The Impact of Writing Self-efficacy and Affective Factors on Writing Proficiency of Chinese EFL High School Students[*]

Xiaoli Chen, Jaewoo Shim & Heechul Lee[**]
(Jeonbuk National University)

Chen, Xiaoli; Shim, Jaewoo & Lee, Heechul. (2022). The impact of writing self-efficacy and affective factors on writing proficiency of Chinese EFL high school students. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 30*(3), 21-41. This study aims to investigate the relationships among writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency of Chinese EFL high school students. A total of 187 subjects responded to a questionnaire with 43 items, which surveyed linguistic self-efficacy, composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation, goal orientation, task value, and anxiety held by the subjects. These subjects had also contributed their essays that were scored by two raters. The correlations among the six constructs were statistically significant (p<0.01). In addition, the results of the multiple linear regression revealed that 55.2% variance in writing proficiency was explained by the linear combination of linguistic self-efficacy, composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation, goal orientation, task value, and anxiety. Also, it was found that the group of students with extrinsic goal orientation outperformed the other group of students with extrinsic goal orientation. Finally, some implications for enhancing English writing strategies for high school students were made.

Key Words: self-efficacy, affective factors, writing proficiency

---

1. Introduction

Writing self-efficacy and affective factors in relation to writing proficiency have been widely investigated (Pajares, 2003). Indeed, writing self-efficacy is learners' judgments of how well they can produce a written text based on their assessment of "creation of various text types, grammar, usage, and mechanical skills" (Pajares & Valiante, 2006: 161). Research findings have consistently shown that writing self-efficacy and writing performance correlated with the task environment, motivation, cognitive process, and writing proficiency (Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Graham & Harris, 2005). For instance, Bruning et al. (2013) proposed a positive relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing proficiency in a cognitive process.

L2 writing proficiency is also influenced by many other affective factors such as motivation, goal orientation, task value, and anxiety (Brown, 1973; Ames & Archer, 1988; Troia et al., 2013; Rahimi & Zhang, 2019; Cheng, 2002). These affective factors belong to an important psychological domain that we need to explore in order to understand the process of L2 writing, and they play a significant role in L2 writing proficiency. For example, it has been shown in a couple of studies that the interaction of writing self-efficacy and affective factors can enhance L2 writing proficiency (Kaplan et al., 2009; Deb, 2018; Sun & Wang, 2020). In the same vein, some researchers have found that affective factors were correlated with L2 writing proficiency.

Although it is obvious that writing self-efficacy and affective factors may have an impact on writing proficiency of EFL college students, there is a lack of research to examine the relationships among writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency. In addition, there is a dearth of studies on the effect of writing self-efficacy and affective factors on writing proficiency of adolescent learners of English. More extensive research on adolescent learners' writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency may provide a much wider perspective on these constructs. Accordingly, this study attempts to explore the relationships among writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency of Chinese EFL high school subjects. The research questions in this study are as follows:

1) What are the correlations among writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency?
2) How much variance in writing proficiency can be explained by the linear combination

of writing self-efficacy and affective factors?

3) Is there any significant difference between the intrinsic goal orientation group and the extrinsic goal orientation group in terms of English writing proficiency?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Writing Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the beliefs learners hold about the ability to complete a particular task (Bandura, 2006). Writing self-efficacy is individuals' judgments of how well they can accomplish a writing task based on their assessments of "various composition, grammar, usage, and mechanical skills" (Pajares & Valiante, 2006: 161). Writing self-efficacy extends self-efficacy to the specific domain of L2 writing (Bruning et al., 2013). This extension of writing self-efficacy to L2 writing has been well received in the field of second language acquisition. Writing self-efficacy is a significant predictor of L2 writing proficiency. For instance, Sun & Wang (2020) used their English writing self-efficacy questionnaire to measure the writing self-efficacy of sophomore Chinese students and found that writing self-efficacy contributed significantly to students' writing proficiency in terms of generating ideas, which it viewed as root in cognitive processes. In addition, writing self-efficacy was reported to have some relationships with variables such as motivation, gender, and grade on writing proficiency. For example, Pajares & Valiante (1999) surveyed 742 middle school students and found that writing self-efficacy, as a part of motivation construct, predicted writing proficiency. Their findings also showed that girls were more competent writers than boys, but there were no gender differences in writing self-efficacy. In addition, subjects with higher grades tended to have a high degree of self-efficacy. Overall, research studies have demonstrated writing self-efficacy had a great influence on writing proficiency.

