

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory

¹Nurin Naufina*, ²Nur Hidayanto Pancoro Setyo Putro,

¹English Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages, Arts and Cultures,
Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

***Corresponding Author**

Email: nurinnaufina.2021@student.uny.ac.id

Received:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
03 December 2024	09 January 2024	10 January 2025	24 February 2025

Abstract

This study examines the three dimensions of writing anxiety (cognitive, somatic, and avoidance) across the four stages of the writing process: prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing. It also seeks to determine how these dimensions vary by school type. A quantitative approach was utilized, employing a survey design with participation from 202 students enrolled in two senior high schools in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta, during the 2023/2024 academic year. The schools, categorized as high-performing and moderately-performing, each contributed three Class X sections to the research. Data collection was conducted using a questionnaire of writing anxiety scale and the writing process framework proposed. Analytical techniques such as confirmatory factor analysis and MANOVA were applied. The findings revealed two main results: (1) students' writing anxiety was characterized by three distinct dimensions (cognitive, somatic, and avoidance) observed across all stages of the writing process, and (2) significant variations in these dimensions were identified at the prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing stages, depending on the school category. This research highlights the complex nature of writing anxiety and its variation across different stages of the writing process and school types. Future studies are encouraged to investigate the underlying causes of stage-specific anxiety, focusing on factors such as individual traits, writing proficiency, and prior experiences.

Keywords: *writing anxiety; writing process; senior high school*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most critical skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. It serves as a cornerstone for academic success and facilitates effective communication in the globalized world of the 21st century (Alshammari, 2020; Motallebzadeh et al., 2018). Writing enables learners to articulate thoughts, analyze ideas, and present arguments in a structured and coherent manner. However, despite its importance, writing proficiency remains a challenging skill for many EFL students. The intricacies involved in constructing grammatically accurate sentences, selecting appropriate vocabulary, and achieving coherence often lead to significant hurdles in mastering this skill (Sadewi et al., 2024). These challenges are further compounded by the pervasive issue of writing anxiety, which negatively impacts

students' willingness to engage in writing tasks and diminishes their overall performance (Cheng, 2004; Salem & Al Dyyar, 2014).

Writing anxiety, a psychological phenomenon, manifests through somatic, cognitive, and avoidance dimensions. Somatic anxiety involves physiological responses such as increased heart rate or sweating, while cognitive anxiety is characterized by negative thought patterns and self-doubt. Avoidance anxiety, on the other hand, leads to procrastination or reluctance to engage in writing tasks (Cheng, 2004). Research has consistently shown that these dimensions of anxiety can disrupt the writing process, resulting in lower-quality outputs and reduced confidence (Rezaei & Jafari, 2014; Sabti et al., 2019). Moreover, writing anxiety does not operate in isolation but interacts with the complex stages of the writing process, which requires students to plan, organize, draft, and revise their work systematically (Oshima & Hogue, 2007). Each stage demands cognitive and emotional effort, making writing a multidimensional challenge for students.

The writing process is inherently complex, requiring students to transform abstract ideas into coherent and well-organized compositions. According to Oshima & Hogue (2007), the writing process consists of four stages: prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing. During the prewriting stage, students generate and organize ideas, often using techniques such as brainstorming and outlining. The organizing stage involves structuring these ideas logically to create a clear roadmap for the draft. Writing is the phase where students convert their ideas into sentences and paragraphs, emphasizing coherence and cohesion. Finally, the polishing stage focuses on refining grammar, punctuation, and overall clarity to produce a final, polished piece. Each stage presents unique challenges that can exacerbate writing anxiety, particularly among EFL learners who may struggle with linguistic and cognitive demands (Pratama, 2012; Wingate & Harper, 2021).

Previous research has provided valuable insights into the prevalence and impact of writing anxiety among students. Writing anxiety among senior high school students has been widely studied, revealing its multifaceted nature, encompassing various causes, effects, and potential interventions. Studies consistently emphasize that writing anxiety negatively impacts academic performance, with cognitive anxiety (worries about evaluation and performance) emerging as a significant factor (Pratiwi, 2021; Rasuan & Wati, 2021). Majidifar (2015) highlights the notable influence of test anxiety and self-efficacy on writing outcomes, arguing that addressing test anxiety alone is insufficient to ensure satisfactory performance. External factors such as fear of negative feedback, limited vocabulary, and time constraints further intensify anxiety, often leading to avoidance behaviors in writing tasks (Lestari et al., 2019; Yayli & Genç, 2019). Similarly, Karahan's study highlighted a negative correlation between writing anxiety and writing disposition, reinforcing the notion that anxiety can hinder students' attitudes towards writing (Karahan, 2021).

The measurement of writing anxiety frequently relies on validated instruments like the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), which has been effectively used across diverse educational contexts to assess cognitive and behavioral dimensions of anxiety (Min & Rahmat, 2014; Wern & Rahmat,

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

2021)). Interventions to mitigate writing anxiety include structured, process-based methods like the Four-Square Writing Method (Ipek & Karabuga, 2022) and strategies aimed at enhancing emotional intelligence (He et al., 2023), both of which show considerable promise in reducing anxiety levels. These approaches align with Kurniawati & Anam's (2023) findings, which underscore the importance of adopting structured pedagogical methods to address writing anxiety effectively. However, the study mentioned did not examine how writing anxiety varies across different school categories or how it interacts with the stages of the writing process. This gap in the literature underscores the need for further investigation into the unique challenges faced by high school students, particularly in diverse educational settings such as state schools in Indonesia.

