

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES



**THE IMPACT OF TEACHING CLUSTERING PREWRITING STRATEGIES
ON WRITING SELF- EFFICACY AMONG EFL LEARNERS IN TURKEY**

MASTER'S THESIS

Randa AL SAMMAN

Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program

SEPTEMBER, 2021

T.C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE STUDIES



**THE IMPACT OF TEACHING CLUSTERING PREWRITING STRATEGIES
ON WRITING SELF- EFFICACY AMONG EFL LEARNERS IN TURKEY**

MASTER'S THESIS

Randa AL SAMMAN

(Y1812.020024)

Department of English Language and Literature
English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Eyyüp Yaşar KÜRÜM

SEPTEMBER, 2021

APPROVAL FORM



DEDICATION

I hereby declare with respect that the study “The Impact of Teaching Clustering Prewriting Strategies on Writing Self- Efficacy among EFL Learners in Turkey”, which I submitted as a Master thesis, is written without any assistance in violation of scientific ethics and traditions in all the processes from the Project phase to the conclusion of the thesis and that the works I have benefited are from those shown in the Bibliography. (03/09/2021)

Randa AL SAMMAN

FOREWORD

Firstly, I am grateful to God for granting me the good health, knowledge and wellbeing that were necessary to accomplish this research.

Secondly, I would like to express my faithful gratitude to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Eyyüp Yaşar Kurum for his endless support, patience, motivation and massive knowledge. His supportive guidance helped me all through the process of writing the research. I could not have the opportunity to complete my graduate study without his sincere support.

Thirdly, I am also thankful to the English Language and Literature Department at Istanbul Aydin University. I have had the privilege to be taught by a variety of brilliant professors that have made a lasting impact on my academic life. Thank you for your tireless work to see that your students succeed and are prepared for the life outside the classroom. I will cherish the time I have spent as a student under your instruction at Istanbul Aydin University.

Furthermore, I would like to express gratitude to all of the Social Science faculty members for their help and support. They have been extremely helpful in the development of this work.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the administration and the English teachers of the English preparatory school of Istanbul Aydin University, for providing me with all the support and essential facilities to conduct this research.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my mother for her endless support and guidance throughout my life as my first English teacher. I wish also to express my thanks to my father for encouraging me through -out my educational journey to fulfill my goals. I'm so thankful for having such great role model parents.

Last but not the least; I would like to thank my brothers and sisters for supporting me spiritually throughout writing this thesis, I will always be indebted.

September, 2021

Randa AL SAMMAN

THE IMPACT OF TEACHING CLUSTERING PREWRITING STRATEGIES ON WRITING SELF- EFFICACY AMONG EFL LEARNERS IN TURKEY

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of teaching prewriting strategies on improving the writing self-efficacy of EFL learners while doing writing activities. This research was conducted on English preparatory level students in Turkey through an 8 - week period of time. A mixed research method is used in this research. The quantitative research method was based on the writing self-efficacy scale while the qualitative research method was done through the writing assessment rubric, and it was used to examine the students' essays. Participants were chosen from the preparatory school of a foundation university where the study was conducted. Accordingly, they were divided into two groups, 20 students within the experimental group and 20 students within the control group. Each group was taught by different teachers. The experimental group students were taught the prewriting strategy of clustering while the control group students were not. As this study was conducted to examine the impact of using the prewriting strategy of clustering on students' writing self- efficacy, the students responded to the writing self-efficacy scale before and after writing their essays. There was no significant difference in the writing performance of the experimental group compared to the performance of the control group. Accordingly, the researcher found that the use of the clustering prewriting strategy in particular did not influence the writing self-efficacy among students. Thus, the researcher concluded that EFL students in both groups had similar levels of writing self-efficacy.

Keywords: Writing self- efficacy, essay writing, prewriting strategies.

TÜRKİYE'DE EFL ÖĞRENCİLERİNDE KÜMELEME ÖN YAZMA STRATEJİLERİNİN ÖĞRETİLMESİNİN YAZMA ÖZYETERLİLİĞİNE ETKİSİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada araştırmacı yazma etkinlikleri yaparken EFL öğrencilerinin yazma öz-etkinliğini iyileştirmede ön yazma stratejilerinin öğretilmesinin etkisini araştırdı. Bu araştırma özel bir üniversitenin İngilizce hazırlık düzeyindeki öğrencileri ile 8 haftalık bir sürede yapılmıştır. Bu araştırmada karma bir araştırma yöntemi kullanıldı. Nicel bilgiler öz-yeterlilik ölçeği ile toplandı. Nitel bilgiler ise yazma değerlendirme yönergesine dayalı olarak öğrencilerin yazdıkları kompozisyonlar incelenerek elde edildi. Katılımcılar çalışmanın yapıldığı bir vakıf üniversitesinden seçildi. Buna göre, deney grubu içinde 20 öğrenci ve kontrol grubu içinde 20 öğrenci olmak üzere katılımcılar iki gruba ayrıldılar. Her gruba farklı öğretmen ders verdi. Deney grubu öğrencilerine kümelenme ön yazma stratejisi öğretilirken, kontrol grubu öğrencilerine ise böyle bir öğretim verilmedi. Bu çalışma, kümelenme ön yazma stratejisinin öğrencilerin öz-etkinliği üzerindeki etkisini incelemek için yapıldığından öğrencilerin kompozisyonlarını yazmadan önce ve sonra yazma öz-etkinlik ölçeğine yanıt vermeleri istenmiştir. Çalışmadan elde edilen verilere göre kontrol grubunun performansı ile deney grubunun yazma performansı arasında anlamlı bir fark görülememiştir. Buna göre, araştırma özellikle kümeleme ön yazma stratejisinin kullanılmasının öğrencilerdeki yazma öz-etkinliğini etkilemediğini ortaya koymuştur. Bu veriler her iki gruptaki öğrencilerin benzer düzeyde yazma öz- etkinliğine sahip olduğu sonucuna varılmasına neden olmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yazma öz yeterliliği, kompozisyon yazma, ön yazma stratejileri.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DEDICATION.....	ii
FOREWORD.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background of the Study.....	1
B. Statement of the Problem and Purpose.....	3
C. Research Questions.....	3
D. Significance of the Study.....	4
E. Definitions of Key Terms.....	4
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
A. Theories of Writing.....	6
B. Writing Strategies.....	10
C. Writing Self-Efficacy.....	11
1. Definition of Self-Efficacy.....	11
2. Sources of Writing Self-Efficacy.....	12
III. METHODOLOGY.....	15
A. Nature of the Research.....	15
B. Research Design and Methodology.....	16
1. Research Problem.....	16
C. Research Context.....	16
D. Participants.....	17
E. Sampling.....	17
F. Data Collection Instruments.....	18
1. Writing Self-Efficacy Scale.....	18

2. Pilot Study.....	20
3. Writing Task.....	20
G. Data Analysis.....	21
H. Limitations of the Study	22
IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSION	24
A. The Structure of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale	24
B. Findings from the Pretest Results of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale	25
C. Findings from the Posttest Results of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale.....	28
D. Findings from the Writing Assessment Rubric:	32
1. The Results of Experimental Group’s Essays according to the Rubric.....	33
2. The Results of Control Group’s Essays according to the Rubric	36
V. CONSLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
A. Conclusions.....	41
1. The Commonly Used Writing Self-Efficacy Strategies among EFL Learners ...	41
2. The Influence of Clustering Prewriting Strategies on the Students’ Generation of Ideas	42
3. Writing Self-Efficacy Challenges Faced by EFL Learners.....	42
B. Recommendations.....	44
VI. REFERENCES	45
APPENDICES	56
RESUME.....	61

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: The Subcategories of the Questionnaire	19
Table 2: The Statistical Pre-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale	25
Table 3: Pre-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale	26
Table 4: The Statistical Post-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale.....	29
Table 5: Post-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale.....	30
Table 6: The Assessment of the Experimental Group's Essays Based on the Rubric ..	34
Table 7: The Experimental Group's Teacher Assessment of Essays Based on the Rubric	35
Table 8: The Assessment of the Control Group's Essays Based on the Rubric	36
Table 9: The Results of the Experimental and Control Groups' Essays Based on the Rubric	38

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the study. It will represent the following sections: background of the study, purpose of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, and the definition of key terms.

A. Background of the Study

Language is a method of communication and a system of different sounds that have several meanings (Ellis, 2012). It is a natural endowment which is obtained conventionally (Saussure, 1998). In terms of language efficiency, it is a distinctive feature for humans in which it permeates deeply to their conception in correspondence to their biological nature (Chomsky, 2009). Therefore, mastering certain skills in language especially reading, writing and speaking is an important element to enhance one's communicative skills. In addition, learning such skills enhances the individual's role in the society since knowing these skills enables people to gain more information and strengthen their abilities (Pierson, 2014). Besides communicating with other people and understanding a language vary according to the variation of contexts in which a certain expression can be used (Bahaziq, 2016).

