



## ENGLISH WRITING INSTRUCTION AND STRATEGIES AS PREDICTORS OF WRITING ANXIETY OF STUDENTS

**Eutiquio M. Canada Jr.<sup>i</sup>,**

**Tessie G. Miralles**

Professional Schools,  
University of Mindanao,  
Davao City, Philippines

### **Abstract:**

This study aimed to determine English teachers' writing instruction and students' writing strategies significantly predict students' ESL writing anxiety. The working group for the present study, in which quantitative descriptive-predictive design was employed, included 271 first-year students enrolled in GE 2 subject at UM Digos College. The participants answered adopted standard questionnaires to quantify which dimension/s of English Teachers' writing instruction and English students' writing strategies significantly predict/s writing anxiety. The gathered data were analyzed and interpreted using the mean and standard deviation, Pearson-r, regression, and multiple linear regression. Regression analysis was used to predict the value of writing anxiety based on the value of writing instruction and strategies. Multiple linear regression was used to model the linear relationship between writing anxiety and writing instruction and strategies. The results revealed that teachers' explicit writing instruction in teaching and students' employment strategies in writing helped the learners lessen their writing anxiety. The findings corroborated the three domains for English writing instructions and English writing strategies: learning to write factual texts, learning to write formal and informal texts, and resourcing, significantly predict English writing anxiety. The findings obtained in this study suggest that the employment of effective instruction and strategies for students may alleviate anxiety and desirably perform various writing tasks in any particular genre.

**Keywords:** education, writing instruction, writing strategies, writing anxiety, regression, Philippines

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [eutiquiocanadajr@gmail.com](mailto:eutiquiocanadajr@gmail.com)

## 1. Introduction

Writing is a difficult talent to master because it necessitates good lexicons and grammar to organize mental meanings and generate content (Zhang, 2019). As a result, the complexity of writing sometimes presents difficulties, such as finding the idea to write, paraphrasing the thesis statement, using vocabulary related to the essay topic, and lacking knowledge, resulting in writing anxiety (Huerta, Goodson, Beigi, & Chlup, 2016; Fitrinada, Leoneto, & Fiftinova, 2018). Such difficulties have been ascribed to an absence of English writing experience and skill (Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015). From a worldwide perspective, any Iraqi students in an ESL setting with minimal exposure to and use of English, particularly in writing, are more likely to have comparable difficulties (Sabti, Rashid, Nimechisalem, & Darmi, 2019). Thus, Zhang (2019) mentioned that the more anxious the students are, the worse their writing accomplishment is because they lacked confidence in their abilities and skills to create writing.

With this regard, several previously published works related to studying writing anxiety indicate its importance and factors in enhancing students' writing performance. According to Rezaei and Jafari (2014), anxiety has long been recognized as a critical source of difficulty in second language acquisition by researchers, teachers, and students. Moreover, in research by Sabti et al. (2019), if a student find writing difficult, it may hamper their learning process and writing proficiency. Such issues have been attributed to a lack of experience and expertise in writing in English. Some scholars have been concerned with researching the potential correlation between writing anxiety in learning second or foreign languages (Nazari, 2019). As a result, it is believed that several factors must be addressed in ESL writing instruction to assist the teaching and learning process, help students overcome their writing anxiety, and enhance their writing ability.

Further, Cheng (2004) identified Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory concerns with performance and high expectations, fear of negative feedback from teachers, low self-confidence, and insufficient linguistic understanding as the primary drivers of writing anxiety. To add, the effective use of writing strategies will enhance writing abilities and reduce writing anxiety, as stated by Flowers and Hayes' notion of the recursive writing process (Rezaei and Jafari, 2014). Furthermore, according to the genre-pedagogy, students may learn to grasp the forms necessary for performance and social progress by examining the significant elements of the genres by working with example materials. Writing instruction and writing strategies are some of the factors that influence students' anxiety in writing (Bai, Hu, & Gu, 2013; Horverak, 2015).

Besides, there have been research on the writing process that have clarified teaching techniques and developed instruction and strategies to assist learners in overcoming problems they have when writing (Diaz, Ramos, & Ortiz, 2017). As the institution where the study is conducted, it has been observed that some ESL students tend to write short and erroneous content; other difficulties in writing have been remarked on as well. Though there have been several valuable types of research on writing anxiety, the researcher still seeks to determine whether writing instruction and students' writing strategies significantly predict students' ESL writing anxiety. Lastly, the

findings and conclusions of this study will aid in pedagogical development. Professors and course designers at universities will be more aware of such difficulties and better understand how to help students improve their writing abilities and reduce their writing anxiety.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Writing Instruction**

English writing instruction focuses on how different sorts of texts are taught, how students perceive their writing abilities, and how feedback is utilized to help students improve their writing abilities (Horverak & Haugen, 2016). Moreover, according to the findings of Horverak (2015), most writing serves to assure students' learning development. Still, there is a need for a methodology that assists students in becoming competent in dealing with writing in future classrooms. A finding in this instance focuses on how some Norwegian upper secondary school instructors now engage with writing in the English classroom. Consequently, it represents what instructors do in the classroom, based on teacher competencies and teaching styles.

In addition, Horverak and Haugen's (2016) research on writing instruction is based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, created in Australia in the 1980s. Besides, according to Cope and Kalantzis' (2014) genre-pedagogy, revealing the essential elements of genres through the use of model texts will aid students in learning to master genres that are necessary for success and societal advancement. Most genre-based approaches employ activities based on Vygotsky's cooperative learning theory and Bruner's scaffolding idea, which is a significant concern for second-language writing instructors (Han & Hiver, 2018). Therefore, teachers can utilize genre pedagogies to give structured and concise explanations of how writing works to communicate to students.

Furthermore, in research from Han and Hiver (2018), during the duration of genre-based second language writing instruction, students with the appropriate qualities were able to increase their capacity for writing self-regulation and retain and consolidate their writing self-efficacy. As a result, many learners' final profiles were marked by high degrees of writing anxiety. To add, Horverak (2015) posited that one of the essential findings of studies on second-language writing is that second-language writers have more difficulties structuring material than first-language writers. Thus, there is a need to create and make accessible English teaching materials for writing instruction and enhance English teacher education in writing instruction.

Indeed, when teaching young adult English learners, teachers have a greater need to train students for college and career writing demands (Fernandez, Schaetzel, & Peyton, 2019). However, because of the complexities of writing teaching, many teachers feel inadequate to teach writing skills (Curtis, 2017). Furthermore, Fernandez et al. (2019) pointed out that instructors fail to understand and satisfy the requirements of students in English as a second language and that teachers frequently lack professional development in the successful teaching of writing to adults. This is similar to the conclusions of Coon and Jacobsen's research, which indicated that instructors would

require assistance in developing programs that provide adult students with additional opportunities to learn the skills they need to do better in writing.

Concurrently, Horverak and Haugen (2016) stressed that teaching and feedback are part of the writing instruction process. Curtis (2017) added that professional development in straightforward prewriting exercises, precise feedback, and successful cooperation between instructors and students might help teachers improve their proficiency in teaching writing. Hence, Coon and Jacobsen believed that curricula at all English levels should be developed to include some writing skills at all English competence levels. Moreover, students are most likely learning to compose narrative and factual texts and formal and informal texts right now. Although these texts are relevant and essential for academics, classes and the composition of first-year students should not be ignored or delayed (Fernandez et al., 2019).

To conclude, the topic of English writing instruction is significant in the modeling stage of the teaching-learning cycle because it deals with how writing is taught in the classroom (Horverak & Haugen, 2016). In fact, Curtis (2017) mentioned that teachers play an imperative role; feeling confident and qualified strengthens them in their delivery of education, which has a beneficial influence on student accomplishment. On the whole, Horverak and Haugen (2016) focused on determining how students evaluate teachers' instructional techniques. This includes determining if students have been taught narrative and factual texts, which are considered argumentative texts, and adapting the language to the appropriate formality level. Thus, the factors identified in the writing instruction are labeled: narrative texts, self-confidence and narrative texts, factual texts, self-confidence and factual texts, and formality level.

A narrative text depicts a series of events to convey a tale. Many genres of formal writing, such as biography, autobiography, and journalism, use this pattern (Kabosu & Kamiasi, 2020). Hudri and Ryanti (2015) stated that narrative, like a story, tries to answer the question, "What happened?" by telling or describing an activity that already happened. In research from Purba (2018), the narrative refers to telling a tale rather than the story itself, which is why words like written narrative and oral narrative are frequently employed. Also, Hudri and Ryanti (2015) believed that narrative text is beneficial for teachers in achieving the instructional goals of the teaching-learning process. As a result, there are several studies written by some researchers related to narrative text.

Firstly, Hudri and Ryanti (2015) concluded that the students' ability to write the narrative text was fair. Based on the result, 50% of the respondent got a score of 56-65, which indicates as fair, 25% got 0-45, which means very poor, 15% got a score of 66-79, which is good, and 10% got to score 46-55 which is poor. Almost all students are between 56-65, which means fair. As a result, students were placed in the inadequate group since most of them lacked topic knowledge. To put it differently, they are restricted in their thinking. The students' issues were that they produced too many grammatical and spelling errors had difficulty using connectors, restricted vocabulary, and could not pick the correct diction.