Writing proficiency requires the combination of enhanced linguistic knowledge and the ability to compose various texts. L2 writing processes involve such multiple skills as both low-level skills such as spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and other conventions (Anastasiou & Michail, 2013), on the one hand, and high-level skills of organizing concepts, making texts cohesive and coherent, and so on (Bruning et al., 2013), on the other. Throughout these writing processes, one's linguistic self-efficacy and composition self-regulatory efficacy may play roles in keeping their confidence in writing and promoting cognitive and metacognitive engagement.

2.1.1. Linguistic Self-efficacy

Researchers have shown great interest in linguistic self-efficacy, which is a more specific dimension to writing self-efficacy. Therefore, scholars attempted to define the construct of linguistic self-efficacy. For instance, Hayes (1996) referred to learners' judgment of their capability in cognitive and language-related aspects of writing processes as linguistic self-efficacy. Indeed, linguistic self-efficacy is learners' self-judgments of their ability to recall appropriate words from long-term memory, display syntactic competence, and meet the discourse demands of the writing process. According to research studies (Kormos, 2012; Lee, 2016; Woodrow, 2011, Zhang & Guo, 2012), L2 writing proficiency was highly related to linguistic self-efficacy. For example, through learners' self-judgment of the ability to retrieve knowledge of morphological, semantic, and syntactic levels, linguistic self-efficacy significantly influenced writing proficiency. These findings were also similar to Woodrow's (2011), who reported that Chinese college students' low linguistic self-efficacy was related to the lack of linguistic knowledge, low self-assessment, and increased anxiety due to low writing proficiency.

2.1.2. Composition Self-regulatory Efficacy

Composition self-regulatory efficacy refers to learners' perceived capability to execute the metacognitive control in writing such as monitoring, evaluating, and goal setting. It is generally agreed to that composition self-regulatory efficacy is a metacognitive process that requires learners to assess their writing works and plan alternative pathways to success (Usher & Pajares, 2008). Indeed, a successful writing process requires writers to regulate their cognition to generate constructive ideas for writing, establish goals to direct their learning activities and use some strategies to monitor and evaluate their performance (Manchón, 2009). In addition, the exploration of the relationship between self-regulatory efficacy and writing performance was already evolving as well. For instance, a study by Mortazavi & Soleimani (1970) surveyed Iranian beginners and advanced learners of English for writing self-regulatory efficacy. The study explored the role of structured and problematic scaffolding mechanisms and found potential moderating impact of proficiency on writing self-regulatory efficacy. Nevertheless, the findings made it possible to build mechanisms that significantly improve self-regulatory efficacy and writing performance. Furthermore, other relevant factors may affect the composition self-regulatory efficacy in the writing process. For example, learners' confidence in goal-oriented monitoring and evaluation contributed to fostering composition self-regulatory efficacy and arousing

positive motivation and interest (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007). Therefore, high levels of composition self-regulatory efficacy may indicate that learners have achieved some capability for using metacognition to produce written texts, and in the writing process, composition self-regulatory efficacy was the essential point of writing self-efficacy. However, there have been few research studies on composition self-regulatory efficacy in L2 writing.