Writing is the process used to transfer information in the form of symbols in which it can be understandable (Bright, 1996). It is considered as a difficult task because it requires several skills which have to be learned. The difficulty of the writing skill rises as it relates to one's cognitive abilities (VanKooten, 2016). Therefore, teaching writing demands the application of various approaches because written and spoken languages differ in many aspects such as pointedness, intensity, objectivity, arrangement, the use of standard language, and permanence (Penny, 1998). According to Chafe and Tannen (1987) "Language form can be collected, stored, examined, manipulated, and analyzed in ways that were impossible for spoken language" (p.383). The writing teaching approaches include traditional instruction and writing workshop. The traditional instruction focuses mainly on the

role of the teacher. The teacher determines instruction and provides it to the whole class based on the textbooks and worksheets. Students do not choose topics as the teacher is the audience of their performance. On the other hand, writing workshop involves the teacher's determination about the students' needs by providing a mini lesson to the whole class or to small groups. Students have the opportunity to choose their own topics and they can work independently, with peers or with their teachers throughout the writing process (McCarthy & Sun, 2011).

Self-efficacy is defined as the individuals' beliefs in their ability to behave in a specific manner which enables them to accomplish a certain task (Bandura, 1994). Moreover, self-efficacy influences how a person performs a task and how he is motivated to achieve a certain goal (Iroegbu, 2015). In this sense, self-efficacy is a doctrine which is influenced by the teacher-student interaction. As a result, teachers can improve students' writing self-efficacy through the use of certain intrusions during classroom instruction; and that would excess learning achievement (Jackson, 2002).

Therefore, several previous studies have explored the areas of writing strategies and writing self-efficacy. In such a study, the sources of beliefs regarding writing self-efficacy among students of elementary, middle and high school students were investigated. The study revealed that elementary students had the highest rate of self-efficacy (Pajares, Johnson & Usher, 2007). Another study was done on the effect of thinking, pairing and sharing techniques on the achievement of written descriptive essays (Sumarsih & Sanjaya, 2013). The study results emphasized the effectiveness of using the techniques of thinking, pairing and sharing in the process of writing. Moreover, a study in Iran involved the area of teaching prewriting strategies and its impact on the quality of EFL writing (Shafiee, Koosha & Afghari, 2015). The results of this study indicated that teaching prewriting strategies has a positive effect on the quantum of the written texts in accordance to the number of ideas represented in the text.

Within the Turkish context (Demir, 2018), the focus was on developing writing self-efficacy by using writing strategies. The main result of the study is that writing self-efficacy is affected by the awareness levels of writing strategies. In addition, female students had higher levels of writing self-efficacy because of their increased knowledge of writing strategies.

B. Statement of the Problem and Purpose

Writing is an important language skill which receives a lot of attention by English language teachers. Students' ability to write is affected by two main factors which are: knowledge and the personal beliefs about their ingenuity to accomplish a task successfully (Corkett, Hatt & Benevides, 2011). In this realm, (Pajares & Valiante, 1997) focused on the impact of self-efficacy on writing by considering the factor of gender. They found out that self-efficacy had an impact on writing performance especially among girls. Within the Turkish educational context, it was revealed by Solak & Bayar (2015) that attention should be paid on the improvement of the language skills, including reading, writing, speaking and listening instead of only focusing on grammar. According to Ekoc (2019), students' writing difficulty is related to a certain weakness in the teaching process which is the teachers' negative behavior in the classroom. In addition, the lack of writing confidence is associated with the teachers' negative comments and time deficiency (Kırmızı & Kırmızı, 2015). In this realm, the serious concern is in the students' self-confidence to generate ideas before they start writing which can be acquired from their instructors. In addition, it is important to shed light on the levels of students' writing self-efficacy by considering the effects of using prewriting strategies.

Thus, the aim of this study is to find out about how teaching clustering as a prewriting strategy affects students' writing self-efficacy levels. Accordingly, within the research context at the foundation university where the present study was conducted, it is important for students to learn how to cluster their ideas as a prewriting phase to improve their writing self-efficacy.

C. Research Questions

Based on what has been said so far, this study seeks to find answers to the following questions:

- Which writing self-efficacy strategies are commonly used among the Turkish EFL learners?
- How does teaching prewriting strategies of clustering influence the students' generation of ideas in their written texts?

- What challenges do learners face to become more efficacious in writing essays?

The hypothesis of this current research is that teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering has a positive impact on EFL learners writing self- efficacy.

D. Significance of the Study

Self-efficacy is an important element in language teaching. It is an inseparable skill from other language skills since it has a significant impact on written and oral language production. Moreover, writing is an essential element in the language since it is a complex task that requires specific skills (Jones, 2007). By considering each language element, one can notice that self-efficacy and the production of written texts are correlated terms that influence each other. Therefore, enhancing self-efficacy in writing has been receiving good attention recently.

Regarding this, teachers need to improve students' achievement in writing through careful guidance in the EFL classroom setting (Corkett, Hatt & Benevides, 2011). Based on what has been mentioned, it is important to conduct this study to examine the impact of teaching the clustering prewriting strategy on writing self-efficacy especially for university students learning English language at the preparatory level in Turkey. Furthermore, conducting this research is important for the present researcher since it has been found that mastering prewriting strategies especially clustering will enhance the students' techniques in writing. In addition, mastering the prewriting strategy of clustering will improve the students' generation of ideas. The study aims to enhance the students' self-efficacy in writing. Moreover, the study seeks to clarify the difference between EFL learners who acquire prewriting strategies and those who do not in terms of self-efficacy development.

E. Definitions of Key Terms

Writing Self-efficacy: It refers to the self-efficacy in writing and is defined as the evaluation and assessment of the personal ability to produce a written text (McCarthy, Meier & Rinderer, 1985).

Essay writing: It is defined as the pragmatic composition of words regarding a specific subject which aims to analyze, describe and clarify it and it includes an introduction, body and conclusion (Fleming, 2018).

Prewriting strategies: It is a term defined as the art of inventing a new written work, and it is a task used to enable the writer to generate ideas through determining the purpose and preparing to write. It involves several activities such as clustering, brainstorming, outlining and freewriting (Nordquist, 2019).



II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction English language learning has been taking a good attention all over the world for many decades. In some countries people learn English as a second language (ESL) since English is used as a means of communication in daily life in those countries, such as India, Pakistan and Nigeria. On the other hand, in many other countries, people learn English as a foreign language (EFL) as is the case in the Turkish context. Within the Turkish educational context, people used to learn English in the secondary level, while in 1997, English language learning started in the primary level (Braine, 2005).

By diving deeply into the particular issue, Kizildag (2009) revealed that English language teachers in Turkey lacked the efficiency in teaching listening and speaking skills compared to grammar and reading due to the lack of supporting materials such as CDs, computers and projectors. Besides, the lack of teaching proficiency had been associated with the poor design of the textbooks. In her study, Yıldız (2020) stated that ideal language learning setting has to be supported with technological equipment in addition to the flexible uncrowded learning classroom.

On the other hand, Solak & Bayar (2015) stated that the most important challenge facing foreign language learners in Turkey is learning grammar in particular rather than learning the four skills of English language. In addition, they shed light on the importance of teaching English on practical basis rather than theoretical basis. Therefore, in the following sections, this literature review will handle the subject under three topics namely: theories of writing, writing strategies and writing self-efficacy.

A. Theories of Writing

Writing is described by Susser (1994) as a cognitive process which is based on recurrence as the writer generates ideas through several stages of prewriting, writing, revising and editing till reaching the level of satisfaction. Furthermore, Clark (2014) defines writing as the thinking procedure in which learners are allowed to convert

their perceptions of the surrounding environment into written expressions (Clark, 2014).

Graham (1997) stated that the process of writing could be accomplished through four main areas. The first area includes the awareness of writing theme. The second discusses the proficiency in text creation. The third area is concerned about the learners' enthusiasm to write about a certain topic and the fourth area includes the use of certain strategies to accomplish specific goals (Graham, 1997).

Raimes (1991) offers three approaches to writing which include: *genre approach*, *process approach* and *product approach*. The purpose of the *genre approach* is to focus on the role of the student as a reader. On the other hand, *the process approach* sheds light on the role of the student as a writer which means that writing is a learner centered task. Accordingly, the process approach is in line with the theory of constructivism which claims that each learner has control over the writing process. For the *product approach*, it focuses on the production of written texts from a linguistic point of view (Raimes, 1991).

As for the aforementioned approaches to writing, the Genre Approach is a social and cultural action which focuses particularly on the language of the text as well as its discourse community. Therefore, the explicit knowledge of discourse should be taught within classrooms of language (Hasan & Akhand, 2010). Similarly, the Genre Approach presents an apparent conception of the target genre's structure which could be written in various ways based on the various communicative contexts (Huang & Zhang, 2019). Accordingly, the Genre Approach examines the linguistic relationship between the writer and the reader in addition to the context and purpose of the written text.

For the process and product approaches, Steele (2004) defined each of them through specific stages. The Process Approach includes eight stages. The first stage is the Brainstorming which is about the generation of ideas. The second stage is the Planning stage which requires students to evaluate the ideas through exchanging them. The third stage is Mind mapping where students are expected to write their ideas sequentially in a well- organized manner. The fourth stage is the stage of writing the first draft which can be done either in groups or in pairs. The fifth stage is Peer feedback where students improve each other's work through the process of

evaluation and reading. The sixth stage is the stage of editing the drafts according to the suggested peer feedback. In the seventh stage, students are required to write the final drafts. In the eighth stage, teachers evaluate students' work by providing feedback (Steele, 2004). Some researchers such as Scott and Vitale (2003) name the last stage as "publishing". Publishing is the final stage of writing in which writers submit their essays to the publisher. Based on the abovementioned information, the main advantage of the Process Approach is that teachers provide students with feedback several times throughout the process of writing (Myles, 2002). In the Process Approach learners examine their personal writing abilities and to develop their ideas in order to write the final product as teachers do not give feedback anymore (Sutikno, 2008).