This research thus seeks to address the existing gap by examining the relationship between writing anxiety and the writing process in senior high schools located in Sleman, Yogyakarta. It focuses on analyzing the presence of writing anxiety across three key dimensions (somatic, cognitive, and avoidance) throughout the stages of prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing. Furthermore, the study aims to uncover significant differences in these anxiety dimensions across the stages, based on the type of school. By exploring these distinctions, the study offers valuable insights into the development and variation of writing anxiety within diverse educational contexts, highlighting the dynamic interaction between anxiety dimensions and the writing process stages.

METHOD**Respondents**

This research employed a quantitative approach with a survey design to examine the dimensions of writing anxiety (cognitive, somatic, and avoidance) among senior high school students across the four stages of the writing process: prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing (Creswell & Creswell, 2017) states that the quantitative method was chosen due to its capacity to systematically measure and analyze patterns, relationships, and variations within a population, thus making it well-suited for investigating the intricate dynamics between writing anxiety and the distinct stages of the writing process. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire, which was adapted from Cheng's (2004) Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) and supplemented with elements of Oshima & Hogue's (2007) writing process framework). The study was conducted at two well-known senior high schools in Yogyakarta, SMA Negeri 6 and SMA Negeri 9, with three Class X sections from each school participating. The data collection occurred between November 22 and December 7, 2023, during the 2023–2024 academic year, involving a total sample of 202 students.

Instruments

The researcher used a modified questionnaire to assess writing anxiety, incorporating writing process theory. Based on Cheng (2004) Second Language Writing Anxiety Scale, the questionnaire consisted of three sections: "avoidance behavior," "somatic anxiety," and "cognitive anxiety." Additionally, the writing process theory, adapted from Oshima & Hogue (2007), was used to evaluate students' beliefs about their essay writing process, covering prewriting,

organizing, writing, and polishing stages. The final instrument, an 88-item questionnaire, was translated into Indonesian and used a four-point Likert scale for responses.

Table 1. Modified Questionnaire

No	Statements
1.	I feel nervous when I need to find ideas quickly
2.	When planning my writing in a very short time, my heart beats fast.
3.	My heart beats fast when I write English essays in a very limited time.
4.	In a very limited time, my heart still races as I rearrange, check grammar, and punctuation in my English essays.
5.	Sometimes my mind goes blank when I try to think of ideas for my English essays.
6.	In the planning stage, I often feel my mind going blank when I start working on English essays.
7.	When I'm drafting, my mind often goes blank when I try to convey ideas in my English essays.
8.	During the revision stage, I continue to improve grammar, punctuation, and writing techniques even when my mind is blank.
9.	I get shaky or sweaty when I have to write English essays under pressure.
10.	When outlining, sometimes I overcome trembling or sweating when writing English essays under very limited time.
11.	I tremble or sweat when writing rough drafts of English essays in very limited time.
12.	Despite trembling or sweating, I prioritize content, organization, grammar, punctuation, and details during the revision stage.
13.	It's hard for me to think clearly when I'm rushed to come up with ideas.
14.	I have chaotic thoughts when organizing ideas for English essays under very limited time.
15.	My mind gets confused when writing English essays in a very limited time.
16.	I revise content, organization, grammar, and writing techniques despite facing chaotic thoughts when writing English essays in a very limited time.
17.	I often get scared when I have to think of ideas for my English essays with little time.
18.	I often panic when organizing ideas for English essays under very limited time.
19.	I often panic when writing English essays in a very limited time.
20.	Despite panicking, I revise content, organization, grammar, and writing techniques in my English essays.
21.	I freeze up when I have to think of ideas for my English essays out of the blue.
22.	I freeze when suddenly asked to outline English essays.
23.	I freeze when suddenly asked to produce rough drafts.
24.	While feeling stuck when sudden writing tasks arise, I still revise content, organization, grammar, punctuation, and writing techniques.
25.	I feel tense all over when I'm brainstorming ideas for my English essays.
26.	I usually feel my entire body stiff and tense when I outline ideas for English essays.
27.	When I turn ideas into rough drafts for English essays, my whole body often feels tense and stiff.
28.	I usually feel my whole body stiff and tense when I revise my English essay.
29.	Often, I choose to record my thoughts in English when generating ideas.
30.	Often, I choose to organize my ideas in English.
31.	Often, I choose to write rough drafts in English.
32.	Often, I choose to process my thoughts in English when editing.
33.	I usually try to avoid thinking of ideas for my English essays if I can.
34.	I usually try my best to avoid organizing my English essay writing.

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

35.	I usually try my best to avoid writing rough drafts for my English essays.
36.	I usually try my best to avoid revising my English essays.
37.	I do my best to avoid situations where I have to think of ideas in English.
38.	I try my best to avoid situations where I have to organize my ideas in English.
39.	I try my best to avoid situations where I have to create outlines in English.
40.	During the revision stage, I try to avoid situations that require writing in English.
41.	Unless I have no other choice, I won't use English to think of essay ideas.
42.	Unless I have no other choice, I won't use English to organize essay ideas.
43.	Unless I have no choice, I will not use English to write essays.
44.	During the editing stage, I generally tend to avoid using English for writing unless necessary.
45.	Before I start writing, I often find reasons to avoid English essays.
46.	In the organization stage, my instinct is to find reasons when faced with English essays.
47.	At the writing stage, my instinct is to find reasons to avoid when faced with English essays.
48.	The tendency to avoid English essays continues into the revision stage.
49.	I usually look for every opportunity to look for ideas for making English essays outside of class.
50.	I usually look for every opportunity to organize ideas for English writing outside of class.
51.	I usually look for every possible opportunity to write English essays outside of class.
52.	I usually look for every possible opportunity to revise English essays outside of class.
53.	Whenever possible, I will use English to gather ideas in writing essays.
54.	Whenever possible, I will use English to organize ideas for essays.
55.	Whenever possible, I will use English to write essays.
56.	When revising, I prefer to use English to write essays whenever possible.
57.	I'm not nervous when I write down ideas in English.
58.	When organizing ideas in English, I don't get nervous at all.
59.	When writing a draft in English, I don't get nervous at all
60.	While revising my draft in English, I was not nervous at all
61.	I worry when I know my English essay will be graded.
62.	When organizing ideas for English essays, I feel worried and anxious if I know they will be evaluated.
63.	When writing English essays, I feel worried and anxious if I know the essays will be evaluated.
64.	When revising English essays, I feel worried and uncomfortable if I know the essay will be evaluated.
65.	I put aside concerns about my English composition being worse than others at the prewriting stage.
66.	When organizing, I avoid worrying about my English writing being less good than other people's writing.
67.	I write with confidence, not worrying if my English writing is not as good as other people's writing.
68.	At the revision stage, my focus is on improvement, not on worrying about my English essay being less good than other people's essays.
69.	I get anxious about my English grade when I start brainstorming ideas.
70.	When arranging my ideas, I still worry about getting a very low grade for my English essay.
71.	When I write, I'm still afraid of getting very low grades for my English essays.
72.	In the final editing stage, I still worry about the possibility of receiving an inferior grade for my English essays.
73.	I'm already worried about my English grade before I even start writing.
74.	When organizing my ideas, I keep thinking about the possibility of getting a very low grade for my English essay.
75.	When I write, the fear of getting very bad grades for my English essays is on my mind.
76.	During the editing stage, I still fear receiving a very