Secondly, in improving students' writing narrative text, the usage of graphic organizers is valuable and helpful. It also motivates students to be more innovative and self-motivated. The findings revealed that utilizing a graphic organizer enhanced students' capacity to write narrative text. The improvement was affected by the usage of engaging content and the teacher's involvement with the students (Sari, Yunita, & Azwandi, 2018). Furthermore, it was shown that using discussion starter story approaches helped students enhance their writing narrative text achievement. It is stated that the students could write better on their personal experiences (Purba, 2018).

On the other hand, descriptive research in finding out the writing ability of students in narrative text revealed that the students were in the poor category. The result suggested that students become more engaged in writing activities outside of the classroom and classroom learning activities. The instructor must encourage children to practice writing, particularly narrative text (Irfani, Azhar, & Jismulatif, 2017). Similarly, based on the findings of Mulyaningsih (2013), students from low and middle achievers have insufficient knowledge of writing narrative text which still needs much writing guidance from their teachers. Also, proper teaching techniques and approaches should be used.

Self-confidence is one of the most important aspects of writing for ESL and EFL students. Unfortunately, it is not simple to instill confidence in students (Listyani, 2021). The relevance of second language self-confidence in boosting language learners' linguistic and non-linguistic ability to communicate effectively with others has been stressed by researchers and theorists (Ghasemi, Ahmadian, Yazdani, & Amerian, 2020). Listyani (2021) added that it is the teacher's task to help students have positive self-esteem and build self-confidence in writing, particularly narrative text. Once they have more positive self-esteem and better self-confidence, automatically, they will feel more at ease and inspired to write as a result.

Moreover, further studies explored the relevance of self-confidence to develop writing with different genres such as narrative text. For example, in the study of Indratama and Suparno (2016), there was a successful implementation of collaborative learning that enhanced students' self-esteem and boosted self-confidence in writing narrative text. Similarly, Mardiansyah's (2018) study concluded a significant correlation between students' self-confidence and essay writing achievement with  $r$ -obtained was 0.620. Besides, with 38.5 percent, self-confidence had a substantial impact on essay writing success. Therefore, this research has relevance for English language instructors or lecturers who teach narrative text.

Besides, motivation, personality, intergroup climate or group dynamics, self-esteem, and self-confidence are interrelated (Listyani, 2021). In line with this, when the peer-editing approach was used, Nugroho (2021) found that students' composing narrative text skills improved. The peer-editing technique is an indicator of intergroup or group dynamics. Similarly, Ramdha (2019) cited that students' writing ability is influenced by teaching techniques and students' self-confidence while teaching writing. Therefore, improved self-esteem and self-confidence go hand in hand with better motivation and teaching. This necessitates some effort on the teachers' side.

In writing factual text, the writer has to think that all information is equal in importance. That not shall be a single detail be eliminated. And, coordination is the best prototype to manifest such equality in writing. Thus, in such a way, writing factual text requires excellent coordination (Almehmadi, 2012). In addition, factual writings include facts and information to teach, instruct, or convince. It might be a factual account, a retelling of events, an information report, or a procedural report. With this, it is indeed prevalent that the self-efficacy of writers in writing factual text is rooted in the development of the writer's competence by significantly increasing their self-confidence (Pajares et al., 2018).

Self-confidence is regarded as one of the most potent motivators and regulators in people's everyday lives (Pajares et al., 2018). Accordingly, the primary mediating construct of success strivings is one's impression of ability or self-confidence. In this case, self-confidence is not a driving element. One's capacity determines to attain a particular goal, and as such, it must be evaluated in the milieu of a broader knowledge of motivation (Almehmadi, 2012). Thus, self-confidence requires in writing factual texts.

On the other hand, the level of formality with which students write should be decided by their audience's expectations and objectives. For example, if one student would write a cover letter or a college academic essay, he or she would write in a formal tone. Students might employ a more casual style if they write a letter to a friend, something personal, or even something for a comic or special interest magazine where informal writing is anticipated. On the other hand, a letter of application to a known colleague might be written semi-formally (Listyani, 2021).

In brief, English writing instruction focuses on how different sorts of texts are taught, how students perceive their writing abilities, and how feedback is utilized to help students improve their writing abilities (Horverak & Haugen, 2016). The ideal of writing instruction was based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics and genre-pedagogy approach that use tasks based on Vygotsky's view of collaborative learning and Bruner's concept of scaffolding (Cope & Kalantzis, 2014; Horverak & Haugen, 2016). Besides, it represents what teachers do in the classroom, based on teacher skills and classroom practices (Horverak & Haugen, 2016). Thus, writing instruction includes narrative texts, self-confidence, narrative texts, factual texts, self-confidence and factual texts, and formality.

## **2.2 Writing Strategies**

Writing strategies refer to how writers use specific procedures or approaches to improve their writing abilities (Bai et al., 2013). Writing strategies were techniques and procedures that students used to write more effectively or generate better compositions (Raofi, Mifi, Ghabiri, & Malaki, 2014). Also, Wischgoll (2017) cited that writing strategies can help learners' control and modify their efforts to master the writing task. To support with, Masriani et al. (2018) mentioned that the lack of strategy in writing makes students judge writing as tricky and try to avoid it. The relevance of writing strategies in improving second language writing has been established, and there are differences between better and less proficient learners in the number and diversity of approaches used, as well as

how the strategies are applied effectively to the writing task (Maarof & Murat, 2013; Raofi et al., 2014).

Additionally, when students' interests are identified and provided multiple opportunities to practice writing and apply techniques, their writing abilities might develop (Cole & Feng, 2015). Similarly, Boonyarattanasoontorn (2017) stressed the significance of teaching students writing strategies to help them overcome any obstacles they may encounter when creating a piece of writing. Moreover, Maarof and Murat (2013) agreed that students should be encouraged to use various methods to improve their writing. ESL students need strategy preparation to help them write in the target language. The use of strategies will help enhance writing skills; thus, several studies have analyzed different writing strategies (Donker, de Boer, Kostons, Dignath, & Werf, 2014). Furthermore, much research in the field of English language writing focuses on exploring strategies. Writing strategies tend to be especially significant since numerous studies have found that they may discriminate between less experienced and more skilled writers. While in this study, the three factors identified by Bai et al. (2013) are addressed in three subsections focusing, respectively, on metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social/affective strategies. Similarly, some findings showed that improving writing skills requires effective metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective interventions in learning and teaching (Cer, 2019; Raofi et al., 2013; Sethurman & Radhakrishnan, 2020).

Metacognitive strategies refer to students' global skills and knowledge about cognition which are used to assist students to improve their self-awareness, guiding their learning, and track their progress (Diaz, 2017). Similarly, Febriana (2016) defined metacognitive strategies as mostly how students learn to master a particular skill. Metacognition is becoming increasingly crucial in studying learning and the many tasks that occur in a learning environment (Stewart, Seifert, & Rolheiser, 2015). Additionally, Diaz (2017) emphasized that metacognitive strategies are considered a crucial component of a good writer; hence, to be an influential writer, a writer must be conscious of his or her learning process.

Moreover, metacognitive strategies refer to students' overall abilities that reflect their self-awareness of their degree of knowledge and motivation (Masriani et al., 2018). To support with, metacognitive refers to the mental processes that help students control their learning and put it into practice consciously (Boonyarattanasoontorn, 2017). Similarly, Cer (2019) discovered that to improve writing skills, it is necessary to effectively use the metacognitive strategy in learning and teaching. Dumlij (2018) further classified the strategies into planning, monitoring, controlling, evaluating, and self-regulating the learning process. In this study, metacognitive strategies are addressed in three sub-sections focusing, respectively in, self-initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Bai et al., 2013).

In addition, the researchers could see the metacognitive strategies in the students' strategies were self-initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Bai et al., 2013; Febriana, 2016; Goctu, 2017). In the study of Bai et al. (2013), the employment of self-initiation strategies was the least common form of metacognitive strategy. This category

of writing strategies primarily includes strategies that are utilized outside of the classroom. In other words, they are unlikely to make independent efforts to learn to write. According to the data from Febriana's (2016) study, students may not value self-initiation strategies as highly as other strategies. On the other hand, planning is one strategy in metacognitive strategies wherein students plan their essays by organizing their ideas. Also, Bai et al. (2013) concluded that it was the most frequently used strategy in the classroom.

In the monitoring and evaluating, Bai et al. (2013) discussed in their study that these strategies are very frequently used since these are the strategies that students can employ very easily. In the research of Febriana (2016), the data showed that students monitored and reviewed what they were writing. Additionally, through the interview, students claimed that they read the essay through again and check for mistakes to make sure the flow of the essay was maintained. The answers they gave showed that they did some monitoring of their work. Consequently, it is a way that students to evaluate their work after they finished a writing task. Thus, these metacognitive strategies are an essential component of a good writer (Diaz, 2017).

On the other hand, cognitive strategies are individual strategies that allow students to process and transform information (Masriani et al., 2018). Sethuraman and Radhakrishnan (2020) also mentioned that cognitive strategies effectively strategize knowledge retrieval and improve students' thinking ability. Similarly, according to Dumlija (2018), cognitive strategies refer to authors' methods to carry out their actual writing tasks. These skills enable students to analyze, change, and produce data to perform complicated tasks, effectively communicate, and actively engage in the education learning process (Diaz, 2017). In this study, cognitive strategies reflected in the students were revising, text-generating, and resourcing (Bai et al., 2013; Febriana, 2016). The average frequency of strategy was in the medium range (Bai et al., 2013). Accordingly, the revising strategy was not well received by the students. This suggests that the participants did not attempt to modify their compositions in general. Instead, greater emphasis was placed on the planning stage. Although rewriting is an essential component of the writing process, the findings suggest that revising should receive greater instructional focus in Singapore primary schools. By contrast, in the research of Febriana (2016), students made changes in their essays throughout the writing process; they do revise their essays. Thus, the ideas would develop as the writing process continuously, and students organize the paragraph also as the process went by.