2.2. Affective Factors Associated with Writing Proficiency

2.2.1. Motivation

The concept of learners' motivation is used to explain the degree to which learners invest attention and effort in learning processes (Brophly, 1998). Motivation has been extensively studied in various aspects of second language acquisition, and in L2 writing specifically, it was found that motivation profoundly influences L2 writing proficiency. Some empirical studies reported that motivation affected the writing process as an individual's learning strategy (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Pajares & Valiante, 2001; Pintrich, 1999; Wolters & Benzon, 2013). Teng & Zhang (2018) surveyed 512 Chinese undergraduate students on the relationship between motivation and L2 writing proficiency, and research results showed that through the strategy of motivation, L2 writers could become more active in expanding learning efforts and utilizing a variety of strategies to increase their interests and social engagement in completing L2 writing. In addition, motivation was also influenced by a few moderating variables like gender, age, and so on, while the degree of motivation and writing proficiency are also mutually influenced. Troia et al. (2013) examined 618 children and adolescents and explored the relationship between the L2 students' motivation and writing proficiency, and researchers found that the factor of gender directly influenced writing proficiency. Indeed, girls' motivation was higher than boys', and the higher the writing proficiency, the higher the degree of motivation, which shows a mutually reinforcing relationship between motivation and writing proficiency.

2.2.2. Goal Orientation

Goal orientation can be defined as two distinct perceptions of why they engage themselves in a specific task: intrinsic goal orientation and extrinsic goal orientation (Ames and Archer, 1988). Intrinsic goal-orientation is that students tend to engage in a task to acquire specific knowledge as their ultimate goals. For these learners, intrinsic goal orientation has more to do with the learning process than the result or reward. Contrarily, extrinsic goal orientation is that students tend to use strategies producing more shallow

forms such as memorization or guessing in writing. Most extrinsic goal-oriented students concentrate on making good performance or receiving compliments (Lyke & Kelaher Young, 2006). Regarding the relationship between intrinsic goal orientation and writing proficiency, Sathya & Lee (2014) surveyed 244 Cambodian university students. They found that intrinsic goal orientation was shown to have positive correlations with L2 writing proficiency. Meanwhile, studies on the relationship between extrinsic goal orientation and writing proficiency reported a null relation (Dupeyrat & Mariné, 2005; Kaplan & Gorodetsky, 2009). Nevertheless, it is necessary to enrich the empirical research on goal orientation in L2 writing.

2.2.3. Task Value

Task value in the current study can be interpreted as the benefits offered to the development of writing skills and pertains to what Eccles et al. (1983) referred to as utility task value, or in other words, the value students held towards an academic task that assists in achieving learning goals. Task value could help students assess the importance and usefulness of, and their interest in, a task. According to Pintrich et al. (1991), task value plays a critical role in learning a specific domain such as writing in L2. Since learners' different levels of task value can determine the quality of a written work (Pintrich et al., 1991), for example, when students are required to write an L2 essay with a writing task, the task may be interesting or boring to them depending on how each individual perceives the task of writing. Several psychological factors can influence the relationship between task value and writing proficiency. In addition, a couple of studies subdivided the task value into several dimensions to analyze the task value predictors of writing proficiency. Raoofi & Maroofi (2017) categorized task value into intrinsic value, attainment value, and utility value. Their finding showed that the two types of intrinsic value and attainment value were significantly related to writing proficiency. Another study by Pintrich (1999) showed that the students with higher task value attachment had higher academic performance than those with lower task value attachment.

2.2.4. Anxiety

Anxiety is defined as "the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (Horwitz et al., 1986: 125). As dimension-specific anxiety, Daly and Miller (1975a) proposed the term "writing apprehension" to describe the dysfunctional anxiety that many individuals suffer

when confronted with writing tasks. Research on anxiety in L2 writing has been extensively done, with studies focused on the effects of anxiety on L2 writing performance and other studies on the interplay between anxiety and L2 writing performance (e.g., Csizér & Tankó, 2017; Teimouri et al., 2019; Rahimi & Zhang, 2019; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021). In the study by Cheng (2002), the researcher developed a writing anxiety scale that examined the relationship between anxiety and L2 writing proficiency. Then the researcher found that anxiety and L2 writing proficiency had a negative effect on each other. In other words, the higher level anxiety meant the lower level of L2 writing proficiency and the higher level of L2 writing proficiency meant the lower level of anxiety. Furthermore, the girls in the L2 writing process had significantly higher writing anxiety than the boys. In addition, the researcher found strong correlation between anxiety and length of English study. However, Brown (2007) researched into facilitative anxiety and set up an experimental group with a facilitative environment and a control group with a regular learning environment. The results demonstrated that the facilitative learning environment could promote students' L2 learning.