	poor grade for my English essays.
77.	When gathering ideas, I don't think at all about what other people will think about my English essay.
78.	When organizing my ideas, I don't worry about what other people think about my English composition.
79.	When I write, I don't worry at all about what other people will think about my English composition.
80.	At the completion stage, I still don't care about what other people think about my English essay.
81.	I worry that my English essay might get picked for class discussion.
82.	When organizing my ideas, I worry that my English work will be chosen for class discussion.
83.	When I write, I worry that my English essays will be selected for class discussions.
84.	During the editing stage, I am still afraid my English writing might be chosen for class discussion.
85.	When gathering ideas, I wasn't worried that my English essay would get a very bad grade.
86.	While organizing my ideas, I was not at all afraid that my English essay would be judged very badly.
87.	At the writing stage, I wasn't worried about my English essay getting a very bad grade.
88.	When revising, I am not afraid that my English essay will be judged very badly.

Procedures

This study was carried out in three well-defined phases. The first phase, the preliminary stage, involved identifying the research problem and conducting an extensive review of relevant literature and prior studies. This stage also included initial interviews with English teachers to gain contextual insights. The second phase centered on instrument preparation, during which the research tools were customized and adapted to meet the specific requirements of the study. The third phase encompassed data collection, where information was gathered from the selected institutions using a single questionnaire distributed to students via a WhatsApp group. The study concluded with the data analysis phase, involving a thorough quantitative examination of the collected data.

Data analysis

The data underwent rigorous analysis using Factor Analysis and MANOVA, chosen to align with the research methodology and objectives. First, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to determine if factors related to writing anxiety matched the initial hypotheses (Wang & Wang, 2012). This approach aids in validating the reliability and unidimensionality of measurement models for intangible constructs. The measurement model outlines steps to convert variables into measurable indicators, utilizing a Likert scale for questionnaire responses.

Items that did not meet a minimum factor loading of 0.30 were removed, and modifications were made based on fit indices. Any factor with fewer than three items was excluded from the analysis (Wang & Wang, 2012). Model fit was evaluated using several indices, including the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), with specific thresholds indicating good fit (Morin et al., 2013).

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

Subsequently, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was utilized to evaluate differences in mean scores across multiple groups and to assess the influence of independent variables on a set of dependent variables. This analytical approach specifically focused on examining variations in writing anxiety across distinct school categories and stages of the writing process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dimension of Writing Anxiety at Writing Process Stages

The summary of the CFA results from Amos, including the factors, items, and factor loadings of each factor, is presented in Table 2. It can be seen from the CFA results that all the factor loadings show a significant value. All the factor loadings based on the Amos result were more important than 0.35. Moreover, Table 2 provides an overview of the CFA studies.

Table 2. Summary of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of Writing Anxiety at the Prewriting Stage

No.	Factor Loadings	Types
1.	.448	Somatic
5.	.597	
9.	.698	
13.	.655	
17.	.711	
21.	.591	
25.	.709	Avoidance
33.	.649	
37.	.728	
41.	.703	
45.	.789	Cognitive
57.	.347	
61.	.648	
69.	.808	
73.	.767	
81.	.629	

The tabulated data revealed three aspects of writing anxiety during the prewriting period: cognitive, somatic, and avoidance behavior, consistent with Cheng's (2004) findings. The 3-factor model was found to have a good match with the data after the last round of CFA, which proved that the model was valid ($\chi^2/df=1.761$, CFI=.931, TLI=.920, RMSEA=.062, SRMR=.062). In the final model, 16 items were retained. Items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, and 25 loaded onto factor 1 (somatic); items 33, 37, 41, and 45 onto factor 2 (avoidance) ; and items 57, 61, 69, 73, and 81 onto factor 3 (cognitive).

Table 3. Summary of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of Writing Anxiety at the Organizing Stage

No.	Factor Loadings	Types
2.	.528	Somatic
6.	.691	
10.	.548	

14.	.697	
18.	.720	
22.	.570	
26.	.477	
30.	.344	Avoidance
34.	.598	
38.	.783	
42.	.748	
46.	.790	
62.	.657	Cognitive
70.	.801	
74.	.778	
82.	.740	

In table 3, twenty-two items assessed students' anxiety levels during the organizing stage of writing. The CFA data indicate a good fit for the 3-factor model ($\chi^2/df=1.771$, CFI=.937, TLI=.925, RMSEA=.062, SRMR=.0862). After analysis, 16 items were retained, forming three distinct constructs. All items exhibited factor loadings above the threshold of .30, indicating satisfactory construct validity. The subsequent section elaborates on the interpretation of these factors based on the CFA results.