The Product Approach consists of four stages. In stage one, students get introduced into different genres; and they study the features and requirements of each genre in depth. In stage two, students practice each genre separately, and they are given different topics on which to write. The third stage is the organization of ideas; and this is the most important stage in the product approach as students realize the importance of organizing ideas in a suitable manner. In the fourth stage, students start to practice writing individually and they use the previously taught skills, lexicon, and composition to complete the final product (Steele, 2004). Tangpermoon (2008) states that the Product Approach concerns the students' ability to write grammatically correct structures in which they start from the pre-writing stage and end by the stage of composition. On the other hand, Nunan (1999) claims that the Product Approach sheds light on the final written text as it concerns the students' willingness to write coherent texts.

Flower and Hayes (1981) viewed writing from the cognitive theory's point of view. According to them, the theory of cognitive process consists of four basic components. The first component describes writing as a group of peculiar thinking procedures which writers regulate through composition. The second component states that writing is organized in which all components are ranked above each other. For the third component, it states that writing is a process which has a certain goal. During the act of composition, writers arrange ideas by creating a hierarchy of goals which lead the process of writing. In the fourth component, according to Flower & Hayes, it is described that there are two ways in which writers originate their

objectives. The first way is by creating the main goals and advocating their subheadings in order to shape their aim. The second way is by producing their most important main goals according to what they have studied through writing (Hayes & Flower, 1981). According to Flower and Hayes (1981) the cognitive approach views writing as a mental activity which demands sufficient knowledge. Furthermore, Hayes (2000) suggested a new model of the cognitive theory which included two categories. The first category is task environments in which teachers' comments are considered carefully which has an impact on the students' writing performance as well as their cognitive features. The second category is the physical environment which involves the students' cognitive abilities such as memory processing and motivation to writing.

According to Richards and Schmidt (2010), writing can be defined as a combination of processes which require certain strategies and procedures that are used while writing on a topic. Therefore, the process of writing includes the stages of planning, drafting, and revising (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Planning is defined as the process of organizing ideas based on the requirements of a certain writing assignment. Drafting could be defined as the initial stage of the process of writing in which writers translate their ideas into visual words on a paper (Kinneavy, 1992). Revising is defined as the stage of writing in which the writer checks the content's appropriateness for the reader's perception (Brown & Hood, 1989).

Silva (1990) claims that an effective writing process has four main approaches. The first approach is the controlled approach which is considered as the initial stage of the writing process which is drawn from two basic concepts, the structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology. The concept of structural linguistics explains language as a form of speech. On the other hand, the concept of behaviorist psychology emphasizes that the process of language acquisition could be accomplished through repetition. The second approach is the current traditional rhetoric which is impacted by the theory of contrastive rhetoric. It was brought up in the mid-sixties. It emphasizes the difference between controlled and free writing more than focusing on the composition of grammatical sentences. Kaplan's theory of contrastive rhetoric defines rhetoric as the methodology used for arranging syntactic units into greater patterns (Kaplan, 1966). The third approach is the process approach, which is about the improvement of functional strategies of writing.

Finally, the fourth approach is the social approach is the fourth approach which concerns the writing process as part of socialization with the community of discourse (Silva, 1990).

B. Writing Strategies

Writing strategies involve eight main stages: planning, global planning, rehearsing, repeating, pre-reading, questioning, revising and editing. In the planning stage writers make a decision about what to write. The global planning stage is the overall organization of a text. The rehearsing stage is the writer's trial of ideas. In the repeating stage, writers express their enthusiasm to continue writing. In the pre-reading stage, writers check what they have already written while in the stage of questioning they categorize and rectify their ideas. In the last two stages, revising and editing, writers are responsible for the overall product in terms of illustrating meaning and validating spelling and syntax (Arndt, 1987).

According to Heyland (2008), writing is the process of creating meaning in which writers display their ideas and rearrange them in an understandable manner. Therefore, teachers need to develop their students' knowledge by helping them to enhance their vocabulary knowledge as well as their cognitive schema. Teachers may enhance schema development through several steps.

Firstly, teachers can help students to generate ideas through implementing a set of pre-writing strategies such as the pre-writing strategy of clustering, brainstorming and free writing. Secondly, teachers can brainstorm ideas with their students and outline them chronologically. Outlining is the most effective writing strategy as it improves writing performance through enhancing cognitive abilities. Thirdly, students could be encouraged to write by being engaged in challenging writing activities. Fourthly, teachers could give students the opportunity to write several drafts and provide them with feedback as well as encouraging peer feedback. Finally, teachers could only provide official corrections on the final drafts (Heyland, 2008).

According to the aforementioned information, people can generate ideas related to a certain topic by starting from the prewriting stage. Within the prewriting stage, students learn several prewriting strategies such as, brainstorming, clustering, outlining and freewriting. This research concerns the prewriting strategy of

clustering. By getting deeper into the particular issue, the prewriting strategy of clustering was initially developed by Gabriel Rico (1983). According to him, "Clustering is a simple technique which lifts the familiar concept of brainstorming into a new dimension. Instead of brainstorming by word or phrase association in a linear fashion, or in a random fashion, students are shown how to cluster by centering the key word or phrase, circling it, then allowing each idea to run its course in a line of related words or ideas. When a new idea occurs, the student begins again at the center and follows the course of associations for this idea" (Rico & Clagett, 1983, p. 27). The advantage of applying the strategy of clustering is that it provides a wide arrangement of ideas instead of writing them in a linear form (Rico, 1983).

Within this area of research, Steel and Steele (1991) found that applying the prewriting strategy of clustering allowed each individual to participate efficiently in the process of thinking. In addition, they concluded that students began to share their ideas freely after executing the clustering prewriting strategy.

Inal (2014) discussed the impact of the pre-writing strategy of clustering on Turkish students' writing achievement as well as on their writing attitude. The results indicated that clustering has a positive impact on students' attitude in writing (Inal, 2014). Similarly, Ghufroon (2014) conducted a study on the effect of prewriting strategy of clustering on improving students' skills while writing descriptive skills. The results of this study indicated that students' writing skills improved when the prewriting strategy of clustering was used.

C. Writing Self-Efficacy

1. Definition of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, first proposed by Bandura (1977), is one of the aspects of Social Cognitive Theory, a paradigm of psychological behavior. Self-efficacy is defined as the people's opinion about their ability to perform a certain task (Anthony Jr, 2012). According to the Social Cognitive Theory, people's behavior is influenced by the social factors as well as the environmental factors (Glanz, Rimer, & Viswanath, 2008).

Writing self-efficacy can be defined as the students' confidence in their abilities to accomplish an English writing task in a successful manner; the task includes correct grammatical structure of sentences, correct punctuation and good composition (Bandura, 1994). Hashemnejad, Zoghi & Amini, 2014 defines writing self-efficacy as the students' confidence in their ability to succeed in performing an English writing task such as good composition, correct punctuation and correct grammatical creation of written samples.

According to MacArthur, Philippakos, & Graham (2016), writing self-efficacy is a definite ability which requires several skills, schema, realization and self-regulation. According to Zimmerman (2000), self-efficacy predicts the challenging level of the academic tasks chosen by the students in addition to their academic interpretation level. It also predicts the students' potential to achieve a certain writing task which is measured by their overall performance. In this realm, Shell (1989) developed a Writing Self-Efficacy Scale which includes eight items. The items include paragraph organization, the usage of parts of speech, spelling, the use of singulars and plurals, grammar use, the ability to support main ideas, use of punctuation marks, sentences organization, the ability to write simple, compound and complex sentences. The purpose of the scale was to assess students' 'confidence rate in performing certain writing skills such as the ability to punctuate a certain passage in addition to the willingness to organize sentences in a well expressed manner.

2. Sources of Writing Self-Efficacy

There is a variety of self-efficacy sources that influence an individual's performance in a certain task such as excellent performance, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and the effect of physiological states. The first source of self-efficacy can be obtained from the individual's excellent performance in a difficult task which has an influence on increasing self-efficacy (Pajares, 2003). The second source of self-efficacy is gained from the vicarious experiences, which means the observation of others' performance in a certain task and the realization that they have performed in a better manner than others do (Magogwe, Ramoroka & Mogana-Monyepi, 2015). The third source of self-efficacy is acquired from the social persuasion which is the convincing comments received from others; positive comments increase self-efficacy while negative comments decrease it (Bandura, 1977). The fourth source of self-efficacy is the effect of physiological states such as

anxiety. Students can extend their self-confidence by experiencing their psychological state while ruminating on a specific task. Accordingly, the students' emotional states towards the task can help in expecting the extent of either their success or failure. As a result, experiencing negative thoughts may decrease self-efficacy conception which enhances students' stress and inappropriate performance (Pajares, Johnson & Usher, 2007).