3. Methods

3.1. Subjects

A total of 202 senior high school students took the writing proficiency test and responded to a questionnaire with 43 items for this study. The data of 187 students were used for statistical analyses after deleting 15 subjects who failed to respond to all the items. The subjects were from a high school in a provincial capital city in northern China. The subjects consisted of 99 males (52.9 %) and 88 females (47.1 %). The age of the participants ranged from 17 to 18 years old. Among these students, 163 (87.2%) belonged to the science track and the other 24 (12.8%) belonged to the humanities track.

3.2. Instrument

3.2.1. The Writing Test

The subjects' English writing proficiency was assessed based on their essays in the college entrance exam. The subjects were given 30 minutes to write an essay. Afterward, subjects were asked to complete 43 items that tapped writing self-efficacy and affective

factors associated with writing proficiency.

English writing proficiency is essential to high school students' English language proficiency in China because English writing is considered an important scale in the Chinese College Entrance Examination. Specifically speaking, the English writing test is mandatory for Chinese high school students who are asked to write an argumentative essay. Students should produce approximately 100 words essays. Their written texts are scored based on the IELTS assessment scale, which includes coherence and cohesion, vocabulary use, grammatical range, and accuracy. Two TESOL-qualified evaluators were invited to assess the essays. The consistency of the scores rated by the two raters was calculated using the Pearson correlation coefficients.

3.2.2. The Scales for Writing Self-efficacy and Affective Factors Associated with Writing Proficiency

The items in the writing self-efficacy questionnaire were adapted from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (Pajares et al., 2001) and Descriptive Analysis of the L2 Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) (Teng et al., 2018). The items measured constructs such as linguistic self-efficacy and composition self-regulatory efficacy. The affective factors associated with writing proficiency questionnaire items were adopted from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (Pintrich, 1991). The items measured constructs such as motivation, goal orientation, task value, and anxiety. These six constructs were adapted to explore their relationship with the writing performance of Chinese EFL senior high school students. The questionnaire adopted in this study consisted of 43 items using a 6-point Likert scale from 1(Strongly disagree) to 6 (Strongly agree). The reversed items were recoded correctly before submitting to SPSS. The questionnaire was translated into Chinese using blind back-translation (Brislin, 1970) to ensure the same interpretation of the items. The internal consistency for all 43 items was Cronbach alpha of 0.90.

3.3. Data Analysis

The data were processed by SPSS Version 23 to calculate the descriptive statistics of means and standard deviations for six constructs (linguistic self-efficacy, composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation, goal orientation, task value, anxiety) and writing proficiency. The Pearson correlation coefficients were also calculated to understand the relationships among six constructs and writing proficiency. In addition, multiple linear

regression was applied to investigate the explained variance in the dependent variable of writing proficiency. Also, the multiple regression analysis included a dummy variable for the goal orientation variable; 1 for the intrinsic goal orientation group, 0 for the extrinsic goal orientation group.

4. Results

4.1. Bivariate Correlations of Variables

Table 1 shows the bivariate correlations among linguistic self-efficacy, composition self-regulatory efficacy, goal orientation, task value, motivation, anxiety, and writing proficiency. In this study, self-efficacy was divided into linguistic self-efficacy and composition self-regulatory efficacy. Affective factors associated with writing proficiency included goal orientation, task value, motivation, and anxiety. Motivation was positively correlated at the highest level (r=0.683, p<0.01) with composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation was positively correlated at the second-highest level (r=0.594, p<0.01) with linguistic self-efficacy, and motivation was positively correlated at the highest level (r=0.563, p<0.01) with goal orientation. Among the independent variables, a high level of significant positive correlation was found between motivation and other independent variables: composition self-regulatory efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy, and goal orientation.