Furthermore, the employment of text-generating strategies was also widespread. These findings suggest that writing was a cyclical process for many students in which they reviewed what they had already written to generate new ideas. (Bai et al., 2013). It was also argued that, rather than acquiring new knowledge when writing, students' writing was often a process of drawing on what was already within their minds. While resourcing strategies were used on a semi-regular basis. This is to be expected when writing; young children are less likely to consult a dictionary, grammar books, textbooks, writing guides, or old compositions. In general, Singaporean students cannot use outside materials when writing.



Social strategies, meanwhile, aimed to increase social awareness and empathy among peers to assist them in overcoming academic challenges. Students would try to get help from peers or lecturers to check and give feedback about their writing. They mentioned that this strategy helped make their writing better. On the other hand, affective strategy manages emotions, motives, and attitudes (Febriana, 2016; Masriani et al. 2018). Identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about emotions, and praising oneself for excellent performance are effective strategies (Goctu 85). Generally, social/affective strategies, according to Dumlija (2018), are strategies that writers employ to engage with people to explain some questions and manage emotions, motivation, and attitudes in their work.

In this study, social/affective strategies reflected in the students were help-seeking and affect-managing. The most commonly utilized social/affective strategies were enjoyment of writing and not being concerned when producing an English composition (Bai et al., 2013). This is consistent with Loh's findings that students would use their social/affective strategies more frequently if the learning tasks were complex. As a result, affective strategies are less relevant when writers have a restricted amount of time. Also, social strategies may not be applicable in class since writing is an individual task. Nevertheless, it could be done to plan and evaluate writing within-pair or group work (Goctu, 2017).

A further study discovered that affective and metacognitive techniques were the most commonly used writing strategies (Masriani et al., 2018). Although the findings of Wischgoll (2017) support this combining cognitive and metacognitive assistance is a possible way to help students improve their writing skills. However, Sethuraman and Radhakrishnan's (2020) research findings show that cognitive strategy has a beneficial impact on attaining coherence and unity in students' writing and capacitating and controlling students' mental processes. Indeed, Sharp (2016) highlighted that the procedures connected with writing change with each writing assignment should incorporate each writer's personality, cognitive strategy, and experiences.

In addition, less than half of the individuals employed and were aware of metacognitive learning strategies, according to data. However, professors addressed such strategies in class; only around half of the 15 respondents used or were aware of them. Therefore, the study of Goctu (2017) aimed to offer metacognitive instruction to help ESL and EFL writing teachers be more aware of the need to educate students to be self-regulated learners. While in the research of Azizi, Nemati, & Estahbanati (2017), students' writing performance was shown to be unaffected by strategy categories such as planning, monitoring, and self-awareness. Lastly, it addressed students' persistent issues with metacognitive awareness of writing strategy utilization, which can help them improve proficiency levels in less time.

Generally, students with strong writing abilities utilized much more writing strategies than students with moderate or low writing abilities, according to research (Raofi et al., 2017). Indeed, Cer (2019) concluded that practical application of the metacognitive strategy in learning and teaching is required to develop writing skills. Besides, influential writers use metacognitive, cognitive, and social-affective

strategies (Bai et al., 2013; Diaz et al., 2017). Similarly, Boonyarattanasoontorn (2017) emphasized the need to teach students writing strategies to overcome any obstacles they may have when creating a piece of writing. As a result, students will have great opportunities to develop writing skills (Cole & Feng, 2015).

To sum up, the term writing strategies referred to the techniques and procedures used by students to write more effectively or generate better compositions. Also, the writing strategies of the students refer to the metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective strategies. Several types of research were conducted and appeared to be particularly important concerning factors that distinguished less skilled writers from more skilled one (Bai et al., 2013; Raoofi et al. 624). Such as, some findings showed that improving writing skills requires effective use of metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective interventions in learning and teaching (Cer, 2019; Sethuraman & Radhakrishnan, 2020). In general, these strategies were seen as an essential component of a good writer.

### **2.3 Writing Anxiety**

Writing anxiety is a natural aversion to anxiety that occurs when a person is confronted with duties that require writing (Blasco, 2016). Agreeably, Aloairdhi (2019) mentioned that writing anxiety in a second language is commonly considered to refer to unpleasant, nervous sentiments that interfere with some aspect of the writing process. Writing may be an unpleasant, painful, and even frightening activity for some kids. Also, Đumlija (2018) proposed that the word writing anxiety be used to characterize persons who have one or more feelings, attitudes, or behaviors that make it difficult for them to begin, work on, or complete a writing job cognitively capable. Thus, Ekmekçi (2018) stated that students with low anxiety wrote higher-quality compositions than those with high anxiety, implying that writing anxiety had a detrimental impact on students' composition writing.

Moreover, the great bulk of writing anxiety research in EFL learning has been conducted in university settings, investigating how anxiety impacts writing performance and what could be the causes of writing anxiety (Blasco, 2016). Writing anxiety, being a skill-based subtype, may be seen as both a permanent trait and a transient mood brought on by various causes (Đumlija, 2018). Meanwhile, writing anxiety is defined as a level of worry about writing that surpasses the expected benefit from the circumstance (Fakeye & Ochia, 2016). In this regard, the complexity of writing often causes challenges for student writers, causing stress such as different levels of emotional discomfort, apprehension, and agony (Zhang, 2019).

Likewise, Cheng (2004) proposed a three-dimensional understanding of anxiety comprising somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior. Further research is expected to see and conceptualize sub-levels of writing anxiety as somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior. Somatic anxiety manifests as bodily symptoms such as tension. Aside from that, the cognitive element of anxiety, such as negative expectations, preoccupation with performance, and concern about others' perceptions, is referred to as cognitive anxiety. Then, avoidance behavior deals with the

behavioral aspect of students regarding avoiding writing uneasiness (Dar & Khan, 2015; Karlina & Pancoro, 2018; Masriani et al., 2018; Rezaei & Jafari, 2014; Wahyuni & Umam, 2022).

A previously conducted study has found that all Saudi female university students show a moderate level of writing anxiety. The findings show that individuals exhibit moderate anxiety overwriting. In addition, the respondents' moderate degree of writing anxiety might be regarded as a result of their lack of prior English writing experience (Aloairdi, 2019; Dar and Khan, 2015; Ekmekci, 2018). Furthermore, there was a strong negative connection between students' writing anxiety and their academic success. Asmari (2013) also found out that students with low writing anxiety used more writing methods than high anxiety.

Another case study was conducted with six upper-secondary Spanish EFL students to investigate, identify, and analyze the unique relationships between metacognitive writing strategies, writing anxiety, and writing self-efficacy and how these three factors influence students' writing performance. While composing an English piece, the students participated in the think-aloud technique. The replies of participants to both study instruments revealed a link between writing metacognition and writing self-efficacy. On the other hand, these two characteristics were adversely linked with students' levels of writing anxiety. Thus, the evidence suggests that writing anxiety has a detrimental impact on students' writing abilities (Blasco, 2016).

Besides, Dhar and Khan's (2015) study examined the degrees of writing anxiety experienced by 418 Pakistani undergraduate students from public and private institutions while writing essays in English on a variety of themes. Based on the results, most participants, 61.48 percent, have an average English language writing anxiety degree. On the other hand, 19.38 percent of the total participants have a high degree of English language writing anxiety at the undergraduate level, while the remaining 19.14 percent have a low English language writing anxiety level. The findings back up with Masriani et al. (2018) prior research, which revealed that writing anxiety among EFL students was moderate, with cognitive anxiety being the most common form.

In addition, the same results were found in a Dumlija's (2018) research. The Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) was given to 300 secondary school students in the second, third, and fourth grades. The findings revealed moderate use of writing methods and moderate degrees of anxiety when it came to writing. Association analysis revealed a negative correlation between writing anxiety and writing achievement, in line with numerous prior research. Thus, Aljafen (2013) believed that a moderate level of writing anxiety is considered the normal range of writing anxiety. He added that this level of anxiety is the natural feeling of EFL students, which later leads them to be better writers in the future.

Separate research in Turkey focused on foreign language writing anxiety in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The study's participants are 126 aspiring English teachers enrolled in an ELT program at a Turkish public institution. The study aims to identify the levels and types of foreign language writing anxiety and whether statistically significant differences in levels and types of anxiety between freshman and senior

students. The findings indicated that 60% of the participants have a moderate fear of writing in English. The findings also revealed that to improve students' writing performance, second language teachers should be aware of the hazards of anxiety and provide a stress-free environment in the classroom (Ekmekci, 2018).

Additionally, in the study of Fakeye and Ochia (2016), the findings indicated a significant negative connection between writing anxiety and students' essay writing achievement. This means that the more anxiety the students have about writing, the worse their essay writing will be. This result is supported by Karlina and Pancoro (2018) who state that writing anxiety has been chiefly associated with writing success for many years in foreign languages creating significant barriers for learners to master writing skills. As a result, the educator or instructor must recognize that when students are requested to write a letter, they become worried, and they must simplify the educational instruction to reduce the anxiety (Karlina & Pancoro, 2018).