Early studies have investigated the relationship between writing strategies and writing self-efficacy and their influence on the process of writing. Wahdan & Burogohain (2018) conducted a study on the effects of the use of writing process on the students' performance in writing. By using the content analyzing procedure, the results revealed that studying writing by implementing the writing process allows students to perform better than studying according to the traditional method.

A study by Al Asmari (2013) investigated the relationship between writing strategies, writing apprehension and writing achievement in the Saudi context. In this study, the participants were asked to complete a writing strategies inventory and a writing anxiety inventory. The results showed that the rate of anxiety influenced students' performance since students with a low rate of anxiety performed better than the others.

Another study was done by Junianti, Pratolo & Wulandari (2020) on the used strategies for learning writing. They used a questionnaire to find out about the strategies used for learning the writing skill; the strategies found by the study were cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies. The findings of the study revealed that the most used strategy is the metacognitive strategy which is the strategy of planning.

A study by Mei-Ching (2016) examined the writing self-efficacy and anxiety of PhD students in the Taiwanese context. According to the findings of the study, senior doctoral students were less anxious than the junior doctoral students as they have a deeper experience in writing research papers using the English language. However, interview results revealed that students experienced a variety of writing anxiety sources including deficient English writing skills, anxiety for frustrating comments and time limitations.

Another study by Zhang (2018) identified the influence of the process and genre approaches on writing self-efficacy within academic writing. The study found that implementing process and genre approaches enhanced EFL learners' confidence in their writing abilities. The reason behind this improvement in students' academic performance is that they received explicit instruction regarding the process of writing and the effective use of language.

Another study by Khosravi, Ghoorchaei & Mofrad (2017) investigated the relationship among the three variables of writing strategies, self-efficacy and writing ability in the Iranian context. By performing the IELTS writing task, and filling both questionnaires of self-efficacy and writing strategies, the study revealed that self-efficacy and writing strategies are related positively as they enhance students' writing performance.

Within the Turkish EFL context, a study by Bektaş (2020) investigated self-efficacy in English writing. By using the foreign language writing self-efficacy scale, the study revealed that students' writing self-efficacy is related to their perceived level of language proficiency. This result is in contradiction with the results of a prior study which had been carried out by Tilfarlioglu & Cinkara (2009) within the Turkish context. The study concluded that there are certain differences between pre-intermediate and upper-intermediate students in terms of their self-efficacy levels. It was found that students' levels of self-efficacy increased as their levels of language proficiency increased.

The aforementioned literature review indicated that many studies have been conducted to explore the effect of self-efficacy levels on the students' production of written texts within a variety of educational contexts. However, fewer studies have been done on the effects of using certain pre-writing strategies on students' writing self-efficacy. Thus, the current study aimed to investigate this particular issue in the Turkish educational context where English is taught as a foreign language.

III. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of using the clustering prewriting strategy on EFL learners' writing self-efficacy. This chapter presents the methodology of the research. It will present the nature of the research, research design, research context, participants, sample selection, data collection instruments and data analysis procedures and limitations of the study.

A. Nature of the Research

By considering the methodology that will be used in this study, it can be described as descriptive, a mixed method research, and a survey research. The descriptive research is a kind of research which can be done within educational, psychological and social sciences contexts; it premises that practices improvement and problem solving can be done through the process of observation, description and analysis (Nassaji, 2015). The mixed research method can be defined as the set of data which are derived from qualitative and quantitative methods within one research (Nga, 2014). Accordingly, the qualitative research method provides an inductive reflection of the researcher's observations as the researcher is the initial instrument of the research (Aspers & Corte, 2019). On the other hand, quantitative research method can be defined as the set of data which are used statistically and they consist of numbers and figures (Rasinger, 2013). In addition, this research is a survey research which is defined as a tool used to solve observed problems and to find out whether certain objectives have been met or not, in addition it establishes the amount of the existing problems within a certain context (Isaac, Michael, 1997).

B. Research Design and Methodology

1. Research Problem

Writing is an important language skill which receives a lot of attention by English language teachers. Students' ability to write is affected by two main factors which are: knowledge and the personal beliefs about their ingenuity to accomplish a task successfully (Corkett, Hatt & Benevides, 2011). Within the Turkish educational context, Solak & Bayar (2015) stated that attention should be paid on the improvement of the language skills, including reading, writing, speaking and listening instead of only focusing on grammar. Accordingly, students' writing difficulty is related to certain weakness in the teaching process (Ekoc, 2019). In addition, students lack writing confidence because of the teachers' negative comments and shortage of time (Kırmızı & Kırmızı, 2015). Therefore, the serious problem is in the students' self- confidence to generate ideas before they start writing.

C. Research Context

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of implementing the clustering prewriting strategy on EFL learners' writing self- efficacy. The research will be done within the educational context of Istanbul Aydin University Preparatory School, after getting the permission from the school's administrator and the control and experimental groups' teachers. According to the curriculum of Istanbul Aydin University Preparatory School, students will be taught the skill of writing through four different tracks. Each track lasts for an average of two months. Therefore, this research will be conducted during the third track, which focuses mainly on the process of essays writing. Accordingly, the research will be done during 8 weeks, which is the exact period of the third track.

The first phase of the study will be done through employing the Writing Efficacy Questionnaire, which was developed by Dilek Yavuz Erkan (Erkan, 2013 see Appendix A). In order to be able to utilize the questionnaire at Istanbul Aydin University, Preparatory School, the researcher will get the permission from Aydin University's ethical committee. Accordingly, the questionnaire will be distributed among the experimental and the control group students before and after the

intervention. The purpose of this phase is to examine the difference in the performances between the experimental group which will use only the prewriting strategy of clustering and the control group which will not be asked to implement the clustering strategy.

Additionally, the second phase of the study will be the process of essays writing. Through this phase, the intervention will be accomplished. Within this phase of the study, students of both groups will be asked to write essays. In this realm, students of the experimental group will be taught the prewriting strategy of clustering while students of the control group will not. As a result, students of the experimental group will write their essays based on the prewriting strategy of clustering, while students of the control group will not apply the clustering prewriting strategy before writing. The main purpose of writing essays is to examine the difference in writing efficacy measures between the experimental group and the control group through analyzing their performance in the writing self- efficacy strategies which are: design, content, unity, accuracy and punctuation.

Within the current study, the researcher employed the mixed research method through integrating the Writing Efficacy Questionnaire which is the quantitative data instrument and a rubric, which is the qualitative data instrument and it is designed by the researcher to assess students' written essays, it is shown in Appendix B.

D. Participants

The participants in this study will be chosen from Istanbul Aydin University's Preparatory School. Each group will be taught in a separate class with two different teachers. In order to determine the students' English language proficiency levels, the researcher contacted the teachers of both groups. So, both teachers agreed that the English language proficiency level of both groups is A2 which is considered as an elementary level according to the Common European Framework for Languages.

E. Sampling

In order to be able to choose the sample, the researcher will contact the teachers of both groups and will explain the procedure of the research in details. Furthermore, the researcher will choose the participants through applying simple

random sampling in order to get a representative sample of the whole population. Accordingly, 40 students will be chosen, in which the experimental group will include 20 students and the control group will include 20 students.

F. Data Collection Instruments

Within this current research, a mixed method design was implemented. In accordance, two research instruments were employed. The quantitative method was employed through distributing the writing self- efficacy scale which was developed by Dilek Yavuz Erkan. For the qualitative research method, the researcher developed a writing assessment rubric to assess the students' written essays. Accordingly, the rubric was developed based on the information presented in the website of the (Centre For Enhanced Teaching and Learning) . The rubric included five criteria which aim to evaluate the students' performance. The first criterion is Chronological order, the second is Language use, the third Grammar and Spelling, the fourth is Ideas Development, and the fifth is Punctuation and Capitalization. Each criterion was graded according to a scale that ranged from unacceptable, acceptable, target and exemplary. The unacceptable performance was graded from 0-5, the acceptable performance was graded from 6-10, the target performance was graded from 11-15 and the exemplary performance was graded from 16-20.

1. Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

A scale of Writing Self – Efficacy will be used to grade the students' levels of self- efficacy and to distinguish their confidence in their writing abilities. The Writing Self- Efficacy scale was developed by Dilek Yavuz Erkan (2013). It includes 21 items; and each item is graded according to four- points Likert type scale (4.I do it very well, 3.I do it well, 2.I do not do it well and 1. I do not do it). Likert scale is an unidimensional scale used in surveys in order to distinguish participant's degrees of agreement or disagreement with a certain statement (Batterton & Hale, 2017). As a result, the higher the total scores are, the higher is the writing self- efficacy possessed by the participants.

According to the aforementioned information, the questionnaire is divided into five subcategories namely; Content, Design, Unity, Accuracy and Punctuation. Each category included a certain number of questions as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The Subcategories of the Questionnaire

The Subcategories	No of Items
Content	5
Design	5
Unity	5
Accuracy	4
Punctuation	2

As revealed in Table 1, the first subcategory of content includes questions 6, 9, 12, 17, & 21. Secondly, the subcategory of design includes questions 2, 5, 8, 11, & 16. Thirdly, the subcategory of unity includes questions 3, 4, 10, 13, & 19. Fourthly, the subcategory of accuracy includes questions 1, 7, 14, & 18. Finally, the subcategory of punctuation includes both questions 15 and 20.