Table 1. Correlations of English Writing Self-efficacy,
Affective Factors and Writing Proficiency

Variables	LS	CSRE	GO	TV	MO	AN	WP
LS	1						
CSRE	0.586**	1					
GO	0.264**	0.476**	1				
TV	0.173	0.260**	0.503**	1			
Motivation	0.594**	0.683**	0.563**	0.480**	1		
Anxiety	0.035	0.072	0.163*	0.348**	0.578	1	
WP	0.508**	0.637**	0.320**	0.416**	0.589**	0.272**	1

**p<0.01, * p<0.05, N=187
(LS=Linguistic self-efficacy, CSRE= Composition self-regulatory efficacy, GO=Goal orientation, TV=Task value, WP=Writing proficiency)

Significant correlations were found among the six factors and writing proficiency. The highest significant correlation was between composition self-regulatory efficacy and writing proficiency (r=0.637, p<0.01), the second-highest correlation was between motivation and writing proficiency (r=0.589, p<0.01), the third-highest correlation was between linguistic self-efficacy and writing proficiency (r=0.508, p<0.01), and the fourth-highest correlation was between task value and writing proficiency (r=0.416, p<0.01). Goal orientation showed significant medium correlation with writing proficiency (r=0.320, p<0.01), while anxiety was weakly correlated with writing proficiency (r=0.272, p<0.01). Overall, composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation, and linguistic self-efficacy were highly correlated with writing proficiency; goal orientation showed a significant medium correlation with writing proficiency, and anxiety was weakly correlated with writing proficiency.

4.2. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

ANOVA and multiple linear regressions were used to answer the second research question. Table 2 shows R^2 of 0.552, indicating that 55.2% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by the linear combination of the independent variables, and the regression model was statistically significant (F=36.936, p<0.01).

Table 2. ANOVA[a] for Statistical Significance

Model	R^2	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.552	57.402	6	9.567	36.936	.000[b]
Residual		46.622	180	.259		
Total		104.024	186			

a. Dependent Variable: writing proficiency
b. Predictors: (Constant), linguistic self-efficacy, composition self-regulatory efficacy, motivation, goal orientation, task value, anxiety

From Table 3, the multiple linear regression results showed the model had no issue with multicollinearity. It was also found that the regression coefficients of the six independent variables were statistically significant (p<0.05).

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
Constant	2.527	.271		9.335**	.000		
CSRE	.230	.056	.311	4.097**	.000	.432	2.315
Motivation	.162	.081	.173	1.994*	.048	.332	3.009
TV	.155	.057	.171	2.709**	.007	.626	1.596
Anxiety	.191	.060	.171	3.175**	.002	.856	1.168
LS	.130	.058	.151	2.250*	.026	.550	1.818
IGO	.240	.120	.118	2.005*	.047	.716	1.397

**p<0.01, *p<0.05, N=187
LS=Linguistic self-efficacy, CSRE=Composition self-regulatory efficacy, IGO =Intrinsic goal orientation(Dummy coded as 1), Dependent Variable: WP=Writing Proficiency

Concerning the third research question, there was a statistically significant subject difference in predicting the dependent variable of English writing proficiency (p<0.01). Compared to the group with extrinsic goal orientation students, the group with intrinsic goal orientation performed better on English essay writing task, as indicated by the unstandardized coefficient of 0.118.

5. Discussion and Implication

One of the objectives of this study was to explore the factors that could affect subjects' L2 writing proficiency based on the correlations among writing self-efficacy, affective factors, and writing proficiency of Chinese EFL high school students. The results showed statistically significant high correlations between writing self-efficacy and writing proficiency. Specifically, composition self-regulatory efficacy was associated with writing proficiency at the highest level, followed by linguistic self-efficacy. These results imply that the two constructs have some significant impacts on writing proficiency. This finding is consistent with a few empirical studies (Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Zhang & Guo, 2012; Kim et al., 2015; Sun & Wang, 2020). This study also found statistically significant high or medium correlations between affective factors and writing proficiency. In particular, the correlation between motivation and writing proficiency was 0.589, indicating that the construct of motivation was as important as composition self-regulatory efficacy and linguistic self-efficacy.