According to Jebriel et al. (2014), selected Iranian EFL students majoring in English language teaching had a significant degree of anxiety. Furthermore, students with an elementary level of English writing anxiety were shown to have a more significant degree of anxiety than students with intermediate and advanced levels. Finally, according to the data, the most prevalent anxiety was cognitive anxiety, followed by somatic anxiety and avoidance behavior. On the other hand, according to Wahyuni and Umam's (2022) research, 54% of the participants had high writing anxiety levels, 44% had moderate levels, and 2% had a low level. It also has a comparable effect on the most common kind of writing anxiety, cognitive writing anxiety, which is based on the mean of two other types of writing anxiety.

In the findings of Masriani et al. (2018), the 3rd year students of Universitas Negeri Padang had a moderate degree of writing anxiety with cognitive anxiety as the significant kind. It was found that most of the highly anxious students experienced somatic anxiety. Moreover, the moderate and the low, anxious students experienced cognitive anxiety. Also, students' writing anxiety stems from a limited learning and teaching environment (Zhang, 2019). Language teachers are encouraged to explore their students' difficulties and concerns at the beginning of the semester and actively assist them with relevant strategies (Asmari, 2013). As a result, it is advised that educators, instructors, and students work together to develop additional alternatives to this problem. Finding answers to writing anxiety is intended to make language learning and writing more successful (Aloairdhi, 2019).

Through these previous studies, Đumljia (2018) believed that the more the students are anxious, the more they focus on using writing methods to manage the writing process better and reduce anxiety. This also validates Aloairdhi's (2019) statement that students tend to see writing as complex without writing strategies and will not engage in it. Furthermore, it will eventually develop anxiety towards writing. Agreeably, English language teachers, according to Fakeye and Ohia (2016), should create any ways of lowering students' writing anxiety so that they can write better texts. As a result, excessive strain and stress in the classroom should be avoided to reduce pupils' anxiety and writing ability.

Therefore, the more proficient the participants, the more information they receive to produce better writing (Raofi et al., 2017). To support this, according to Mohseniasl (2014), the execution of a clearly defined strategy for the teacher's teaching may make a massive difference in the learning process for students. Teachers' explicit instruction influenced the presence of actively used strategy in writing in teaching writing, making students more aware of employing strategy in writing and helping the students lessen their writing anxiety (Masriani et al., 2018). Lastly, comprehending how English learners experience alleviating anxiety in the instructional setup of English writing is believed in the study by Han & Hiver (2018).

On the whole, second language writing anxiety, according to Aloairdhi (2019), is defined as unpleasant, nervous sensations that interrupt some aspect of the writing process. Anxiety in writing encompasses cognitive, physical, and avoidance behaviors (Rezaei & Jafari, 2014). The great bulk of writing anxiety research has been done in academic settings, looking at how anxiety impacts writing performance and what could be the causes of writing anxiety (Blasco, 2016). As indicated in this portion of the study, related literature revealed a moderate level of writing anxiety. As a result, Aljafen (2013) judged a moderate degree of writing anxiety within the usual range.

#### **2.4 Correlation between Measures**

Researchers have found out that English writing instruction and strategies impact students' writing anxiety. On the subject of Horverak (2015), there is a need to produce and make available English teaching materials for use in writing instruction and improve English teacher education in writing instruction. In the same way, Coon and Jacobsen point out that teachers would need professional development and resources to provide programs that will seriously look into and introduce more chances for grown learners to gain the talents they need to perform better in writing and alleviate their writing anxiety. Learning different types of texts is necessary for academics; thus, this would not be delayed and should be extensively taught in first-year classes (Fernandez et al., 2019).

In addition, when it comes to the relationship between writing strategies and writing anxiety, Dumlija (2018) claims that the more nervous students are, the more they resort to conscious usage of writing techniques to gain greater control over the writing process and ease their anxiety. This is in line with the findings of Cole and Feng's (2015) study, which found that students' writing skills may be improved when their interests are recognized, and they are given regular opportunities to write. Similarly, Roofi et al. (2017) argued that pupils with strong writing skills had a much greater writing strategy and were less anxious. This also validates the statement of Aloairdhi (2019), stating that students tend to see writing as complex in the absence of writing strategies and will not engage themselves in it.

Similarly, this finding confirms the previous study by Masriani et al. (2018), which states that teachers' explicit instruction influenced the presence of actively used strategy in writing in teaching writing that made students more aware in employing strategies in writing and help the learners lessen their writing anxiety. Further, Cronk-Raby (2018) concluded that writing pedagogy and instruction can improve the self-awareness of the

phenomenon of writing anxiety. Meanwhile, the study by Gibriel (2019) presented that writing strategies negatively correlate with writing anxiety. Also, writing strategies used by low-anxiety students may help high-anxiety students ease into the writing process and minimize anxiety.

In summary, the literature presented by various authors gives value to the present study as it examines how writing instruction and writing strategies influence writing anxiety. These comprehensive discussions gave important views of how students' writing anxiety is affected by English teachers' writing instruction and students' writing strategies. Finally, the researcher is motivated to address the statement of the problem and prove or disprove the hypotheses presented in this study.

### **3. Material and Methods**

This study utilized a quantitative, descriptive-predictive research design. In the gathering and analysis of data, a quantitative research method stressed numbers and statistics (Daniel, 2016). Furthermore, descriptive correlation explained correlations between input data and target variables and provided a response to the query, "What happened?" (Heo, Lim, Yun, Ju, Park, & Lee, 2019). Predictive correlation studies used the variance of another variable to predict one or more variables (Sousa, Driessnack, & Mendes, 2007). A deductive method, on the other hand, in quantitative research applied seeking evidence to support the hypothesis or theory in analyzing the variables: English teachers' writing instruction, students' writing strategies, and anxiety (Muhartoyo, 2007). The research was carried out at the UM Digos College at Roxas Extension, Barangay Zone II, Digos City. It is a tertiary institution nested in a 2-hectare land. The school is a tertiary institution in Davao del Sur offering various undergraduate programs such as Education Courses. The institution was established in 1949, making it one of the oldest schools in the city. Also, in this institution, in all courses, students are obliged to take English subjects, specifically English writing courses.

The 271 research participants of this study were first-year students of UM Digos College. As of the school year 2020-2021, the total population of first-year students is 844. Out of the total population, 271 were identified as the sample size, drawn out using RAOSOFT software. The participants in the study were first-year students who were enrolled in GE 2 (Purposive Communication). Purposive communication subjects are associated with other macro-skills, focusing not only on speaking but also on writing. Random selection of the research participants was drawn out from the population using stratified random sampling.

In this research, stratified random sampling was employed. It was a type of sampling that involved dividing a population into smaller sub-groups known as strata. First, strata were created based on shared features or characteristics among members, such as money or academic achievement (Sharma, 2017). Then, random samples were then selected from each stratum. Also, this sampling method was appropriate when the population had mixed characteristics, and the researcher wants to ensure that every aspect is proportionally represented in the sample.

Hence, the desired number of respondents would be based on the random samples taken from each stratum. The smaller sub-groups or strata were based on the different programs of UM Digos. Moreover, students have various characteristics and attributes as enrolled in different programs. This was one standpoint considered to improve precision and reduce the result's error based on the gathered data. Therefore, this would create an equal representation of each of the abovementioned programs to participate in this study.

This survey was done on the randomly selected first-year GE 2 students of UMDC during the 3rd week of November 2020. For the inclusion criteria, students who were currently enrolled in GE 2 were included in this study. Further, for the exclusion criteria, students who were not enrolled in GE 2 subjects were excluded from this study. Participants in the study were not forced or obligated to answer all questions if they were uncomfortable with the questions posed in the questionnaire, and they had the option to withdraw from the study at any time.

To quantify which dimension/s of English teachers' writing instruction and English students' writing strategies significantly predict/s writing anxiety, the researcher used adapted standard questionnaires duly validated by five language experts.

In English Teachers' Writing Instruction, the EWI-questionnaire was used. English writing instruction – questionnaire focused on how students believe writing different sorts of texts is taught, how they view their writing skills, and what feedback procedures they perceive are utilized in the context of writing in English. The questionnaire had two parts. Part 1 of the survey questionnaire included 21 questions on whether students had been taught narrative and factual writings that were designated as argumentative texts and how to modify the language to formality. Part 2 of the questionnaire had 27 questions about how feedback influences students' self-efficacy (Horverak & Haugen, 2016).

However, after the questionnaire was reduced in the study of Horverak and Haugen (2016), New factor analyses were done when the questionnaire was, and the five variables discovered in the EWIT-Questionnaire were designated as narrative texts, self-confidence and narrative texts, factual texts, self-confidence and factual texts, and formality level. Thus, the researcher used the newly analyzed English Writing Instruction - Questionnaire, which consists of 24 items.

The study instrument for English students' writing techniques, on the other hand, was developed by Bai et al. (2013) Questionnaire – Based Investigation of Writing Strategies. The content validity of the questionnaire was assessed using Petri and Czárli's guidelines. Also, the questionnaire focused on examining the writing strategies among students. Forty-six questions are divided into three types of writing strategies: metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social/affective strategies. On a Likert scale, participants will be asked to rate how often they utilized the writing approach in question, with a high score of 5 indicating the most significant frequency and one as the lowest.

Furthermore, the mean of each category of writing anxiety was calculated using the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) questionnaire. Cheng (2004) created a 22-item questionnaire to assess student writers' anxiety when writing in

English. The questionnaire consisted of three independent cognition, physiology, and behavior components, consisting of three subscales: somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and Avoidance behavior. And, the distribution of items across the three subcategories is as follows: cognitive anxiety (1, 3, 7, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21), somatic anxiety (2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 19), and avoidance behavior (4, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22). The justification for utilizing this questionnaire as a measure of writing anxiety was that it was very accurate when employing correlation and factor analysis. The questionnaire included a 5-choice response style, similar to a Likert scale.