The subcategory of content questions the participants about their ability of generating ideas and locating them within the text easily, so it concerns the process of meaning creation by providing reasoning and examples. Within this area, meaning creation is related to the willingness to elevate knowledge through defining the main parts of a writing paper which are the claim and evidence (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987).

The subcategory of design discusses the issues of the writing style. According to Lucas (2012), style is the use of language in an effective way to either create meaningful statements or to activate emotions. Furthermore, he added that style is the way in which a human interacts with others through words. Accordingly, writing style is highly associated with one's personality and attitude (Lucas, 2012).

According to the five items which are classified under the subcategory of unity in the questionnaire, the term refers to the student's ability to express an idea in a good chronological order in addition to the consistency in creating compositions which can support the main idea clearly. Oshima and Hogue (1999) defined unity as the paragraph's discussion of one main idea only (Oshima & Hogue, 1999:30). In addition, a unified paragraph has specific characteristics which are the topic sentence and the supporting sentences which strengthen the main idea (Ahmad, 2019).

The accuracy subscale of the questionnaire dealt with the use of grammar, and it included four questions. The first two questions and the fourth question in this part discussed the students' ability to use grammatical rules easily and correctly while creating certain compositions. The third question dealt with the ability of applying different parts of speech such as nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives in the right position within a sentence. The term grammatical accuracy can be defined as the depiction of the language's structure, and the combination of words and phrases to write meaningful sentences in language (Canale & Swain, 1980).

For the punctuation subscale, two items in the questionnaire presented the students' ability to use several punctuation marks while writing. According to Ginting (2018), punctuation marks have several functions in a piece of writing; for example, a period's function is to separate sentences, a question mark imparts meaning as it interrogates a rhetorical sentence (Ginting, 2018).

2. Pilot Study

Within this research, the researcher will use the Writing Self- Efficacy Scale. According to Erkan & Saban (2011), the questionnaire's developer, it is stated that "The scale was found to be Cronbach Alpha coefficient were .88 for the first factor (Content), .80 for the second factor (Design), .77 for the third factor (Unity), .74 for the fourth factor (Accuracy), and .50 for the fifth factor (Punctuation)" (Erkan & Saban, 2011:174).

3. Writing Task

In order to get in depth into the research's topic and collect more thorough data, the second phase of the research will be essays writing. Therefore, the students' teachers in the experimental and control groups will ask them to write cause and effect essays. The purpose behind choosing the cause and effect essays is that it is the students' final assignment during the course of the third track, so they will have the chance to work on their essays, and practice what they will be taught through the course. Students will write their essays after they submit the pre-test questionnaires, so they will write their essays during one week. The essays will be assessed according to a rubric designed by the researcher.

G. Data Analysis

The procedure of data analysis will be done through two phases. The first phase will be analyzing the data that will be collected from the questionnaire; the data will be analyzed by the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 21. This version of SPSS is helpful in providing a summary of descriptive statistics such as mean, median, and frequency through selecting variables in data editor, in addition to its flexibility in comparing data sets. Moreover, within the second phase of the study, the researcher will collect the students' essays and grade them according to the researcher's grading rubric. The rubric is approved by the teachers of both groups. It is developed based on the information presented in the website of the (Centre for Enhanced Teaching and Learning). The rubric includes five criteria which are: chronological order, language use, grammar and spelling, ideas development and use of punctuation. Therefore, rubrics are designed to help teachers in orienting themselves toward their goals. Basically, teachers use rubrics to examine the students' expected result through evaluating the final degrees (Andrade, 2005).

According to Hall and Axelrod (2014), examining students' writing attitudes focuses on students' sensations towards writing and their sense of motivation to write; in addition, it examines their writing predilections (Hall & Axelrod, 2014). Accordingly, the experimental group's teacher will teach them the prewriting strategy of clustering in order to implement it before they start writing. On the other hand, control group's teacher will not teach them the prewriting strategy of clustering, so they will write their essays regardless of any specific prewriting strategy.

Each criterion will be graded according to a scale which is divided into four subcategories of unacceptable, acceptable, target and exemplary. The first subscale of unacceptable is graded from 1-4, the second subscale of acceptable is graded from 5-10, the third subscale of target is graded from 11-15, and the fourth subscale of exemplary is graded from 16-20. So, the overall grade of the essays is out of 100.

For the skill of Logical Division of Ideas, it focuses on the essays' organization which must include the introduction, two body paragraphs and the conclusion. Furthermore, it focuses on the convincing presentation of ideas. In accordance,

chronological order is a writing technique which is used for ideas' organization within a paragraph (Anggraini, 2021).

The skill of Language Use focuses on sentence structure and the number of written words. In this realm, students are expected to write simple, compound and complex sentences correctly. In addition, they are expected to write 300 to 400 words within the essay.

Regarding the skill of Grammar and Spelling, it investigates the students' ability to write grammatically correct sentences in addition to the willingness to write words correctly in terms of morphology. According to Azar (2007), the main function of grammar is that it provides a reasonable understanding of what is heard and written (Azar, 2007). Furthermore, morphology is defined as the word's internal form in addition to its meaning (Haspelmath & Sims, 2010). Therefore, the ability to distinguish the words morphologically influences the perception of a written text.

For the skill of Ideas development, it examines students' ability to write their ideas comprehensively. In addition, it examines the students' ability to provide reasonable examples coherently. Within this area, Achili (2007) claimed that coherent texts are produced according to the idea's organization and their relevance to the main topic (Achili, 2007).

The last criterion of the rubric is the Use of Punctuation which focuses on the students' willingness to use punctuation marks such as periods, commas and semicolons. In this realm, punctuation is defined as a tool used for clarifying a written text through separating it into phrases, clauses, sentences and paragraphs (Nemouchi, 2010).

H. Limitations of the Study

The current research aims to investigate the impact of implementing the prewriting strategy of clustering on the writing self- efficacy of EFL learners in Turkey. The first limitation of the study is that the researcher is not the participants' teacher; therefore, it will be difficult to get control over them to enhance their responses to the questionnaire. Furthermore, the research will have time limitations, as the researcher will have to observe the teachers' timings in order to be able to distribute the questionnaire and to get the students' essays on the required time. In

addition, it is difficult to communicate directly with the teachers and students due to the COVID-19 situation in which communication will be restricted to be through emails and other online platforms. In addition, the findings of this study cannot be generalized as it will be carried out at Aydin University's preparatory school.



IV. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The chapter of Results and Discussion provides a detailed explanation of the findings obtained in this study. It includes the structure of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale, findings from the Writing self-efficacy scale (pretest and posttest findings), and the findings from the writing assessment rubric for both groups, the experimental and control groups.

A. The Structure of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

This section of the chapter presents the findings related to the first research question: *Which writing self-efficacy strategies are commonly used among the EFL learners?* The data of this part of the study was collected through the Writing Efficacy scale developed by Erkan (2011). The scale contains 21 items which are divided into five subscales of content, design, unity, accuracy and punctuation. The first subscale of content included five items which examined the students' ability to generate ideas in order to write about a specific topic. The second subscale of design included five items which examined the students' capability to organize their ideas and include all required information for each paragraph in an understandable manner. The third subscale of unity included five items which aimed to unveil the students' ability to support the topic sentence with coherent compositions. The fourth subscale of accuracy included four items which aimed to unveil the ability of students to use grammar properly. The fifth subscale of punctuation included two items which investigated the students' capability to apply the punctuation marks and capitalizations that simplify the sentence structure comprehensibly. Furthermore, the items in the scale were graded according to the following scale: 1. I cannot do it at all, 2. I can't do it well, 3. I can do it, 4. I can do it very well.

B. Findings from the Pretest Results of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

Table 2 shows a detailed description of the data obtained from the pretest phase of the Writing Efficacy Scale. Firstly, each subscale is presented in Table 2 together with the group of items in the scale that aimed to elicit the related data. The first column in Table 2 shows the five subscales together with the item numbers in the scale. The second column shows the experimental and the control groups. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth columns represent the statistical values obtained from data analysis, namely the mean, standard deviation, t- test values and the probability values. By examining the t-test results, the significant difference is identified by $p < .05$ as the number of participants within each group is 20 students. Degree of freedom for this set of data is $df = 38$ which can be calculated by subtracting 1 from the total number of observations.