Writing anxiety manifests itself in three distinct ways: physically, behaviorally (via avoidance), and cognitively (during the planning phase). The three aspects of writing anxiety identified by Cheng (2004) are supported by this discovery. A total of sixteen items were kept in the final model. Item numbers 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, and 26 were loaded into factor 1 (Somatic), whereas item numbers 30, 34, 38, 42, and 46 were loaded into factor 2 (avoidance), and item numbers 62, 70, 74, and 82 were loaded into factor 3 (cognitive).

Table 4. Summary of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of Writing Anxiety at the Writing Stage

No.	Factor Loadings	Types
3.	.539	
7.	.648	
11.	.677	
15.	.697	Somatic
19.	.778	
23.	.623	
27.	.479	
31.	.326	
35.	.685	
39.	.827	Avoidance
43.	.732	
47.	.785	
63.	.582	Cognitive
71.	.863	
75.	.852	
83.	.681	

The factor structure analysis in table 4 revealed that six items had cross-loading issues, so they were excluded. Afterward, the remaining sixteen items were analyzed again. The final confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the 3-factor

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

model's alignment with the data, establishing its conceptual integrity and validity ($\chi^2/df=1.961$, CFI=.928, TLI=.914, RMSEA=.069, SRMR=.0726).

The table data supports three dimensions of writing anxiety: physical discomfort, avoidance behaviors, and mental stress. These align with Cheng's (2004) findings. The final model retained 16 items, with specific items loading onto each of the three factors: Factor 1 (somatic) include items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, Factor 2 (avoidance) include items 31, 35, 39, 43, 47, and Factor 3 (cognitive) include items 63, 71, 75, 83.

Table 5. Summary of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results of Writing Anxiety at the Polishing Stage

No.	Factor Loadings	Types
4.	.304	Somatic
8.	.505	
12.	.692	
16.	.680	
20.	.760	
24.	.733	Avoidance
36.	.538	
40.	.808	
44.	.670	
48.	.760	Cognitive
64.	.669	
72.	.774	
76.	.782	
84.	.770	

Analysis of the factor structure in table 5 revealed that eight initially included items showed signs of cross-loading, requiring their exclusion due to their detrimental effect on model coherence. Subsequently, the remaining fourteen items underwent thorough examination. Following the final Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), the results confirmed the favorable alignment of the 3-factor model with the collected data, strengthening the conceptual robustness and validity of the model ($\chi^2/df=1.457$, CFI=.965, TLI=.957, RMSEA=.048, SRMR=.0784).

According to the data in the table, there are three aspects to writing anxiety: physical discomfort, avoidance, and cognitive stress during revisions. The three aspects of writing anxiety identified by Cheng (2004) are supported by this discovery. In the final model, 14 items were retained in total. Item numbers 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24 were loaded into factor 1 (somatic), whereas item 36, 40, 44, 48 were loaded into factor 2 (avoidance) and item 64, 72, 76, 84 were loaded into factor 3 (cognitive).

Analyzing Writing Anxiety across Four Stages by School Category

The findings indicate variations in the dimensions of writing anxiety among students, contingent upon the categorization of schools, as evidenced by the statistical analysis: $F(3, 198) = 64.47$, Sig .000, $P < .05$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .506$. Subsequent examination revealed notable statistical variances in all dimensions of writing anxiety contingent upon the classification of the educational institution during the prewriting stage. The inquiry scrutinized the disparities

in these factors contributing to writing anxiety across the categories of medium and high school levels.

Table 6. MANOVA Writing Anxiety Dimension at Prewriting Stage by School Category

Multivariate Tests^a

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.986	4662.804 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.014	4662.804 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	70.649	4662.804 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	70.649	4662.804 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
School	Pillai's Trace	.494	64.466 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.506	64.466 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	.977	64.466 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.977	64.466 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000

a. Design: Intercept + School
 b. Exact statistic

The results from the MANOVA in table 6 clearly demonstrate that all employed multivariate tests (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root) yield p-values of 0.000, well below the standard significance threshold of 0.05. This indicates that the type of school plays a critical role in influencing the dependent variables, which likely represent the cognitive, somatic, and avoidance dimensions of writing anxiety at prewriting stage. These results suggest that the educational environment, shaped by factors such as institutional resources, teaching approaches, or performance expectations, has a substantial and measurable impact on how students experience writing anxiety. This confirms and accepts the fifth hypothesis, demonstrating that students' writing anxiety dimensions vary significantly by school type during the prewriting stage

Table 7. MANOVA Writing Anxiety Dimension at Organizing Stage by School Category

Multivariate Tests^a

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.985	4308.258 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.015	4308.258 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	65.277	4308.258 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	65.277	4308.258 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
School	Pillai's Trace	.062	4.396 ^b	3.000	198.000	.005
	Wilks' Lambda	.938	4.396 ^b	3.000	198.000	.005
	Hotelling's Trace	.067	4.396 ^b	3.000	198.000	.005
	Roy's Largest Root	.067	4.396 ^b	3.000	198.000	.005

a. Design: Intercept + School
 b. Exact statistic

The findings in table 7 indicate discernible differences in the dimensions of students' writing anxiety across school categories, as evidenced by a simultaneous analysis yielding $F(3, 198) = 4.39$, $\text{Sig} .005$, $P < .05$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .938$. Further analysis showed statistical differences in two aspects of writing anxiety based on the school category during the organizing stage. The MANOVA

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

results decisively demonstrate that the independent variable "School" exerts a statistically significant multivariate impact on the dependent variables assessed in the study. Each of the four tests (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root) consistently reports significant values with a p-value of 0.005, distinctly below the conventional threshold of 0.05. This confirms a significant difference in the dependent variables across different types of schools. Thus, the hypothesis was accepted.

