G. N. (2021). The role of self-efficacy in writing achievement of Indonesian senior high school students. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistik Terapan Dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 8(1), 51–58. <https://ejournal.unisnu.ac.id/JE/article/view/1602>
- Irawaty, C. F., Yunanada, F., Simalango, A. M. R., Simanullang, W. L., & Lubis, B. N. (2024). An analysis on the students' challenges faced in writing procedure texts at budi murni 1. *Jurnal Basataka*, 7(2), 917. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36277/basataka.v7i2.578>
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*.
- Kamila, S. N., & Agus RM, A. H. (2023). Implementation of Merdeka curriculum in improving the quality of senior high school. *Jurnal Educatio*, 9(1), 394–401. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v9i1.4591>
- Korban, M. M., Jamiluddin, Budi, & Mertosono, S. R. (2024). Writing difficulties faced by the grade eleven students of senior high school. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 2673–2684. <https://doi.org/10.2456/ideas>
- Krishnapatria, K. (2021). Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) curriculum in English studies program: Challenges and opportunities. *ELT in Focus*, 4(1), 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.35706/eltinf.v4i1.5276>
- Martono, S., Dian WP, S., Yulianto, A., Purwanta, E., & Dwiningrum, S. I. A. (2022). Role of optimism, self-efficacy and motivation for goals achievement in academic resilience: Moderating role of institutional support. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 101(101), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2022.101.010>
- Ndari, W., Suyatno, Sukirman, & Mahmudah, F. N. (2023). Implementation of the Merdeka curriculum and its challenges. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 4(3), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.3.648>
- Nugroho, A. A., & Ena, O. T. (2021). Writing anxiety among EFL students of John senior high school. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 9(1), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v9i1.1885>
- Nurdianingsih, F., Fitriati, S. W., Astuti, P., & Rozi, F. (2024). Writing difficulties faced by EFL writing learners of English education study program. *Proceedings of Fine Arts, Literature, Language, and Education*, 461–476. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/icoella/article/view/3710>
- Obilor, E. I., & Miwari, G. U. (2022). Content validity in educational assessment. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research*, 2(10), 57–69. Retrieved from <https://www.seahipaj.org>
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of

- the literature. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308222>
- Pasaribu, A. N., Pasaribu, T. K., Siahaan, R. B., & Sitompul, D. S. (2024). Challenges for Indonesian EFL students in English academic writing. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(2), 527–536. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v12i2.9780>
- Rudiyanto, V. S. Aldina. (2022). The correlation between students' self-efficacy in writing descriptive text and their writing performance. *Research on English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 10(02), 75–82. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/retain/article/view/46085>
- Sabrina, F., Saputra, T., Lahfi, F. F., & Fadhil, A. (2024). Persepsi publik terhadap pergantian menteri pendidikan. *Dinamika Pembelajaran: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Bahasa*, 2(1), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.62383/dilan.v2i1.1122>
- Taber, K. S. (2017). The use of cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2017a). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language contexts: Scale validation through structural equation Modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 911–942. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.432>
- Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2017b). Conceptualizing Writing Self-Efficacy in English as a Foreign Language Contexts: Scale Validation Through Structural Equation Modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 911–942. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.432>
- Tiyas, S. W., & Kartikawati, D. (2024). An analysis of tenth grade students' difficulties in writing procedure text. *Variable Research Journal*, 01(02). <https://variablejournal.my.id/index.php/VRJ/article/view/82>
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing* (J. C. Alderson & L. F. Bachman, Eds.).
- Yang, S., & Berdine, G. (2021). Normality tests. *The Southwest Respiratory and Critical Care Chronicles*, 9(37), 87–90. <https://doi.org/10.12746/swrccc.v9i37.805>
- Yuda, B., Rasuki, M., & Fathurrochman, H. (2024). Self-efficacy and writing abilities: A correlational study with Indonesian EFL students. *International Social Sciences and Humanities UMJember Proceeding Series*, 3(2), 320–326. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32528/issn.v3i2.608>
- Zhang, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2024). Profiling L2 students' writing self-efficacy and its relationship with their writing strategies for self-regulated learning. *System*, 122, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103253>
- Zhou, J., Wang, S., & Wang, J. (2022). Investigating high schoolers' L2 writing anxiety, L2 writing self-efficacy, L2 writing self-regulated strategies, and L2 writing engagement: Relationships and mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 01–09. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012407>
- Zidan, M. R., & Qamariah, Z. (2023). A literature study on the implementation of merdeka curriculum. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Bahasa*, 2(2), 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jurribah.v2i2.1576>