Table 2: The Statistical Pre-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale

Subscale	Group	Mean	SD	T-test	P
Content (Questions 6,9,12,17,21)	Experimental	2.72	0.80	0.3414	0.7347
	Control	2.63	0.86		
Design (Questions 2,5,8,11,16)	Experimental	2.62	0.71	0.2846	0.7775
	Control	2.56	0.62		
Unity (Questions 3,4,10,13,19)	Experimental	2.88	0.70	0.2240	0.824
	Control	2.83	0.71		
Accuracy (Questions 1,7,14,18)	Experimental	2.75	0.68	0.2846	0.7775
	Control	2.68	0.70		
Punctuation (Questions 15,20)	Experimental	3.3	0.72	1.1402	0.2613
	Control	3.025	0.80		
Significant difference is identified by p< .05		df= 38			

According to the information presented in the table, students have the highest levels of self- efficacy in terms of punctuation. The mean value for the variable of punctuation is 3.3 for the experimental group and 3 for the control group, and their t-test value is 1.14. This result indicates that there is no significant difference between both groups in terms of punctuation since the t- test score is greater than 0.05. In addition, students' levels of writing self- efficacy in unity are similar in both groups since their average response is 2.88 for the experimental group and 2.83 for the control group, with

a t-test score of 0.224. Based on the t- test score, it indicates that there is no significant statistical difference between both groups in terms of unity since this value is more than 0.05. Furthermore, the third level of writing self- efficacy is accuracy. Within this level, the experimental group's mean response is 2.75 while for the control group it is 2.68. The t-test score for accuracy is 0.2846. By comparing both groups' results in terms of accuracy, the t-test indicates that there is no significant difference between both groups in terms of accuracy as it is greater than 0.05. The fourth level of writing self- efficacy is content. The experimental group's average answer is 2.7 while the control group's average answer is 2.63, with a t-test score of 0.3414. Therefore, the t-test score reveals that there is no significant difference between both groups in terms of content as it is greater than 0.05, which is the exact value of significant difference between both groups. Students have the lowest levels of writing self- efficacy in terms of design. Accordingly, the average answer for this part of the questionnaire is 2.62 for the experimental group and 2.56 for the control group, with a t-test score of 0.2846. As a result, the difference is not statistically significant in terms of design because the t-test score is greater than 0.05 which is the greatest level of significant difference between both groups.

Table 3: Pre-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale

SUBSCALES										
Experimental Group										
Pretest	Content	%	Design	%	Unity	%	Accuracy	%	Punctuation	%
I cannot do it at all	1.2	6%	0.6	3%	0.8	4%	0.75	3.75%	0	0%
I can do it well	6.2	31%	5.8	39%	3.4	17%	5.5	27.5%	3	15%
I can do it	9.2	46%	9	45%	11.6	58%	11.5	57.5%	8	40%
I can do it very well	3.4	17%	2.6	13%	3.8	19%	2.25	11.25%	9	45%
Control Group										
I cannot do it at all	2	10%	1.2	6%	0.4	2%	0.75	4%	1	5%
I can do it well	6.4	32%	7.6	38%	5.8	29%	6.75	34%	4.5	23%
I can do it	8.6	35%	10	50%	10.6	53%	10.5	52%	9	55%
I can do it very well	3	13%	1.2	18%	1.2	6%	2	10%	6	30%

Table 3 presents the pretest results obtained from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale. The first part of the table presents the results obtained from students of the experimental group while the second part presents the results of the control group's

students. The table displays the subcategories of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale and the responses to each subcategory with their percentages. The responses presented in the scale are: (1)I cannot do it at all, (2)I can't do it well, (3)I can do it, and (4)I can do it very well. This section will explain the results presented in Table 3 regarding the responses of the experimental group and the control group.

For the experimental group, 6% of the participants have responded "I cannot do it at all" in terms of content while 31% have responded "I can't do it well". 46% of the respondents have stated "I can do it" and 17% responded "I can do it very well". In terms of design, 3% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 39% have responded "I can't do it well". 45% have responded "I can do it" while 13% have responded "I can do it very well". For the subscale of unity, 4% of the participants have responded as "I cannot do it at all" while 17% have responded "I can't do it well". 58% have responded "I can do it" while 19% have responded "I can do it very well". Regarding accuracy, 3.75% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 27% have responded "I can't do it well". 57.5% have responded "I can do it" while 11.25% have responded "I can do it very well". In terms of punctuation, 0% have responded as "I cannot do it at all" while 15% have responded "I can't do it well". 40% have responded "I can do it" while 45% responded "I can do it very well".

For the control group, 10% of the respondents have stated that "I cannot do it at all" in terms of content while 32% have responded "I can't do it well". 35% have responded "I can do it" while 13% have responded "I can do it very well". For design, 6% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 38% have responded "I can't do it well". 50% have responded "I can do it" while 18% have responded "I can do it very well". In terms of unity, 2% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 29% have responded "I can't do it well". 53% have responded "I can do it" while 6% have responded "I can do it very well". Regarding accuracy, 4% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 34% responded "I can't do it well". 52% have responded "I can do it" while 10% have responded "I can do it very well". In terms of punctuation, 5% have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 23% have responded "I can't do it well". 55% have responded "I can do it" while 30% have responded "I can do it very well".

Based on the results shown in Table 4.2, students in both groups have responded to the scale by "I can't do it well" and "I can do it very well" which means that their responses ranged between 2 and 4 based on the scale. Students of both

groups had the highest levels of writing self-efficacy in terms of punctuation as they have an average response of “I can do it” .In terms of unity, both groups had an average response between “I can’t do it” and “I can do it”. For accuracy, students of the experimental group had an average response of “I can do it” while the responses of the control group students ranged between “I can’t do it” and “I can do it”. In terms of content, students of both groups had an average response of “I can do it”. For design, students of both groups had an average answer of “I can’t do it”.

To sum up, the pre- test findings shown in Table 4.1 reveal that students of both groups tended to have the same level of performance in terms of the writing self- efficacy strategies within the pretest phase. Accordingly students in both groups had high levels of writing self- efficacy in the strategy of punctuation. This means that students in both groups are aware of the use of punctuation marks, and how to include them within the essays wherever they are required. On the other hand, students tended to have low writing self- efficacy levels in terms of design which indicate that students in both groups lack the ability to arrange their ideas in a well-organized manner. By considering the t-test values of the pre-test experiment, there was no significant difference between both groups of EFL learners in terms of the used writing self- efficacy strategies in the written texts. Moreover, both groups showed the same weakness levels in addition to strength levels in writing self-efficacy.

C. Findings from the Posttest Results of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

By considering the data presented in Table 4, each column describes a set of data that clarify the findings of the posttest results. In the first column, each subscale is presented in the table in addition to the group of questions it examined within the questionnaire. In the second column, the groups studied in the research are represented. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth columns present the statistical values obtained from data analysis which are the mean, standard deviation, t-test values and the probability values. By examining the t- test results, the degree of freedom of this set of data is $df = 38$ and the significant difference is identified by $p < .05$, taking into consideration that the number of participants within each group is 20 students.

Table 4: The Statistical Post-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale

Subscale	Group	Mean	SD	T-test	P
Content	Experimental	2.96	0.82	0.24	0.81
(Questions 6,9,12,17,21)	Control	2.9	0.74		
Design	Experimental	3.04	0.82	0.6	0.56
(Questions 2,5,8,11,16)	Control	2.89	0.8		
Unity	Experimental	3.1	0.810	1.13	0.26
(Questions 3,4,10,13,19)	Control	2.8	0.8		
Accuracy	Experimental	3.05	0.83	1.3	0.20
(Questions 1,7,14,18)	Control	2.72	0.76		
Punctuation	Experimental	3.27	0.816	1.6	0.11
(Questions 15,20)	Control	2.85	0.8		
Significant difference is identified by p< .05		df= 38			

The results in Table 4 represent the post-test findings revealed from the scale. According to the data shown in the table, students of both groups had a slight improvement in their levels of writing self- efficacy. Students of the experimental group showed high writing self- efficacy levels in terms of punctuation as the mean of their answers is 3.27, while the control group's mean answer is 2.85, with a t-test score of 1.6. In accordance, t- test value revealed that significant difference is not shown between both groups in terms of punctuation because it is more than 0.05. Furthermore, in terms of content, both groups showed similar levels of writing self- efficacy as their mean answer is 2.9. The t-test score is 0.24 which is greater than 0.05 which indicates that there is no significant difference between both groups in terms of content. Additionally, the experimental group had a higher level of writing self- efficacy in terms of design than the control group since their average answer is 3.04 while the control's group average answer is 2.89, and their t-test score is 0.6. Although there was a difference in both groups' average answer, the difference is considered not significant as it is greater than 0.05. In terms of unity, the mean score for the experimental group is 3.1 while the average score for the control group is 2.8. The t- test score for these two values is 1.13. This indicates that there is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of unity. Moreover, students of the experimental group have high levels of writing self - efficacy in terms of accuracy since their average score is 3.05. On the other hand, the accuracy level of the control group is 2.72, with a t-test score of 1.4. According to

the t-test results, there is no significant difference between both groups in terms of accuracy since their t- test score is higher than 0.05.

In sum, students in the experimental group had the highest levels of writing self- efficacy in terms of punctuation. In this realm, the use of punctuation marks influences the reader's perception of the information presented within the essay. Accordingly, students of the experimental group tended to use semicolons and commas precisely. Therefore, applying the prewriting strategy of clustering had a positive impact on the students' performance in using punctuation marks. This finding contradicts the finding represented by Etinurwati (2016) who found that Indonesian EFL students had a weak ability in writing due to their mistakes represented in using punctuation marks (Etinurwati, 2016). Moreover, students of the control group had the highest levels in writing self- efficacy in terms of content which is related to the students' ability to generate ideas in a certain topic. However, their levels of writing self- efficacy in terms of content are lower than the experimental group's levels. In this realm, a study was conducted within the area of ideas generation and development which findings are in line with the findings of the current study, and it found that the generation of ideas is highly connected to the use of complex vocabulary items which enhance the quality of the written essays (Crossley, Muldner & McNamara, 2016). According to the aforementioned information, and by considering the t- test values of the post- test experiments, there was no significant difference among both groups in terms of the implemented writing self- efficacy strategies (significant difference is identified by $p < .05$).