Table 8. MANOVA Writing Anxiety Dimension at Writing Stage by School Category

<i>Multivariate Tests^a</i>						
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.985	4386.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.015	4386.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	66.469	4386.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	66.469	4386.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
Sekolah	Pillai's Trace	.070	4.983 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Wilks' Lambda	.930	4.983 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Hotelling's Trace	.075	4.983 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Roy's Largest Root	.075	4.983 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002

a. Design: Intercept + Sekolah

b. Exact statistic

The findings in table 8 illuminates stark differences in students' writing anxiety dimensions across educational classifications, as revealed by a concurrent analysis yielding $F(3, 198) = 4.98$, $\text{Sig} = .002$, $P < .05$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .930$. Further analysis showed apparent statistical differences in all aspects of writing anxiety based on the school category during the writing phase. The investigation analyzes variations in these dimensions of writing anxiety between institutions categorized as medium and high, offering insights into the nuanced complexities of academic apprehension.

In the Multivariate Tests, each test statistic (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root) shows a significance (Sig.) value of 0.002. These p-values significantly exceed the conventional threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance, confirming that the influence of "School" on the multivariate array of dependent variables is decisively significant across all assessments.

Table 9. MANOVA Writing Anxiety Dimension at Polishing Stage by School Category

<i>Multivariate Tests^a</i>						
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.990	6220.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.010	6220.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	94.256	6220.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	94.256	6220.922 ^b	3.000	198.000	.000
School	Pillai's Trace	.073	5.201 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Wilks' Lambda	.927	5.201 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Hotelling's Trace	.079	5.201 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002
	Roy's Largest Root	.079	5.201 ^b	3.000	198.000	.002

Multivariate Tests^a

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis	df	Error	df	Sig.
a. Design: Intercept + School							
b. Exact statistic							

This study in table 9 utilizes MANOVA to compare medium and high schools regarding writing anxiety during the polishing phase. The results show significant differences in students' writing anxiety characteristics across school types, with $F(3, 198) = 5.20, p = .002, Wilks' \Lambda = .927$. Further analysis reveals two statistically significant differences in aspects of writing anxiety based on school category during the polishing stage.

The table indicates that all four multivariate tests (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root) consistently show a statistically significant effect of the independent variable "School" on the dependent variables, each with a p-value of 0.002, well below the 0.05 threshold for statistical significance. This highlights the substantial impact of different school environments in educational research and its implications for policy and practice, leading to the acceptance of the hypothesis.

DISCUSSION

Dimension of Writing Anxiety at Writing Process Stages

According to the study, significant disparities exist in students' writing anxiety depending on the type of school they attend. Finding the various aspects of writing anxiety across each stage of the writing process among senior high school pupils in Sleman was accomplished through the use of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). In the end, all four hypotheses that were tested and found to be correct were those that were evaluated using this analytical method.

Factor analysis confirmed the validity of these writing anxiety characteristics across the prewriting, organizing, and writing stages, with 16 out of 22 indicators showing a loading factor > 0.3 . The polishing stage was entered while 14 of 22 indications were validated. Consequently, all hypotheses, encompassing the first, second, third, and fourth, were unequivocally validated. Three separate aspects of writing anxiety emerged from the research, according to this evidence: cognitive anxiety, somatic anxiety, and avoidance behavior. The aforementioned findings substantiate that the construct of writing anxiety was meticulously developed in accordance with the three dimensions outlined in Cheng (2004) theoretical framework, which delineates writing anxiety into somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior. This viewpoint is further substantiated by research conducted by Tsiriatakis et al. (2017), Jebreil et al. (2015), and Rezaei & Jafari (2014) which suggests that a tripartite measurement of students' writing anxiety is essential.

Grasping the complexity of writing anxiety requires recognizing its multidimensional nature, as outlined by Cheng (2004). This approach is critical to understanding how somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior together contribute to the anxiety experienced during writing tasks. Sabti et al. (2019) highlights the interrelation of these dimensions and their negative impacts on writers' self-confidence and motivation. Daly (1978) further explores the influence of self-esteem and personality traits on writing anxiety,

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

indicating that individuals' perceptions of their writing abilities significantly influence their anxiety levels. This complexity calls for a comprehensive assessment approach.

Takahashi (2010) adds to this discourse by underscoring the importance of carefully measuring these dimensions to better understand individuals' experiences with writing anxiety. Such detailed insights facilitate the development of targeted interventions aimed at effectively mitigating writing anxiety. By distinguishing anxiety symptoms across somatic, cognitive, and avoidance dimensions, researchers can dissect the complex nature of writing anxiety and its significant impact on individuals. In light of this, examining the refinement of the writing anxiety questionnaire to integrate aspects of the writing process emerges as an essential endeavor. The assertion by Oshima & Hogue regarding the necessity of four distinct phases in the composition process (prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing) highlights the intricate nature of writing as a form of communication. These stages are foundational to producing transparent, concise, and complete papers (Laplante, 2018), and they significantly contribute to performance improvement, with each stage characterized by unique features that guide the writing process (Leggette et al., 2015).

Furthermore, incorporating the writing process into the assessment of writing anxiety allows for a more comprehensive exploration of how each stage (ranging from the initial planning (prewriting) to the final touches (polishing)) may influence or be influenced by writing anxiety. For instance, anxiety experienced during the prewriting stage may stem from uncertainty about organizing thoughts or apprehensions about meeting the assignment's requirements. By refining the writing anxiety questionnaire to include aspects of the writing process, researchers and educators can identify specific stages where interventions may be most needed to alleviate anxiety and enhance writing performance.