Lastly, the research instruments were validated by a group of experts and had a mean score of 4.68, which is very good. Also, the researcher followed all the corrections, advice, and suggestions of the experts to make it easier for the study participants to understand. It also went through pilot testing and was tested it using Cronbach Alpha. Consequently, reliability was proven in the Alpha equivalent of writing instruction (0.968), metacognitive strategy (0.946), cognitive strategy (0.957), and writing anxiety (0.975), all excellent, and social/affective strategy (0.818) as good.

Random sampling and organized data-collecting tools are used in quantitative research to fit diverse experiences into preset answer categories that are straightforward to describe, compare, and generalize.

The data collection started after the researcher had identified the study's scope and had the research instrument validated by experts. Moreover, to formalize the start of the data-gathering process, the researcher sought approval from the Professional Schools' research office to conduct the study. When a permit declaring the consent to conduct the study was already sought, the researcher wrote a formal letter addressed to the AVP-Branch Operations of UM Digos to inform them of the date and the nature of how students would answer the questionnaire as well as the responsibilities of the researcher throughout the entire data collection.

However, due to the inevitable occurrence of the global pandemic – COVID-19, online platforms were utilized in the data-gathering procedure to abide by government ordinances and health safety protocols. Thus, the questionnaire was encoded at an online data collection platform named Google Forms under the website <https://www.docs.google.com/forms>. It served as the alternative research instrument used in the study, given that the features were the same as the questionnaires validated by the experts.

The study aimed for at least 271 respondents selected using a stratified random sampling technique. Selected respondents received a pre-filled survey link via electronic mail or any other online channels. They were asked to honestly answer the survey questionnaire based on their English writing instruction and strategies as predictors of writing anxiety. After collating the responses, the researcher then forwarded the raw results of the university statistician's responses for statistical validation and treatment. Then, the interpretation of data followed.

Data were analyzed and interpreted using mean, standard deviation, Pearson r, regression, and multiple linear regression. Mean and standard deviation used to determine the students' writing instruction, strategies, and anxiety to answer problems



one (1), two (2), and three (3). Meanwhile, Pearson  $r$  was used for determining the strength of a linear relationship between two variables. Regression, on the other hand, used to understand better the link between a dependent or criterion variable and numerous independent or predictor factors. Multiple linear regression, then, utilized to describe the linear connection between the explanatory (independent) and the response (dependent) variables.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

Established in this chapter are the data and the analysis of findings based on the respondents' responses on English writing instruction and strategies as predictors of writing anxiety.

Tables are arranged in the following subheadings: assessment of the level of English writing instruction, level of writing strategies, level of writing anxiety, correlational analysis showing the significance of the relationship between English writing instruction and English writing anxiety, correlational analysis showing the significance of the relationship between writing strategies and English writing anxiety, and hierarchical multiple regression analysis showing the significant predictors of English writing anxiety among first-year college students.

As shown in Table 1, the students perceived a high level of English writing instruction, which obtained an overall mean of 3.51 (SD = 0.810). This means that the condition associated with English teachers' writing instruction is observed oftentimes. It indicates that students are more likely to complete the assignments if the writing instructions are explicitly specified. According to Horverak (2015), there is a need to create and make accessible English teaching materials for use in writing instruction and enhance English teacher education in writing instruction.

As shown in the same table, among the variable's indicators, learning to write narrative texts obtained the highest mean of 3.56 (SD = 0.849), which was verbally described as high. This means that the condition associated with English writing instruction in learning to write narrative texts is often observed. Hudri and Ryanti (2015) believed that narrative text is beneficial for teachers in achieving the instructional goals of the teaching-learning process. On the other hand, the lowest mean was obtained for self-confidence in writing narrative texts and learning to write formal and informal texts; also described as high. This means that the conditions associated with English writing instruction in terms of self-confidence in writing narrative texts and learning to write formal and informal texts are observed oftentimes. Listyani (2021) cited that self-confidence is one of the most important aspects of writing for ESL and EFL students. Hence, it is the teacher's task to help students to have positive self-esteem and better self-confidence in writing. A high self-confidence will have students that feeling of more at ease and inspired to write.

**Table 1:** English writing instruction

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Learning to write narrative texts	3.56	.849	High
Self-confidence in writing narrative texts	3.49	.855	High
Learning to write factual texts	3.50	.872	High
Self-confidence in writing factual text	3.52	.849	High
Learning to write formal and informal texts	3.49	.875	High
Overall	3.51	.810	High

Moreover, self-confidence in writing factual text obtained a mean of 3.52 (SD=0.849), and learning to write factual text obtained a mean of 3.50 (SD = 0.872), which are both described as high. This means that the conditions associated with English writing instruction in terms of self-confidence in writing factual text and learning to write factual text are observed oftentimes. To support the findings, Mardiansyah's (2018) study concluded a significant correlation between students' self-confidence and essay writing achievement.

Illustrated in Table 2 is the level of writing strategies among first-year college students. These strategies were categorized into metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social or affective strategies. It was explained that all strategy indicators had obtained a rating that was verbally described as high. This means that the condition associated with English students' writing strategies is observed oftentimes. A high level of the findings of students' writing strategies agreed with Wischgoll (2017) findings that writing strategies can help learners control and modify their efforts to master the writing task.

**Table 2:** Writing strategies

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
<b>Metacognitive strategies</b>			
Self-initiation	3.64	.744	High
Planning	3.86	.732	High
Monitoring and evaluating	3.85	.722	High
<b>Cognitive strategies</b>			
Revising	3.90	.734	High
Text-generating	3.80	.736	High
Resourcing	3.88	.808	High
<b>Social of affective strategies</b>			
Help-seeking and affect managing	3.75	.786	High

Specifically, in metacognitive strategies, students expressed a high level of planning ( $x = 3.86$ ;  $SD = 0.732$ ), monitoring and evaluating ( $x = 3.85$ ;  $SD = 0.722$ ) and self-initiation ( $x = 3.64$ ;  $SD = 0.744$ ); which all were descriptively described as high. This indicates that the condition associated with English students' writing strategies, specifically metacognitive, is observed oftentimes. Thus, students are frequently associating strategies relevant to self-initiation, planning, monitoring, and evaluating. To support with, Cer (2019)

believed that to improve writing skills, it is necessary to effectively use metacognitive strategies in learning and teaching.

On the other hand, in terms of cognitive strategies, revising obtained the highest mean of 3.90 (SD = 0.734) among the other indicators, which were observed as high. The finding opposed the study result of Bai et al. (2013) which mentioned that the revising strategy was not well received by the students, who did not attempt to modify their compositions in general. While resourcing obtained a mean of 3.88 (SD = 0.808) and text-generating obtained the lowest mean of 3.80 (SD = 0.736), descriptively described as high. This means that the condition associated with English students' writing strategies in cognitive strategies is often observed. Therefore, students voiced that they are more used to revising other than text-generating and resourcing.

Conversely, students obtained a mean of 3.75 (SD = 0.786) for help-seeking and affect managing as the sole indicator of social or affective strategies. This indicates that the condition associated with English students' writing strategies in terms of social or affective strategies is observed oftentimes. Goctu (2017) cited that social strategies may not be applicable in class since writing is an individual task. Hence, students tend to be more likely to help-seeking and effectively manage.

Shown in Table 3 is the extent of English writing anxiety of first-year college students. Based on the table, students felt moderate anxiety in English writing with a mean of 2.98 (SD = 0.977). This means that the condition associated with English language anxiety is observed sometimes. Likely, Dar and Khan (2015) presented a finding that individuals exhibit moderate anxiety over writing.

**Table 3: Writing anxiety**

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Level
Cognitive	3.16	1.093	Moderate
Somatic	3.02	1.054	Moderate
Avoidance	2.73	.941	Moderate
Overall	2.98	.977	Moderate

Moreover, among all of its indicators, students expressed the highest anxiety in terms of cognitive ( $x = 3.16$ ;  $SD = 1.093$ ) while the lowest anxiety in terms of avoidance ( $x = 2.73$ ;  $SD = 0.1.054$ ). Similarly, students expressed moderate anxiety in terms of somatic ( $x = 3.02$ ;  $SD = 0.1.093$ ). The findings are mostly similar to the result of Jebriel et al. (2014) which presented that the most prevalent anxiety was cognitive anxiety, followed by somatic anxiety and avoidance behavior.

Presented in Table 4 is the correlation analysis shows the significance of the relationship between English writing instruction and writing anxiety among first-year college students. Based on the analysis, overall English writing instruction was negatively but significantly correlated with overall English writing anxiety ( $r = -0.361$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This finding is supported by Karlina and Pancoro (2018) who claimed that the educator or teacher must understand that when learners are asked to write a letter, their

learners feel nervous, so they must simplify the teaching instruction to mitigate the anxiety.

Moreover, the indicators of English writing instruction also negatively but significantly correlated with overall English writing anxiety; learning to write narrative texts ( $r = -0.328$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), self-confidence in writing narrative texts ( $r = -0.332$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), learning to write factual texts ( $r = -0.370$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), self-confidence in writing factual text ( $r = -0.323$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and learning to write formal and informal texts ( $r = -0.346$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is rejected.