Table 5: Post-test Results of the Writing Efficacy Scale

	SUBSCALES									
	Experimental Group									
Post test	Content	%	Design	%	Unity	%	Accuracy	%	Punctuation	%
I cannot do it at all	0.8	4%	0.8	4%	1.2	6%	1	5%	1	5%
I can't do it well	4.6	23%	4.2	21%	2.2	11%	3	15%	1.5	7%
I can do it	9	45%	8.4	39%	10	50%	9.25	46.25%	8	40%
I can do it very well	5.6	23%	6.2	29%	6.8	36%	6.75	33.7%	9.5	47.5%
Control Group										
I cannot do it at all	0	0%	0.2	1%	0.2	1%	0	0%	1	5%
I can do it well	6.6	33%	6.8	34%	8	40%	9.25	46.25%	5	25%
I can do it	8.8	44%	8	40%	7.2	36%	7	35%	10	50%
I can do it very well	4.6	23%	5	25%	4.6	23%	3.75	18.75%	4	20%

Table 5 presents the posttest results obtained from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale. The first part of the table presents the results obtained from students of the experimental group while the second part presents the results of the control group's students. The table displays the subcategories of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale and the responses to each subcategory with their percentages. The responses presented in the scale are: (1) I cannot do it at all, (2) I can't do it well, (3) I can do it, and (4) I can do it very well. This section will explain the results presented in Table 5 regarding the responses of the experimental group and the control group.

For the experimental group students, 4% of the respondents have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 23% have responded "I can't do it well" in terms of content. 45% of the participants have responded "I can do it" while 23% responded "I can do it very well". In terms of design, 4% of the participants have answered "I cannot do it at all" while 21% of the participants have responded "I can't do it well". 39% of the respondents have answered "I can do it" while 29% have responded "I can do it very well". For the subscale of unity, 6% of the respondents have answered "I cannot do it at all" while 11% have answered "I can't do it well". 50% of the participants have responded "I can do it" while 36% have responded "I can do it very well". In terms of accuracy, 5% of the participants have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 15% have answered "I can't do it well". 46.25% of the respondents answered "I can do it" while 33.7 responded "I can do it very well". For the subscale of punctuation, 5% of the participants have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 7% have answered "I can do it well". 40% of the participants have responded "I can do it" while 47.5% have answered "I can do it very well".

On the other hand, this paragraph displays the data obtained from the participants of the control group. For the subscale of content, none of the participants have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 33% have responded "I can't do it well". 44% of the participants have responded "I can do it" while 23% have responded "I can do it very well". In terms of design, 1% of the participants have answered "I cannot do it at all" while 34% have responded "I can't do it well". 40% of the respondents have answered "I can do it" while 25% responded "I can do it very well". Regarding the subscale of unity, 1% of the respondents have responded "I cannot do it at all" while 40% have answered "I can't do it well". 36% of the participants have responded "I can do it" while 23% have responded "I can do it very

well”. In terms of accuracy, none of the students have responded “I cannot do it at all” while 46.25% have answered “I can’t do it well”. 35% of the respondents have answered “I can do it” while 18.75% have responded “I can do it very well”. For the subscale of punctuation, 5% of the respondents have answered “I cannot do it at all” while 25% have answered “I can’t do it well”. 50% of the participants responded “I can do it” while 20% have responded “I can do it very well”.

Based on the information obtained from Table 4.4, students of both groups responded to the scale by “I can do it” and “I can do it very well”. This means that their responses range between 3 and 4 according to the scale. In terms of punctuation, students’ average answer is “I can do it very well” for the experimental group and “I can do it” for the control group. For the subscale of content, the average answer for students of both groups is “I can do it”. In terms of design, the average answer for both groups is “I can do it”. For the subscale of unity, the average answer for the experimental group was “I can do it very well” while most of the control group students’ their have answered “I can do it”. In terms of accuracy, the average answer of the experimental group is “I can do it well” while the control group’s average answer is “I can do it”.

By comparing the results revealed from the pretest and posttest, students of the experimental group had a slight improvement in terms of writing self-efficacy. In the pretest stage, students of both groups performed similarly in terms of writing self-efficacy. On the other hand, the post-test results revealed that students in the experimental group had a slight improvement in their performance in writing self-efficacy in comparison with the students in the control group. However, the difference between the performances of both groups is not statistically significant as the t-test results were found to be greater than 0.05 for all the subcategories of the questionnaire. Therefore, teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering to the experimental group did not enhance their performance in comparison with the control group.

D. Findings from the Writing Assessment Rubric:

The findings presented in this section provide answers to the second and third questions of the study. The second question of the study was “*How does teaching clustering prewriting strategies influence the students’ generation of ideas in their*

written texts?” The third question was “*What challenges do learners face to become more efficacious in writing essays?*” In the second phase of the research, the researcher investigated the students’ sense of writing self-efficacy through evaluating their own essays. Over the course of the third track, teachers of both groups asked the students to write cause and effect essays. In accordance with this, students of both groups wrote their essays after the 8 week treatment. The researcher assessed the essays based on the writing assessment rubric.

The items in the rubric are designed according to the subcategories of the scale. Accordingly, the criterion of *Logical Division of Ideas* was used to assess the design of the essays in which students were expected to write their essays convincingly by using transition words such as: moreover, furthermore, in addition and therefore. For the criterion of *Language use*, it was applied to assess the essays’ unity which is related to the students’ ability in writing simple, compound and complex sentences. In addition, it assesses the number of words in the essay. Furthermore, the criterion of *Grammar and Spelling* was used to examine the accuracy of the essays’ which aimed to elicit students’ willingness to write grammatically correct sentences and morphologically correct words. For the criterion of *Ideas development* was used to examine the essays’ content which concerns the students’ ability to support their ideas with logical examples. The criterion of the *Use of punctuation* was used to examine the punctuation essays which include periods, commas and semicolons. Each criterion was graded according to a scale that ranged from unacceptable, acceptable, target and exemplary.

Through examining Table 4, each column represented a set of data that clarify the students’ performance in writing. The first column presents the skills that must be presented in each essay. The skills are: chronological order, language use, grammar and spelling, ideas development and use of punctuation. For the second, third, fourth and fifth columns, they presented the subcategories used to grade the essays which are: unacceptable, acceptable, target and exemplary.

1. The Results of Experimental Group’s Essays according to the Rubric

In this stage of the research, the researcher contacted the experimental group’s teacher to ask them to write their essays using the prewriting strategy of clustering. The teacher taught the experimental group to write essays based on the prewriting

strategy of clustering. Students of the experimental group had the chance to write their essays during one week.

Each column in Table 6 presents a set of data that clarify the students' performance in writing. The first column shows the skills that are needed in each essay. They are: chronological order, language use, grammar and spelling, ideas development and use of punctuation. For the second, third, fourth and fifth columns, they presented the subcategories used to grade the essays which are: unacceptable, acceptable, target and exemplary.

Table 6: The Assessment of the Experimental Group's Essays Based on the Rubric

Skills	Unacceptable 0-4	Acceptable 5-10	Target 11-15	Exemplary 16-20
Logical Division of Ideas	0.00	15 %	10%	75%
Language Use	0.00	15 %	35 %	50%
Grammar & Spelling	0.00	0.00	30 %	70%
Ideas Development	0.00	0.00	15%	85%
Use of Punctuation	0.00	5%	0.00	95%

Table 6 shows the Experimental group's performance in writing cause and effect essays. None of the students had an unacceptable level of performance in all of the skills. The data in Table 4 shows that 15% (3 out of 20) had an acceptable level of performance in terms of logical division of ideas while 10% (2 out of 20) had a target level and 75% (15 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary level of performance. In terms of language use, 15% (3 out of 20) had an acceptable level, while 35% (7 out of 20) had a target level and 50% (10 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary level of performance. Moreover, 30% (6 out of 20) had a target level of performance in terms of grammar and spelling while none of them had an acceptable level of performance and 70% (14 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary performance. In addition, none of the students had an acceptable performance in terms of ideas development; whereas, 15% (3 out of 20) had a target level of performance and 85% (17 out of 20) of the students had an exemplary level of performance. Furthermore, 5% (1 out of 20) had an acceptable level of performance while none of them got a target performance in terms of the use of

punctuation, and 95% (19 out of 20) of the students had an exemplary level of performance.