Moreover, the writing process serves as a framework within systems thinking to organize analysis activities and support the effective communication of views and recommendations (Landel & Corle, 2021). This perspective further amplifies the importance of integrating the writing process into measuring writing anxiety. In undertaking this approach, the enhanced questionnaire effectively encapsulates the intricate dimensions of writing anxiety while acknowledging the procedural intricacies inherent in the act of writing. This comprehensive approach enables a more targeted identification of intervention points, facilitating a more effective support system for writers to navigate their anxieties and improve their writing skills. Thus, the refinement of the writing anxiety questionnaire to encompass the writing process reflects a holistic approach to addressing the challenges of writing anxiety, marking a significant advancement in the field of educational research and intervention.

Analyzing Writing Anxiety across Four Stages by School Category

Furthermore, the differences in mean scores of students' writing anxiety (somatic, cognitive, and avoidance) throughout the writing process stages (prewriting, writing, organizing, polishing), specifically comparing school

categories (medium and high). The results indicate notable differences in all three aspects of writing anxiousness (somatic, cognitive, and avoidance) at every stage of the writing process: prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing. These differences are consistently evident across various school categories, indicating a pervasive impact of educational environments on students' writing anxiety throughout the writing process.

During the writing stage, high-level students exhibit significantly lower levels of writing anxiety, including somatic, avoidance, and cognitive aspects, when compared to their lower-school counterparts. Similarly, at the prewriting stage, high-level students also show reduced levels of somatic and cognitive anxiety in comparison to their peers from medium-level schools. This observation aligns with previous research by Ekmekçi (2018), suggesting that students at higher levels typically exhibit heightened proficiency and experience in English writing, resulting in diminished symptoms of anxiety such as panic, palpitations, nervousness, or tension. This divergence in anxiety levels may be attributed to a perceived self-assurance among high school students in navigating the intricacies of the writing process.

The study also revealed that high-level students exhibited a markedly higher tendency towards avoidance behavior in the prewriting stage compared to students from middle-level schools. Research consistently shows that high-level students, particularly those in EFL programs, experience high levels of writing anxiety (Jebreil et al., 2015; Rezaei & Jafari, 2014; Syarifudin, 2020; Wahyuni & Umam, 2022). Additionally, Y. AlKandari (2021) posits that students may experience anxiety when they perceive a discrepancy between their academic or non-academic goals and their perceived capabilities, leading to altered behavioral responses. Insights from Neer (1990) and Booth-Butterfield (1988) further underscore the role of situational factors in influencing anxiety and avoidance behavior, with Neer (1990) suggesting that specific situational factors may mitigate state anxiety, while Booth-Butterfield (1988) underscores the effectiveness of educational strategies in mitigating situational anxiety and tendencies towards avoidance.

Furthermore, anxiety during the prewriting stage predominantly arises within an academic context due to challenges associated with foreign language expression. Intense anxiety during this phase is often correlated with constraints such as limited time and diminished self-confidence, as outlined by Ariyanti (2017). Nevertheless, for students who do not experience nervousness during prewriting, this phenomenon could be attributed to an understanding that prewriting tasks significantly alleviate writing anxiety, particularly among vulnerable students. This form of anxiety is frequently linked to cognitive aspects such as self-efficacy and genuine writing ability, as highlighted by Shang (2013).

Then, across all three dimensions of writing anxiety at both the organizing and polishing stages, middle-proficiency students consistently exhibited higher anxiety levels than high-level students. This finding aligns with existing research indicating that low-proficiency students often experience heightened levels of writing anxiety, attributed to perceptions of lower scholastic

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

competence and creativity, particularly on the English language as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing (Rahim et al., 2016; Shang, 2013).

Moreover, anxiety during the organizing stage is a common experience among students due to the complexity of the task, encompassing cognitive, social, and emotional aspects (Berdanier, 2021). Challenges often arise from inadequate skills in outlining, coherence, and unity, suggesting a need for additional support in developing advanced organizational skills (Tosuncuoglu, 2018). Furthermore, the traditional five-paragraph theme may not always be an effective organizational pattern, highlighting the necessity for enhanced instructional interventions (Haswell, 1986).

Similarly, anxiety during the polishing phase may arise due to the inherent challenges of the task, including making content easy to read while navigating cognitive, social, and emotional factors in the writing process (Berdanier, 2021). Students also face pressure to adhere to rules such as word choice, coherence, cohesion, and grammar, further complicating the task (Astrini et al., 2020). The results highlight the complex characteristics of writing anxiety throughout various phases of the writing process, as well as the significance of customised support approaches to address the diverse needs of students at varying proficiency levels.

On the other hand, this research shows that the most significant anxiety occurs in cognitive anxiety at the stage of the writing process experienced by middle-level students. Several studies indicate that cognitive anxiety significantly influences students' writing abilities, often hindering their performance by causing distress over linguistic skills and grammar usage. As an illustration, Zabihi et al. (2020) investigated the varying effects of cognitive anxiety on tasks involving narrative and argumentative writing, demonstrating that cognitive anxiety negatively affected accuracy and fluency in writing, particularly for argumentative tasks. On the other hand, Khalil (2022) found that employing specific cognitive strategies in writing education can reduce students' anxiety, enhancing their writing performance.

Additionally, the interactions among cognitive, avoidance, and somatic anxieties can complexly affect the development of micro and macro writing skills. Cognitive anxiety, characterized by negative thoughts and concerns about performance, often leads to excessive rumination and difficulty maintaining focus, which can hinder skill development. Avoidance behavior, prompted by anxiety, may reduce opportunities for practice as individuals shy away from writing tasks. Meanwhile, somatic anxiety can degrade performance through physical symptoms like an increased heart rate or sweating (Fox & Houston, 1983; Mulyono et al., 2020).