**Table 4:** Correlation analysis showing the significance of the relationship between English writing instruction and English writing anxiety among first year college students

English Writing Instruction	English Writing Anxiety			
	Cognitive	Somatic	Avoidance	Overall
Learning to write narrative texts	-.319**	-.291**	-.322**	-.328**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Self-confidence in writing narrative texts	-.340**	-.308**	-.289**	-.332**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Learning to write factual texts	-.354**	-.329**	-.368**	-.370**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Self-confidence in writing factual text	-.306**	-.290**	-.325**	-.323**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Learning to write formal and informal texts	-.336**	-.328**	-.317**	-.346**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Overall	-.352**	-.328**	-.344**	-.361**
	.000	.000	.000	.000

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$

In addition, Table 4 presents the negative but significant relationship between the indicators of English writing instruction and the indicators of writing anxiety. Learning to write narrative texts negatively but significantly correlated to the indicators of writing anxiety; *cognitive* ( $r = -0.319$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), *somatic* ( $r = -0.291$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and *avoidance* ( $r = -0.322$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Also, self-confidence in writing narrative texts negatively but significantly correlated to the indicators of writing anxiety; *cognitive* ( $r = -0.340$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), *somatic* ( $r = -0.308$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and *avoidance* ( $r = -0.289$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Still, learning to write factual texts negatively but significantly correlated to the indicators of writing anxiety; *cognitive* ( $r = -0.354$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), *somatic* ( $r = -0.329$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and *avoidance* ( $r = -0.368$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Self-confidence in writing factual text also negatively but significantly correlated to the indicators of writing anxiety; *cognitive* ( $r = -0.306$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), *somatic* ( $r = -0.290$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and *avoidance* ( $r = -0.325$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Then, learning to write formal and informal texts negatively but significantly correlated to the indicators of writing anxiety; *cognitive* ( $r = -0.336$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), *somatic* ( $r = -0.328$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and *avoidance* ( $r = -0.317$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Thus, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is rejected.

Shown in Table 5 is the correlation analysis shows the significance of the relationship between English writing strategies and English writing anxiety among first-year college students. Based on the analysis, the indicators of English writing strategies

that negatively but significantly correlated with overall English writing anxiety are self-initiation ( $r = -0.238$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), planning ( $r = -0.167$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), revising ( $r = -0.144$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), text-generating ( $r = -0.136$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and help-seeking and affect managing ( $r = -0.176$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Hence, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is rejected. On the other hand, English writing strategies in terms of monitoring and evaluating ( $r = -0.119$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) and resourcing ( $r = -0.068$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) do not significantly correlate with overall writing anxiety.

**Table 5:** Correlation analysis showing the significance of the relationship between writing strategies and English writing anxiety among first year college students

Writing Strategies	English Writing Anxiety			
	Cognitive	Somatic	Avoidance	Overall
Self-initiation	-.216**	-.236**	-.224**	-.238**
	.000	.000	.000	.000
Planning	-.088	-.141*	-.269**	-.167**
	.148	.020	.000	.006
Monitoring and evaluating	-.055	-.096	-.207**	-.119
	.366	.114	.001	.051
Revising	-.076	-.119	-.238**	-.144*
	.212	.051	.000	.018
Text-generating	-.093	-.115	-.194**	-.136*
	.129	.060	.001	.025
Resourcing	-.017	-.038	-.157**	-.068
	.777	.531	.010	.263
Help-seeking and affect managing	-.153*	-.189**	-.162**	-.176**
	.012	.002	.008	.004

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$

Furthermore, Table 5 presents the negative but significant relationship between English writing instruction in terms of self-initiation ( $r = -0.224$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), planning ( $r = -0.269$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), monitoring and evaluating ( $r = -0.207$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), revising ( $r = -0.238$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), text-generating ( $r = -0.194$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), resourcing ( $r = -0.157$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and help-seeking and affect managing ( $r = -0.162$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and writing anxiety in terms of avoidance.

Moreover, self-initiation ( $r = -0.236$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), planning ( $r = -0.141$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and help-seeking affect managing ( $r = -0.189$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) negatively but significantly correlated with somatic writing anxiety. While, monitoring and evaluating ( $r = -0.096$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), revising ( $r = -0.119$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), text-generating ( $r = -0.115$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), and resourcing ( $r = -0.038$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) do not have a significant relationship with somatic writing anxiety.

Table 5 also presented that only self-initiation ( $r = -0.216$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and help-seeking and affect managing ( $r = -0.153$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) have a negatively significant relationship between cognitive writing anxiety. It means that the relationship among the following indicators is inverse. While, planning ( $r = -0.088$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), monitoring and evaluating ( $r = -0.055$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), revising ( $r = -0.076$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), text-generating ( $r = -0.093$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ), and resourcing ( $r = -0.017$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) do not have a significant relationship between cognitive writing anxiety.

A hierarchical multiple linear regression was used to determine the degree of contribution or influence of English writing instruction and students' writing strategies. The indicators of these variables are significant predictors of overall English writing anxiety among college students. Table 6 shows two models which considered two steps of the hierarchical modeling performed. The first step includes the entry of the indicators of English writing instruction, while the second step now includes the indicators of the entry of students' writing strategies.

In Model 1, with English writing instruction entered as regressors, only one of the five indicators was found to significantly influence overall English writing anxiety – learning to write factual texts ( $B = -0.509$ ,  $t = -2.57$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). The five indicators of English writing instruction have a combined variance explained of  $R^2 = 0.135$ , which means that 13.5% of the variation of the dependent variable is explained by the five indicators mentioned. In Model 2, with English writing instruction and students' writing strategies entered as regressors, the indicator learning to write factual texts ( $B = -0.481$ ,  $t = -2.453$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) remained significant.

**Table 6:** Hierarchical multiple regression analysis showing the significance predictors of English writing anxiety among first year college students

Model		B	S.E.	$\beta$	t	Sig.	$\Delta R^2$
1	(Constant)	4.475	.249		17.971	.000	0.135
	Learning to write narrative texts	-.136	.143	-.118	-.949	.343	
	Self-confidence in writing narrative texts	.019	.164	.016	.113	.910	
	<i>Learning to write factual texts</i>	-.509	.198	-.454	-2.570	.011*	
	Self-confidence in writing factual text	.388	.212	.337	1.832	.068	
	Learning to write formal and informal texts	-.190	.142	-.170	-1.337	.182	
2	(Constant)	3.906	.319		12.249	.000	0.178
	Learning to write narrative texts	-.190	.141	-.165	-1.347	.179	
	Self-confidence in writing narrative texts	.039	.165	.034	.239	.811	
	<i>Learning to write factual texts</i>	-.481	.196	-.429	-2.453	.015*	
	Self-confidence in writing factual text	.295	.212	.256	1.391	.166	
	<i>Learning to write formal and informal texts</i>	-.318	.143	-.285	-2.232	.027*	
	Self-initiation	-.058	.133	-.044	-.434	.664	
	Planning	.062	.183	.046	.337	.736	
	Monitoring and evaluating	.319	.189	.236	1.691	.092	
	Revising	-.278	.206	-.209	-1.351	.178	
	Text-generating	.153	.163	.115	.936	.350	
	<i>Resourcing</i>	.353	.124	.292	2.857	.005**	
Help-seeking and affect managing	-.202	.117	-.162	-1.723	.086		

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$

In addition, the non-significant effect of the indicator learning to write formal and informal texts ( $B = -0.318$ ,  $t = -2.232$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) now posed a significant influence. Only one out of seven writing strategies posed a significant influence on overall English writing anxiety – resourcing ( $B = 0.353$ ,  $t = -2.857$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The regressors in Model 2 have a combined variance explained of  $R^2 = 0.178$ . It means that 17.8% of the variation of the dependent variable is explained by the 12 regressors entered into the model. It seems that

the amount of variance as expressed in R<sup>2</sup> only increased by 4.3% in the addition of students' writing strategies.

## 5. Recommendations

The overall level of English writing instruction was derived from the high levels of all indicators, which means that the conditions associated with English writing instruction, in terms of self-confidence in writing narrative texts and learning to write formal and informal texts, are observed oftentimes. Since all the indicators were observed oftentimes, language teachers must maintain the employment of practical instruction in writing different genres, so students would be able to participate and perform their writing tasks desirably. Meanwhile, the high level of English writing strategies shows that the conditions associated with English students' writing strategies, specifically metacognitive, are observed oftentimes. In line with this, students who are learning how to write in a second language are suggested to search for writing strategies that would enable them to make them feel better in writing.

On the other hand, the level of English writing anxiety in all indicators is moderate, which means that the condition associated with English language anxiety is sometimes observed. Through this, language teachers suggested being more aware of how their students feel during the given writing tasks. Furthermore, this academic inquiry revealed that English writing instruction is inversely related to English writing anxiety. With this, it is recommended that those teachers who are teaching writing are encouraged to provide writing instructions that the students can easily understand. For it will help students lessen their fear or anxiety in performing writing tasks.

In addition, this academic inquiry revealed that English writing strategy is inversely related to English writing anxiety. Concerning this, it is recommended that the students look for any writing strategies that can make their writing experience at ease. With this, writing anxiety will be alleviated. Lastly, only three domains for English writing instructions and English writing strategy were found to significantly predict English writing anxiety, which is learning to write factual texts, learning to write formal and informal texts and resourcing. To this effect, further studies may be conducted to explore possible explanatory variables that can predict English writing anxiety.