With the composition self-regulatory efficacy variable is the most important variable in explaining the variance in the dependent variable of writing proficiency (Cheng, 2002; Wolters & Benzon, 2011; Deb, 2018; Teng & Zhang, 2018). The results of the multiple linear regression analysis indicated that 55.2% variance in writing proficiency was explained by the linear combination of independent variables in this study. The results showed that the all of the independent variables were statistically significant. Among them, composition self-regulatory efficacy was the most important variable in explaining the variance of writing proficiency (β=0.311, p<0.01). This finding coincides with other studies that indicated the composition self-regulatory efficacy as a critical variable in terms of writing proficiency (Ching, 2002; Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007; Brown & White, 2010; Csizér & Tankó, 2017; Teng et al., 2018). The subjects' writing proficiency was more influenced by their composition self-regulatory efficacy than the linguistic self-efficacy. Specifically, the writers usually do not focus on the grammar level but on the discourse level, so they are more confident with their composition self-regulatory efficacy, which suggested that learners are aware of the important producing coherent and cohesive texts in addition to the language at the sentence level. Contrary to this finding, most Chinese secondary school teachers of English have the tendancy of putting more emphasis om grammar and vocabulary than the language use at the discourse level. Accordingly, it may be necessary that they are advised on making some changes in the way they teach their students English writing. So that writing at the discourse level is not ignored.

Other findings from the multiple linear regression analysis showed that motivation, task value, anxiety, and goal orientation were sttistically significant variables in the regression model of this study (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998; Wolters & Benzon, 2013; Troia et al., 2013; Yu & Zhou, 2020). In terms of motivation, the higher their motivation about writing in English was, the higher scores in writing proficiency were observed (β=0.173, p<0.01). This finding indicates that Chinese secondary school teachers of English need to provide their students with interesting writing tasks that include pre-writing activities (i.e., group discussion about their topics and free writing), and peer-editing activities through which they are given the opportunity to compose multiple drafts before their final products to be received by the teacher.

The variable of the task value was another statistically significant variable in the regression model. The perceptions held by the students regarding the benefits from performing their writing task turned out to be an important construct. Accordingly, Chinese in-service teachers of English may take time in discussing or explaining what

their students may gain by putting their efforts in their given tasks. For example, when practising composing descriptive paragraphs, students may be instructed about their skills being applied to making travel brochures for visitors to their city. With this type of connecting their writing practices to some practical and authentic uses, the teachers may help students perceive the positive value in performing their given tasks.

Also in this multiple regression model, the variable of anxiety was statistically significant (β=0.171, p<0.01). This finding was the opposite to what other researchers have found (Daly & Miller, 1975a; Daly, 1978; Faigley et al., 1981; Bannister, 1992; Lee & Krashen, 1997). The result of positive effect of anxiety has been illustrated in studies. Brown (2007) claimed that some levels of stress about a writing task facilitative with learners' performance. The similar argument was made by Putwain (2011) who suggested that anxiety was a form of compensation. That is, some students with high anxiety levels may try harder than those with low anxiety levels. Thus Chinese in-service teachers of English may take some advantage of facilitative anxiety in writing and occasionally display students' paragraphs and essay in public. By being forced to produce their writing for the purpose of sharing it with others they may continue to keep some positive levels facilitative anxiety.

Goal orientation was another statistically significant variable in explaining of writing proficiency in the current study (β=0.118, p<0.05). The dummy variables for goal orientation in this study showed that the group of students belonging to intrinsic goal orientation outperformed the other group of students belonging to extrinsic goal orientation. This result was consistent with the results of previous studies (Church et al., 2001; Dupeyrat & Mariné, 2005; Bates, 2006). The finding from the present study about the importance of intrinsic goal orientation over extrinsic goal orientation indicates that Chinese in-service teachers of English may continue to instill students with the ultimate benefits of producing English texts in the long run. For instance, the teacher may guide students into the life-long learning of English in which they continue to grow as authors of writing by exchanging opinions, ideas, perspectives with people in the local areas as well as in other parts of the world.