Furthermore, Eysenck et al. (2007) proposed that anxiety does not necessarily hinder performance if it leads individuals to employ compensatory strategies such as increased effort or additional processing resources. This concept is extended to writing, suggesting that while a balanced level of anxiety can sometimes act as a motivator, it must be carefully managed to avoid detrimental effects on performance. Research also indicates that while moderate anxiety can enhance writing tasks, excessive anxiety can cause significant

stress, particularly in academic settings, thus adversely affecting success (Kaur & J, 2016; Maruthavanan, 2018; Sabti et al., 2019).

Thus, the finding of this study distinguishes itself from previous research by exploring how writing anxiety manifests throughout various phases of the process of writing in two schools with distinct educational outcomes. This nuanced approach provides a deeper exploration of how writing anxiety develops and impacts students, offering enriched insights into specific educational interventions necessary to address this anxiety within varied educational contexts effectively.

CONCLUSIONS

This study sheds light on the multifaceted nature of writing anxiety among senior high school students in Sleman, highlighting the significant influence of educational institution types on anxiety levels. The research validates the cognitive, somatic, and avoidance dimensions of writing anxiety through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), reinforcing Cheng's (2004) theoretical framework. Moreover, statistical analyses, including MANOVA, reveal substantial differences in anxiety levels across prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing phases, underlining the complexity of writing anxiety and the need for a more nuanced approach. Unlike previous studies, this research emphasizes the importance of understanding and addressing writing anxiety at specific stages of the writing process. It integrates rigorous statistical methodologies to explore these dimensions comprehensively, offering a deeper understanding of student writing challenges.

The findings align with existing theoretical frameworks while revealing unique phase-specific variations in writing anxiety that have not been thoroughly explored in earlier studies. For example, anxiety levels may peak at distinct writing phases depending on the category of the school. This underscores the importance of considering both universal patterns and context-specific factors in addressing writing anxiety. Based on these insights, future research should expand measurement tools to encompass diverse educational contexts and larger student populations. Additionally, exploring the interplay between institutional characteristics and demographic factors could provide a broader understanding of writing anxiety dynamics. Educators and policymakers should leverage these insights to develop targeted interventions, such as stage-specific workshops or personalized mentoring, to reduce anxiety, build student confidence, and improve writing proficiency.

AUTHORS' STATEMENTS

Nurin Naufina contributed by sourcing materials, analyzing the data, and drafting the findings and discussion sections. **Nur Hidayanto Pancoro Setyo Putro** provided advice on data collection, meticulously proofread the drafts, and thoroughly cross-checked all aspects of the work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the teachers and students of SMA 9 and SMA 6 for their participation in this research. Their support and cooperation were invaluable to the smooth progress and success of this study.

REFERENCES

- AlKandari, N. Y. (2021). Students Anxiety Experiences in Higher Education Institutions. *Anxiety Disorders - The New Achievements*, undefined-undefined. <https://doi.org/10.5772/INTECHOPEN.92079>
- Alshammari, S. (2020). "Writing to Learn or Learning to Write". A Critical Review of "English as a Foreign Language" (EFL) Teaching Practices in Writing in Saudi Universities. *Research in Education and Learning Innovation Archives*, 24, 1. <https://doi.org/10.7203/realia.24.15867>
- Ariyanti. (2017). Foreign language anxiety in academic writing. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.815>
- Astrini, N. W. F., Ratminingsih, N. M., & Utami, I. G. A. L. P. (2020). The Model of Strategies Employed by English Teachers in Teaching Writing Skill in National Plus Schools. *Journal of Education Research and Evaluation*, 4(1), 59–62. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JERE>
- Berdanier, C. G. P. (2021). Linking current and prospective engineering graduate students' writing attitudes with rhetorical writing patterns. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 110(1), 207–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JEE.20368>
- Booth-Butterfield, S. (1988). Instructional interventions for reducing situational anxiety and avoidance. *Communication Education*, 37(3), 214–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378721>
- 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>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Daly, J. A. (1978). Writing apprehension and writing competency. *Journal of Educational Research*, 72(1), 10–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1978.10885110>
- Ekmekçi, E. (2018). Exploring Turkish EFL Students' Writing Anxiety. In *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal* (Vol. 18, Issue 1).
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336–353. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336>
- Fox, J. E., & Houston, B. K. (1983). Distinguishing Between Cognitive and Somatic Trait and State Anxiety in Children. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Vol. 45, Issue 4).
- Haswell, R. H. (1986). *The Organization of Impromptu Essays* (Vol. 37, Issue 4).
- He, W., Li, S., & Zhang, Y. (2023). An Investigation of Chinese High School Students' EFL English Writing Anxiety and Performance. In *Proceedings of the 2022 4th International Conference on Literature, Art and Human Development (ICLAHD 2022)* (pp. 139–145). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-97-8_18