## 6. Conclusion

This academic inquiry revealed a high level of English writing instruction, including learning to write narrative texts, self-confidence in writing narrative texts, learning to write factual texts, self-confidence in writing factual texts, and learning to write formal and informal texts. On the other hand, the overall level of writing strategies is also high, with a high level of self-initiation, planning, monitoring and evaluating, revising, text-generating, resourcing, and help-seeking and affect management. In comparison, the level of writing anxiety is moderate in cognitive, somatic, and avoidance.

Moreover, there is a significant relationship between English writing instruction and anxiety when it comes to writing. Teachers of English should design any means of minimizing pupils' writing anxiety to write better texts. While English writing strategies were found to be adversely connected with English writing anxiety, they were found to be significantly related. Therefore, to some extent, there is an inverse link between English writing strategies and English writing anxiety among students. Thus, the more anxious students are, the more they resort to deliberate writing strategies to offer them more control over the writing process and therefore reduce their anxiety.

Lastly, the overall writing instruction and writing strategies significantly influence writing anxiety. In their singular capacities, only three domains for English writing instructions and English writing strategy significantly predicted English writing anxiety: learning to write factual texts and learning to write formal and informal texts and resourcing. Further, the significant influence of the aggregated weights of these dimensions indicates that an increase in overall conditions of writing instruction and writing strategies will decrease writing anxiety.

Hence, constructivist theories of learning backed up this study. Constructivism accepts the learner's active engagement in the personal construction of knowledge through biological, neurological, social, cultural, and linguistic interactions, following the concepts of Dewey, Piaget, and Vygotsky. It also recognizes the value of personal and social experience (Dracopoulos & Pichette, 2011). Successful learning outcomes are determined by the nature of the learners' metacognitive knowledge, the quality of their techniques and interactions, and the learners' psychological and affective states. This suggests that the learner is profoundly affected by the dynamic social environment that provides the backdrop for meaningful learning.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to express our sincere and humble gratitude to the people who extended their time, effort, and expertise for the accomplishment of this study.

### **About the Author(s)**

**Eutiquio M. Canada Jr.** is an Associate Professor I and the Sports Coordinator of the UM Digos College, Philippines.

**Tessie G. Miralles** is the Vice President-Branch Operation of the University of Mindanao, Philippines.

### **References**

- Aljafen, B. S. (2013). Writing anxiety among EFL Saudi students in science colleges and departments at a Saudi university. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.462.940&rep=rep1&type=pdf>



- Aloairdhi, N. M. (2019). Writing anxiety among Saudi female learners at some Saudi universities. *English Language Teaching*, 12(9), 55. doi:10.5539/elt.v12n9p55
- Almehmadi, M. M. (2012). A contrastive rhetorical analysis of factual texts in English and Arabic. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3, 68-76. [https://www.academia.edu/2365208/A\\_Contrastive\\_Rhetorical\\_Analysis\\_of\\_Factual\\_Texts\\_in\\_English\\_and\\_Arabic](https://www.academia.edu/2365208/A_Contrastive_Rhetorical_Analysis_of_Factual_Texts_in_English_and_Arabic)
- Asmari, A. A. (2013). Investigation of writing strategies, writing apprehension, and writing achievement among Saudi EFL-major students. *International Education Studies*, 6(11), <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n11p130>
- Azizi, M., Nemati, A., & Estahbanati, N. T. (2017). Meta-cognitive awareness of writing strategy use among Iranian EFL learners and its impact on their writing performance. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 5(1), 42-51.
- Bai, R., Hu, G., & Gu, P. Y. (2013). The relationship between use of writing strategies and English proficiency in Singapore primary schools. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(3), 355-365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0110-0>
- Blasco, A. J. (2016). The relationship between writing anxiety, writing self-efficacy, and Spanish EFL students' use of metacognitive writing strategies: A case study. *Journal of English Studies*, 14(7), <https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.3069>
- Boonyarattanasoontorn, P. (2017). An investigation of Thai students' English language writing difficulties and their use of writing strategies. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, (2)2, 111-18. doi:10.26500/jarssh-02-2017-0205
- Cer, E. (2019). The instruction of writing strategies: The effect of the metacognitive strategy on the writing skills of pupils in secondary education. *SAGE Open*, 9(2), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019842681>
- Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 313-335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001>
- Cole, J. & Feng J. (2015). Effective strategies for improving writing skills of elementary English language learners. *Chinese American Educational Research and Development Association Annual Conference*, 1-25. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED556123.pdf>
- Coon, D. A. & Jacobsen, N. Community college writing programs: Defining success for the immigrant student population. *Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics*.
- Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (2014). The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing. 1<sup>st</sup> ed., London, Routledge, [www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203149812/powers-literacy-rle-edu-bill-cope-mary-kalantzis](http://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203149812/powers-literacy-rle-edu-bill-cope-mary-kalantzis).
- Cronk-Raby, S. (2018). Writing anxiety: A new look at an old problem. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, [www.proquest.com/docview/2019099181/fulltextPDF/7AB7C9DDF06E4B1CPQ/1?accountid=31259](http://www.proquest.com/docview/2019099181/fulltextPDF/7AB7C9DDF06E4B1CPQ/1?accountid=31259).

- Curtis, G. (2017). The impact of teacher efficacy and beliefs on writing instruction. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin: International Journal for Professional Educators*, (74)1, 17–24. [www.dkg.is/static/files/skjol\\_landsamband/bulletin\\_grein\\_jona.pdf#page=17](http://www.dkg.is/static/files/skjol_landsamband/bulletin_grein_jona.pdf#page=17)
- Daniel, E. (2016). The usefulness of qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in researching problem-solving ability in science education curriculum. *Journal of Education and Practice*, (7)15, 91–100. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1103224.pdf>
- Dar, M. F., & Khan, I. (2015). Writing anxiety among public and private sectors Pakistani undergraduate university students. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, 10(1), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.46568/pjgs.v10i1.232>
- DeDeyn, R. (2011). student identity, writing anxiety, and writing performance: a correlational study. 1–168. [http://mountainscholar.org/bitstream/handle/10217/47262/DeDeyn\\_colostate\\_0053N\\_10361.pdf?sequence=1](http://mountainscholar.org/bitstream/handle/10217/47262/DeDeyn_colostate_0053N_10361.pdf?sequence=1).
- Díaz, L. C., Ramos, L., & Ortiz, N. M. (2017). Rhetorical, metacognitive, and cognitive strategies in teacher candidates' essay writing. *Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19(2), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n2.60231>
- Donker, A. S., de Boer, H., Kostons, D., Dignath van Ewijk, C. C., & van der Werf, M. P. C. (2014). Effectiveness of learning strategy instruction on academic performance: a meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 11, 1–26. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2013.11.002
- Dracopoulos, E., & Pichette, F. (2011). Second language writing anxiety, computer anxiety, and performance in a classroom versus a web-based environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 101. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2011.1.1.6>
- Dumlija, A. (2018). The relationship between writing strategies and writing anxiety in EFL. *Study Programme: Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature – Teaching English as a Foreign Language and Pedagogy*, 1–48. <http://zir.nsk.hr/islandora/object/ffos%3A4279/datastream/PDF/view>
- Durga, V., Satya S., & Rao Rao, C. S. (2018). Developing students' writing skills in English: A process approach. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, (6)2, 1–5. [www.researchgate.net/publication/325489625\\_Developing\\_Students'\\_Writing\\_Skills\\_in\\_English-A\\_Process\\_Approach](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/325489625_Developing_Students'_Writing_Skills_in_English-A_Process_Approach)
- Ekmekçi, E. (2018). Exploring Turkish EFL students' writing anxiety. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, (18)1, 158–75. [www.researchgate.net/publication/324825129\\_Exploring\\_Turkish\\_EFL\\_Students'\\_Writing\\_Anxiety](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/324825129_Exploring_Turkish_EFL_Students'_Writing_Anxiety)
- Fakeye, D. O., & Ohia, I. (2016). Writing anxiety: An affective filter for essay writing instruction among ESL students in Ibadan. *An International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 5(3), 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ijah.v5i3.7>
- Febriana, A. (2016). Students' writing strategies to implement critical thinking in an argumentative essay. *Proceeding Universitas Pamulang*, (1)1, 45–56. <http://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/Proceedings/article/view/228/160>

- Fernandez, R., Schaetzel, K., & Peyton, J. K. (2019). A survey of writing instruction in adult ESL programs: are teaching practices meeting adult learner needs? *Journal of Research and Practice for Adult Literacy, Secondary, and Basic Education*, (6)2, 5–20. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1150482>
- Fitrinada, D. M., Leoneto, B. A., & Fiftinova, F. (2018). Students' writing anxiety and its correlation with writing performance. *The Journal of English Literacy Education*, (5)2, 194–205. [www.academia.edu/38710373/STUDENTS WRITING ANXIETY AND ITS CO RELATION WITH WRITING PERFORMANCE](http://www.academia.edu/38710373/STUDENTS_WRITING_ANXIETY_AND_ITS_CO_RELATION_WITH_WRITING_PERFORMANCE).
- Ghasemi, A. A., Ahmadian, M., Yazdani, H., & Amerian, M. (2020). Towards a model of intercultural communicative competence in Iranian EFL context: Testing the role of international posture, ideal L2 self, L2 self-confidence, and metacognitive strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 49(1), 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2019.1705877>
- Gibriel, M. (2019). Investigating writing strategies, writing anxiety and their effects on writing achievement: A mixed method design. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(1), 429–436. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.1.33.429>
- Goctu, R. (2017). Metacognitive strategies in academic writing. *Journal of Education in Black Sea Region*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.31578/jeps.v2i2.44>
- Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 40, 44–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.03.001>
- Hapsari, E. W., & Sukavatee, P. (2018). Second language writing instruction: A recent practice in Indonesia. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*, 3(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v3i1.154>
- Heo, J., Lim, H., Yun, S. B., Ju, S., Park, S., & Lee, R. (2019). descriptive and predictive modeling of student achievement, satisfaction, and mental health for data-driven smart connected campus life service. *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*. doi:10.1145/3303772.3303792.
- Horverak, M. O. (2015). Feedback practices in English in Norwegian upper secondary schools. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v3i2.140>
- Horverak, M. O. (2015b). English writing instruction in Norwegian upper secondary schools. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 9(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.1689>
- Horverak, M. O. & Haudgen. (2016). English writing instruction questionnaire: The development of a questionnaire concerning English writing instruction, writing skills, and feedback practices. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v4i1.288>
- Hudri, M. (2015). Analysis of student's ability in writing narrative text. *Linguistics and Elt Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.31764/leltj.v3i1.313>
- Huerta, M., Goodson, P., Beigi, M., & Chlup, D. (2016). Graduate students as academic writers: writing anxiety, self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. *Higher Education*