6. Conclusion

This study showed that composition self-regulatory efficacy, linguistic self-efficacy and other affective factors of motivation, task-value, anxiety, and goal orientation were

statistically significant in the regression model of this study. The implications from the present study are multiple. The teachers may focus on the language at the discourse level as well as the sentence level, promote process-based writing activities for increasing their learning motivation and connect students' writing tasks with their immediate application to authentic production of their writing. In addition, the teacher may attempt to maintain some levels of facilitative anxiety and put some emphasis on English as a subject of life-long learning.

Although great care was taken of research design, this study is limited in many ways. The subjects were sampled from the same school and so were not diverse in their learning experience, age, and writing proficiency. Further studies are recommended for diverse settings representing L2 writing learners better.

References

Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*(3) 260-267.

Anastasiou, D., & Michail, D. (2013). Exploring discordance between self-efficacy and writing performance among low-literate adult students. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, *11*(1), 53-87.

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

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*(2), 164-180.

Bannister, L. (1992). Writing apprehension and anti-writing: A naturalistic study of composing strategies used by college freshmen. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press.

Bates, C. H. (2006). T*he effects of self-regulated learning strategies on achievement, control beliefs about learning, and intrinsic goal orientation* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Alabama.

Bown, J., & White, C. J. (2010). Affect in a self-regulatory framework for language learning. *System*, *38*, 432-443.

Brophy, J. (1998). *Motivating students to learn.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Brown, H. D. (1973). Affective variables in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *23*(2), 231-244.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5th edition). White Plains, NY: Pearson.

Brislin, R. W., & Leibowitz, H. W. (1970). The effect of separation between test and comparison objects on size constancy at various age-levels. *The American Journal of Psychology*, *83*(3), 372-376.

Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(1), 25.

Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, *35*(6), 647-656.

Ching, L. C. (2002). Strategy and self-regulation instruction as contributors to improving students' cognitive model in an ESL program. *English for Specific Purposes*, *21*, 261-289.

Church, M. A., Elliot, A. J., & Gable, S. L. (2001). Perceived classroom environment, achievement goals, and achievement outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *93*(1), 43-54.

Csizér. K., & Tankó. G. (2017). English majors self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, *38*(3), 386-404.

Daly, J. A. (1978). Writing apprehension and writing competence. *Journal of Educational Research*, *72*, 10-14.

Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975a). The empirical development of an instrument of writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *9*, 242-49.

Deb, J. (2018). Affective factors in second language writing: Is it a matter of concern? *The Morning Watch: Educational and Social Analysis*, *46*(1-2 Fall).

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, *31*, 117-135.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ottó, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. In *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 4. Thames Valley University.

Dupeyrat, C., & Mariné, C. (2005). Implicit theories of intelligence, goal orientation, cognitive engagement, and achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*,

30(1), 43-59.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, *95*(2), 256-273.

Eccles, J. S., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kaczala, C. M., Meece, J. L., & Midgley, C. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement motivation* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.

Faigley, L., Daly, J. A., & Witte, S. P. (1981). The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence. *Journal of Educational Research*, *75*, 16-21.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). Improving the writing performance of young struggling writers: Theoretical and programmatic research from the center on accelerating student learning. *Journal of Special Education*, *39*(1), 19-33.

Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kaplan, A., Lichtinger, E., & Gorodetsky, M. (2009). Achievement goal orientations and self-regulation in writing: An integrative perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *101*(1), 51-69.

Kim, D.-H., Wang, C., Bong, M., & Ahn, H. S (2015). English language learners' self-efficacy profiles and relationship with self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *38*, 136-142.

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(4), 390-403.

Lee, I. (2016). EFL writing in schools. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 113-139). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter.

Lee, S.-Y., & Krashen, S. (1997). Writing apprehension in Chinese as a first language. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 115-116, 27-37.

Lyke, J. A., & Young, A. J. (2006). Cognition in context: Students' perceptions of classroom goal structures and reported cognitive strategy use in the college classroom. *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(4), 477-490.

Manchón, R. M. (2009). Introduction: Broadening the perspective of L2 writing scholarship: The contribution of research on foreign language writing. In R.

Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 1–19). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Mortazavi, M., Jafarigohar, M., Rouhi, A., & Soleimani, H. (1970). The effect of scaffolding through structuring and problematizing on EFL learners' writing self-regulatory skills, essay writing skill and global planning time. *Research in School and Virtual Learning*, 4(15), 15-26.

Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1994). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *28*(3), 313-331.

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1999). Grade level and gender differences in the writing self-beliefs of middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24, 390–405.

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2001). Gender differences in writing motivation and achievement of middle school students: A function of gender orientation? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*, 366-381.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 139-158.

Putwain, D., & Symes, W. (2011). Perceived fear appeals and examination performance: Facilitating or debilitating outcomes? *Learning and Individual Differences*, *21*(2), 227-232.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Pintrich, P. R. (1999). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Educational Research, 31*(6), 459-470.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2019). Writing task complexity, students' motivational beliefs, anxiety and their writing production in English as a second language. *Reading and Writing*, *32*(3), 761-786.

Raoofi, S., & Maroofi, Y. (2017). Relationships among motivation (self-efficacy and task value), strategy use and performance in L2 writing. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *35*(3), 299-310.

Sathya, C., & Lee, S. (2014). The relationships among writing self-efficacy, writing

goal orientation, and writing achievement. *Language Education in Asia*, *5*, 2.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *23*, 7-25.

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *State-trait anxiety inventory for adults. (STAI-AD)*

Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, *90*, Article 102221.

Tahmouresi, S., & Papi, M. (2021). Future selves, enjoyment and anxiety as predictors of L2 writing achievement. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *53*, 100837.

Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *41*, 363-387.

Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2018). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language contexts: Scale validation through structural equation modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(4), 911-942.

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2018). Effects of motivational regulation strategies on writing performance: A mediation model of self-regulated learning of writing in English as a second/foreign language. *Metacognition and Learning*, *13*(2), 213-240.

Troia, G. A., Harbaugh, A. G., Shankland, R. K., Wolbers, K. A., & Lawrence, A. M. (2013). Relationships between writing motivation, writing activity, and writing performance: Effects of grade, sex, and ability. *Reading and Writing*, *26*(1), 17-44.

Tseng, W. T., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 78-102.

Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Self-efficacy for self-regulated learning: A validation study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *68*(3), 443-463.

Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. *System*, *39*, 510–522.

Wolters, C. A., & Benzon, M. B. (2013). Assessing and predicting college students' use of strategies for the self-regulation of motivation. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *81*, 199-221.

Wolters, C. A., Benzon, M. B., & Arroyo-Giner, C. (2011). Assessing strategies for the self-regulation of motivation. In B. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 298-312). New York: Routledge.

Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2020). The impact of L2 writing instructional approaches on student writing motivation and engagement. *Language Teaching Research*, 1362168820957024.

Zhang, Y., & Guo, H. (2012). A study of English writing and domain-specific motivation and self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, *16*(2), 101-121.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). A writer's discipline: The development of self-regulatory skill. *Writing and Motivation*, *19*, 51.

Appendix I. Writing Test

Written expression:

The English Activity Week is collecting English stories from all the students in the school. Write a short essay with the following

Content:
1. The reason for the disagreement.
2. The process of resolving the disagreement.
3. The insights you have gained.

Attention:
1. Word count of about 100 words.
2. The title and first sentence of the essay have been written for you.

A Conflict with My Parents

There is no doubt that teenagers sometimes have conflicts with their parents, and I am no exception.

Xiaoli Chen
Ph.D. Graduate
Department of English Education
Jeonbuk National University
567, Baekjedae-ro, Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 54896, Korea
Phone: +82-63-270-2728
Email: chenxiaoli7689@163.com

Jaewoo Shim
Professor
Department of English Education
Jeonbuk National University
567, Baekjedae-ro, Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 54896, Korea
Phone: +82-63-270-2729
Email: shimjw@jbnu.ac.kr

Heechul Lee
Professor
Department of English Education
Jeonbuk National University
567, Baekjedae-ro, Deokjin-gu
Jeonju, 54896, Korea
Phone: +82-63-270-2719
Email: hclee@jbnu.ac.kr