- Ipek, O., & Karabuga, H. (2022). The Effect of Four-Square Writing Method on Writing Anxiety of Learners of Turkish as a Foreign Language: A Mixed Method Study. *International Education Studies*, 15(5), 132–145.
- Jebreil, N., Azizifar, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). Investigating the Effect of Anxiety of Male and Female Iranian EFL Learners on their Writing Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 185, 190–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.360>
- Karahan, B. U. (2021). The Relationship between Secondary School Students' Writing Attitudes and Anxiety and Writing Disposition. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 9(2), 136. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.9n.2p.136>
- Kaur, G., & J, S. K. (2016). Test Anxiety and Academic Self-Concept of Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0304.009>
- Khalil, E. R. (2022). The Effect of Cognitive Strategies on Iraqi EFL College Students' Writing Anxiety. *Journal of the College of Education for Women*, 33(4), 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v33i4.1633>
- Kurniawati, K., & Anam, S. (2023). The Effect of Indonesian EFL Senior High School Students' Anxiety on Their Writing Achievement in Explanation Text. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing Dan Sastra*, 7(2), 362. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v7i2.47997>
- Landel, R., & Corle, J. (2021). The Writing Process in Systems Thinking. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2974891>
- Laplante, P. A. (2018). The Writing Process. *Technical Writing*, 47–74. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429467394-3>
- Leggette, H. R., Rutherford, T., Dunsford, D., & Costello, L. (2015). A review and evaluation of prominent theories of writing. *Journal of Applied Communications*, 99(3). <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.1056>
- Lestari, D. E., Loeneto, B., & Ihsan, D. (2019). The Correlation among English Learning Anxiety, Speaking and Writing Achievements of Senior High School Students. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(2), 135. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v4i2.137>
- Majidifar, S. (2015). The Relationship among Test Anxiety, Self-Efficacy, and Writing Performance Among Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6), 323. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20150306.11>
- Maruthavanan, M. (2018). A STUDY ON ANXIETY LEVEL OF STUDENTS WHO ARE STUDYING IN 10 TH STANDARD IN MADURAI DISTRICT, INDIA. 6, 271–274. www.impactjournals.us
- Min, L. S., & Rahmat, N. (2014). English language writing anxiety among final year engineering undergraduates in University Putra Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(4), 102–106.
- Morin, A. J. S., Marsh, H., & Nagengast, B. (2013). Exploratory structural equation modeling: An introduction. In *Structural equation modeling: A second course*. CT: IAP.
- Motallebzadeh, K., Ahmadi, F., & Hosseinnia, M. (2018). Relationship between 21st Century Skills, Speaking and Writing Skills: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(3), 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11319a>

How to Cite (APA Style):

Naufina, N and Putro, NHPS. (2025). Senior high school students' writing anxiety: A writing process theory. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature, and Culture*, 10 (1), 16-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.10.1.16-35>

- Mulyono, H., Liestyana, A. R., Warni, S., Suryoputro, G., & Ningsih, S. K. (2020). INDONESIAN STUDENTS' ANXIETY TO WRITE IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACROSS GENDER AND EDUCATIONAL LEVELS. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 78(2), 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/20.78.249>
- Neer, M. R. (1990). Reducing situational anxiety and avoidance behavior associated with classroom apprehension. *Southern Journal of Communication*, 56(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417949009372815>
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing Lvl. 3*. Pearson Education.
- Pratama, D. M. (2012). *Teaching writing: A Handbook of teaching productive skills / Melgis dilkawatry pratama | Perpustakaan UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*. Rizqy Grafika. <https://inlislite.uin-suska.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=172>
- Pratiwi, T. L. (2021). EFL college students writing anxiety of English language education at Universitas Internasional Batam. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 100–112. <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v10i2.42908>
- Rahim, S. A., Jaganathan, P., Sepora, T., & Mahadi, T. (2016). An Investigation on the Effects of Writing Anxiety on Readiness of Writing among Low Proficiency Undergraduates. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*. <http://ijleal.ump.edu.my/>
- Rasuan, Z., & Wati, L. (2021). Students' Writing Anxiety and Its Correlation with Their Writing Performance. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, 1(1), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.32923/eedj.v1i1.1773>
- 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. *SAGE Open*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019894289>
- Sadewi, N. K. A. D., Mahardika, I. G. N. A. W., & Mahendra, M. W. (2024). Challenges Faced by English Education Students in Mastering Vocabulary Through Online Learning Systems. *Journal of English Education Program*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.26418/jleep.v5i2.69604>
- Salem, A. A. M. S., & Al Dyiar, M. A. (2014). Writing Anxiety as a Predictor of Writing Self-Efficacy in English for Special Education Arab Learners. *International Education Studies*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n6p128>
- Shang, H.-F. (2013). FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS WRITING ANXIETY. In *International Journal of English Language Teaching* (Vol. 1, Issue 1). www.ea-journals.org
- Syarifudin. (2020). *Survey on EFL Students' Writing Anxiety: Level, Types, and Causes*. 4(2). <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>
- Takahashi, A. (n.d.). *Foreign Language Writing Apprehension: Its Relationships with Motivation, Self-perceived Target Language Ability, and Actual Language Ability*.
- Tosuncuoglu, I. (2018). Place of critical thinking in EFL. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(4), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.5430/IJHE.V7N4P26>

- Tsiriotakis, I. K., Vassilaki, E., Spantidakis, I., & Stavrou, N. A. M. (2017). The examination of the effects of writing strategy-based procedural facilitative environments on students' english foreign language writing anxiety levels. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7(JAN). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02074>
- Wahyuni, S., & Umam, C. (2022). An analysis on writing anxiety of Indonesian EFL college learners. *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 4(1), 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v4i1.333>
- Wang, J., & Wang, X. (2012). *Structural equation modeling*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118356258>
- Wern, T. C., & Rahmat, N. H. (2021). AN INVESTIGATIVE STUDY ON THE TYPES AND CAUSES OF ESL WRITING ANXIETY: A CASE STUDY OF LEARNERS FROM A CHINESE INDEPENDENT MIDDLE SCHOOL. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i3.3553>
- Wingate, U., & Harper, R. (2021). Completing the first assignment: A case study of the writing processes of a successful and an unsuccessful student. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100948>
- YAYLI, D., & GENÇ, E. (2019). The Second Language Writing Anxiety: The Perceived Sources and Consequences. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 45(45), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.9779/PUJE.2018.231>
- Zabihi, R., Mousavi, S. H., & Salehian, A. (2020). The differential role of domain-specific anxiety in learners' narrative and argumentative L2 written task performances. *Current Psychology*, 39(4), 1438–1444. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S12144-018-9850-6/METRICS>

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright©2025. **Naufina** and **Putro** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.