- Research & Development*, 36(4), 716–729.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1238881>
- Indratama, F., & Suparno, d. D. R. (2016). Enhancing students' self-esteem in writing narrative text using collaborative learning. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, (19)2, 119–27. <http://jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id/index.php/paedagogia>.
- Irfani, W. A., Azhar, F., & Jismulatif, J. (2017). A study on the ability in writing narrative text by the second-year students of SMA Negeri 1 Tualang Perawang. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa*, (4)2, 1–15. <http://media.neliti.com/media/publications/206528-a-study-on-the-ability-in-writing-narrat.pdf>
- Jebreil, N., Azizifar, A., Gowhary, H., & Jamalinesari, A. (2014). A study on writing anxiety among iranian EFL students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.68>
- Kabosu, F. T., & Kamlasi, I. (2020). The ability of the second-year students of SMK Negeri Nibaaf in writing narrative text. *Journal of Educational Experts (JEE)*, 3(2), 60. <https://doi.org/10.30740/jee.v3i2p60-68>
- Karlina, I., & Pancoro, N. H. (2018). Students' writing anxiety: How does it affect students' writing performance in EFL context? *Proceedings of the 5th Asia Pacific Education Conference (AECON 2018)*, 1–2. doi:10.2991/aecon-18.2018.11
- Kırmızı, Ö., & Kırmızı, G. D. (2015). An investigation of L2 learners' writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety and its causes at higher education in turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education*, (4)2. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p57
- Listyani, L. (2021). Teaching writing from the heart: Building EFL writing students' motivation and self-confidence. *Academia Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.20935/al270>
- Loh, J. M. "Language learning strategies of primary six pupils in Singapore primary school." *Singapore: MA Thesis, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University*.
- Maarof, N., & Murat, M. (2013). Writing strategies used by ESL upper secondary school students. *International Education Studies*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n4p47>
- Mardiansyah, R. (2018). A correlation between self-confidence and essay writing achievement." *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 5(2), 154–66. doi:10.19109/ejpp.v5i2.2326
- Masriani, E., Mukhaiyar, M., & Wahyuni, D. (2018). Writing anxiety and writing strategies used by English department students of Universitas Negeri Padang. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, (12)1, 1–10. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/linguadidaktika/article/view/8766/pdf>.
- Mohseniasl, F. (2014). Examining the effect of strategy instruction on writing apprehension and writing achievement of EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.4.811-817>
- Morse, J. M. (2016). *Mixed Method Design: Principles and Procedures*. New York, USA, Routledge.
- Muhartoyo. (2007). Introduction to research methodologies in language studies. *Jurnal Lingua Cultura*, (1)1, 11–18.



- [www.researchgate.net/publication/304423238](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/304423238) Indtroduction To Research Methodologies In Language Studies
- Mulyaningsih, D. U. (2013). An analysis of students' ability in writing narrative texts. *Journal of English and Education*, 1(2), 16–22. <http://media.neliti.com/media/publications/192451-EN-an-analysis-of-students-ability-in-writi.pdf>
- Nazari, M., Farnia, M., Ghonsooly, B., & Jafarigohar, M. (2019). contradictions in writing anxiety: A qualitative case study of expansive learning among Iranian EFL learners." *Journal of Language and Transition*, (9)1, 33–49. [www.researchgate.net/publication/334697486](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/334697486) Contradictions in Writing Anxiety A Qualitative Case Study of Expansive Learning among Iranian EFL Learners.
- Nugroho, S. A. (2021). Enhancing the students' skill in writing a narrative text using peer-editing. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 13(1), 72–78. <https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v13i1.9801>
- Pablo, J. C., & Lasaten, R. C. (2018). Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 46–57. <https://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/APJMR-2018-6.4.06.pdf>
- Pajares, F. (2022). Inviting self-efficacy. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.26522/jitp.v3i1.3765>
- Purba, R. (2018). Improving the achievement on writing narrative text through discussion starter story technique. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(1), 27. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.1p.27>
- Ramdha, T. (2019). The effect of teaching strategies and self-confidence on students' ability in writing descriptive text in an Indonesian school. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices*, 3(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.31258/ijebp.v3n1.p15-28>
- Raofi, S., Miri, A., Gharibi, J., & Malaki, B. (2017). Assessing and validating a writing strategy scale for undergraduate students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(3), 624. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0803.23>
- Rezaei, M., & Jafari, M. (2014). Investigating the levels, types, and causes of writing anxiety among Iranian EFL students: A mixed method design. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1545–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.577>
- Sabti, A. A., Md Rashid, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Darmi, R. (2019). The impact of writing anxiety, writing achievement motivation, and writing self-efficacy on writing performance: A correlational study of Iraqi tertiary EFL learners. 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019894289>
- Sari, R. M., Yunita, W., & Azwandi, A. (2018). Improving students' ability to write narrative text by using graphic organizer. *Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature*, 1(2), 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v1i2.4179>
- Sethuraman, M., & Radhakrishnan, G. (2020). Promoting cognitive strategies in second language writing. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 20(88), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.88.5>

- Sharp, L. A. (2016). Acts of writing: A compilation of six models that define the processes of writing. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(2), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2016.926a>
- Sharma, G. (2017). Pros and cons of different sampling techniques. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 3(7), 749–52. [http://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/58765080/Pros\\_and\\_cons\\_of\\_sampling.pdf?1554128717=&response-contentdisposition=inline%3B+filename%3DImpact+Factor+5+2+IJAR.pdf&Expires=1624504996&Signature=dy8gVnriTzabj1z10XZi7M9m6n8~hVj1TynI29BUudhShIITUV7miih76GJ~N5DEkF3bQMj3Jq3c63K0G2wOyOoC0gc6YuQfeRNLKe0nnQwwiq3yQ2GfJNNrRFWdhPxgfZOVIEEuvdXFqF7kaVealSnf14FrV0hDOSwj1cyU5AW43m-qGk~UxyHd9JJXJIVic5uzMrk73deTP6ZpD2tdZsV0XhqZZsZyUA5ge2Fu1slqDpj k0eeRSQDZT9h5G9HdIHjh3CJJ3LQNrNhADYTXFxr5JxLOKloJ7Yry0oRj0avHLOtlefuvWiNmd3~eGoLoVgtgKI14oSKwwRjc-jgCg\\_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA](http://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/58765080/Pros_and_cons_of_sampling.pdf?1554128717=&response-contentdisposition=inline%3B+filename%3DImpact+Factor+5+2+IJAR.pdf&Expires=1624504996&Signature=dy8gVnriTzabj1z10XZi7M9m6n8~hVj1TynI29BUudhShIITUV7miih76GJ~N5DEkF3bQMj3Jq3c63K0G2wOyOoC0gc6YuQfeRNLKe0nnQwwiq3yQ2GfJNNrRFWdhPxgfZOVIEEuvdXFqF7kaVealSnf14FrV0hDOSwj1cyU5AW43m-qGk~UxyHd9JJXJIVic5uzMrk73deTP6ZpD2tdZsV0XhqZZsZyUA5ge2Fu1slqDpj k0eeRSQDZT9h5G9HdIHjh3CJJ3LQNrNhADYTXFxr5JxLOKloJ7Yry0oRj0avHLOtlefuvWiNmd3~eGoLoVgtgKI14oSKwwRjc-jgCg_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA)
- Sousa, V. D., Driessnack, M., & Mendes, I. A. C. (2007). An overview of research designs relevant to nursing: Part 1: Quantitative research designs. *Revista Latino-Americana De Enfermagem*, 15(3), 502–507. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-11692007000300022>
- 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). <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.1.4>
- Tajfel, Henri and J Turner (1979). An interactive theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.). *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979, Retrieved from <http://dtserv2.compsy.uni-jena.de>
- Wahyuni, S., & Umam, C. (2022). An analysis on writing anxiety of Indonesian EFL college learners. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 4(1), 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v4i1.333>
- Wischgoll, A. (2017). Improving undergraduates' and postgraduates' academic writing skills with strategy training and feedback. *Frontiers in Education*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00033>
- Wittrock, M. C. (1989). Generative processes of comprehension. *Educational Psychologist*, 24(4), 345–376. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2404\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2404_2)
- Zhang, X. (2019). Exploring the relationship between college students' writing anxiety and the pedagogical use of online resources. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0149-y>

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of English Language Teaching shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).