Table 7: The Experimental Group's Teacher Assessment of Essays Based on the Rubric

Skills	Unacceptable 0-4	Acceptable 5-10	Target 11-15	Exemplary 16-20
Logical Division of Ideas	5%	10 %	15%	70%
Language Use	0.00	20 %	30 %	50%
Grammar & Spelling	0.00	5%	20 %	75%
Ideas Development	5%	10%	5%	80%
Use of Punctuation	0.00	5%	5%	90%

Table 7 shows the assessment of the Experimental group's performance in writing cause and effect essays. The data in Table 7 shows that 5% (1 out of 20) had an unacceptable performance in terms of logical division of ideas while 10% (2 out of 20) had an acceptable level of performance. 15% (3 out of 20) had a target level and 70% (14 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary level of performance. In terms of language use, none of the students had an unacceptable performance while 20% (4 out of 20) had an acceptable level. 30% (6 out of 20) had a target level and 50% (10 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary level of performance. Furthermore, none of the students had an unacceptable performance in terms of grammar and spelling while 5% (1 out of 20) had an acceptable performance. 20% (4 out of 20) had a target level of whereas none of them had an acceptable level of performance and 75% (15 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary performance. In terms of ideas development, 5% (1 out of 20) had an unacceptable performance; while, 10% (2 out of 20) had an acceptable performance. 5% (1 out of 20) had a target level of performance and 80% (16 out of 20) of the students had an exemplary level of performance. Furthermore, none of the students had an unacceptable performance in terms of the use of punctuation whereas 5% (1 out of 20) had an acceptable level of performance. 5% (1 out of 20) had a target performance, and 90% (18 out of 20) of the students had an exemplary level of performance.

By comparing the assessments of the experimental group's teacher and the researcher, it can be obtained that both assessments are too similar. That is to say that the rubric is reliable in terms of assessing students' writing performance in all skills

of logical division of ideas, language use, grammar and spelling, ideas development, and use of punctuation. According to the teacher of the experimental group, students had the best performance in terms of the use of punctuation. More than 90% of the students punctuated their texts properly. Therefore, the grades of this group of participants ranged between 16 and 20 out of 20. On the other hand, the results revealed that students had a lower level of performance in their ability of using language. This is to say that 7 students out of 20 tended to write structurally incorrect sentences since their scores ranged between 11 and 15 out of 20. Within this area, students tended to utilize ambiguous sentence structures which distract the reader's perception of the whole idea.

2. The Results of Control Group's Essays according to the Rubric

For assessing the control group's essays, the researcher contacted with the students' teacher in order to ask the students to write the cause and effect essays regardless of the use of any specific prewriting strategy. So, students had the chance to use any prewriting strategy they prefer. The control group's students had the chance to write their essays over the duration of one week.

Table 8 displays the data revealed from the students' essays assessment. The first column lists the skills needed within the written essays (Logical Division of Ideas, Language Use, Grammar and Spelling, Ideas Development and Use of Punctuation). The second, third and fourth columns presented the subcategories used to grade the essays which are: acceptable, target and exemplary. Furthermore, the subcategory of unacceptable, which is represented within the subcategories in the grading rubric, was omitted from the table because none of the control group's students reached an unacceptable level of performance.

Table 8: The Assessment of the Control Group's Essays Based on the Rubric

Skills	Unacceptable 0-4	Acceptable 5-10	Target 11-15	Exemplary 16- 20
Logical Division of Ideas	0.00	25%	30%	45%
Language Use	0.00	15%	45%	40%
Grammar & Spelling	0.00	5%	55%	40%
Ideas Development	0.00	5%	20%	75%
Use of Punctuation	0.00	0.00	50%	50%

Based on the findings shown in Table 8, none of the students had an unacceptable performance in any of the skills. In terms of logical division of ideas 25% (5 out of 20) performed an acceptable level. While 30% (6 out of 20) had a target level of performance, 45% (9 out of 20) of the participants had an exemplary level. For the skill of language use, 15% (3 out of 20) had an acceptable level while 45% of the participants had a target level of performance, and 40% (8 out of 20) had an exemplary level. In terms of grammar and spelling, 5% (1 out of 20) had an acceptable level, 55% (11 out of 20) of the participants had a target level of performance and 40% (8 out of 20) had an exemplary level. Regarding the criterion of ideas development, 5% (1 out of 20) had an acceptable level, 20% (4 out of 20) had a target level and 75% (15 out of 20) had an exemplary level. Students of the control group had the highest level of performance as, while and. Furthermore, none of the students had an acceptable level in the use of punctuation while 50% (10 out of 20) had a target level and 50% (10 out of 20) had an exemplary level of performance in their ability to use punctuation marks.

In sum, by considering the assessment of the control group's essays, participants had the best performance in terms of ideas development since 15 students out of 20 showed an exemplary level for ideas development. According to the researcher's assessment of the students' writing performance, they showed their proper ability to support the main statement with logical development of ideas that convince the reader. In addition, they supported their ideas with persuading examples which strengthen the paragraph's development. In the contrary side, 11 out of 20 students had a moderate ability to write structurally correct sentences in terms of grammar and spelling as they got an average grade between 11 and 15 out of 20. In this realm, most of the grammatical mistakes were related to subject- verb agreement in addition to the incorrect verb tenses.

To compare the performance of both groups, Table 9 displays a summary of the findings revealed from the assessment of both groups' essays based on the writing assessment rubric. In accordance, students of both groups wrote their essays after the completion of 8 weeks treatment.

Table 9: The Results of the Experimental and Control Groups' Essays Based on the Rubric

Skills	Group	Acceptable 5-10	Target 11-15	Exemplary 16-20
Logical Division of Ideas	Experimental	15%	10%	75%
	Control	25%	30%	45%
Language Use	Experimental	15%	35%	50%
	Control	15%	45%	40%
Grammar & Spelling	Experimental	0.00	30%	70%
	Control	5%	55%	40%
Ideas Development	Experimental	0.00	15%	85%
	Control	5%	20%	75%
Punctuation	Experimental	5%	0.00	95%
	Control	0.00	50%	50%

Consequently, the second research question aimed to investigate the impact of teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering on the students' generation of ideas. Therefore, the researcher clarified the answer of this question through assessing the students' essays based on the writing assessment rubric. Accordingly, the rubric assessed five skills of: logical division of ideas, language use, grammar and spelling, ideas development and punctuation. Regarding to this, the researcher focused on the criterion of ideas development. Within the criterion of ideas development, participants were asked to provide their essays with examples and clear reasoning. Teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering to the students of the experimental group influenced the students' generation and development of ideas as 17 students out of 20 performed ideally in the process of ideas development. On the other hand, 15 students from the control group performed perfectly in the development of ideas. This is to say that teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering to the students of the experimental group did not enhance their performance in ideas generation and development in comparison with the control group students who did not receive a specific clustering strategy training.

Accordingly, this research finding contradicts the findings of several previous studies done on the effect of the prewriting strategy of clustering. The first study done by Raharjo (2018) revealed that applying the strategy of clustering within the

experimental group and the other prewriting strategies in the controlled group positively influenced the students writing achievement in the Cambridge Checkpoint test (Raharjo, 2018). Furthermore, Inal (2014) discussed the impact of the pre-writing strategy of clustering on Turkish students' writing achievement as well as their writing attitude. The results indicated that clustering has a positive impact on students' attitude in writing (Inal, 2014). Additionally, a study within the Indonesian EFL context revealed that applying the clustering strategy improved the students' performance while writing narrative essays (Adriati, 2013). Moreover, the findings of a study within the Ecuadorian context supported the positive influence of the clustering prewriting strategy on the students' writing performance (Olivres & Andres, 2019).

Moreover, the third research question investigated the challenges that learners faced to become more efficacious in writing essays. Accordingly, the findings from the essays' assessment revealed that students of the experimental group were less efficacious in language use which is related to the ability to write simple, compound and complex sentences. In relation to this finding, Fajri (2016) conducted a research regarding the assessment of unity, coherence and use of words in writing among Indonesian EFL learners. The study revealed that students' mistakes in unity were commonly related to the misuse of words because of their inference to their mother language (Fajri, 2016). However, the study of Anggraini (2019) contradicts the findings of this study regarding the area of unity and language use. The study found that most students had high levels of performance in terms of unity as they tended to state a clear thesis statement in addition to their precise use of connectors (Anggraini, 2019). Accordingly, 35% of the students (7 out of 20) were at a moderate level in terms of using language as they tended to present inaccurate sentence structure that display noticeable confusion. Therefore, students of the experimental group need to strengthen their knowledge about the different types of sentences to avoid creating distracting sentences.

For the students of the control group, 11 students out of 20 were less efficacious in the use of grammatical rules and spelling. Consequently, students presented sentences that lack subject verb agreement. Furthermore, they tended to misuse capitalizations and they presented various spelling errors within one paragraph. This finding is in line with the findings of Shweba and Mujiyanto's

(2017) study which was conducted to examine the mistakes employed by first year students in spelling, punctuation and capitalization. The study concluded that the most frequently occurred mistakes were capitalization errors while the least occurred mistakes were spelling errors (Shweba & Mujiyanto, 2017). Furthermore, Siddiqui (2015) concluded that the most significant errors occurred within the essays of the Saudi EFL learners were related to capitalization (Siddiqui, 2015).As a result, students of the control group need more instruction to enhance their ability to write error free sentences.



V. CONSLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of applying clustering prewriting strategies on writing self-efficacy within EFL learners in Turkey. In this realm, few studies within the Turkish educational context have examined the impact of particular prewriting strategies on the writing self-efficacy among students. Accordingly, this section of the research will provide a discussion about the results revealed in the previous chapter in accordance to the research questions in addition to the limitations and recommendations.

A. Conclusions

1. The Commonly Used Writing Self-Efficacy Strategies among EFL Learners

By considering the first research question, this section will clarify the writing self-efficacy strategies which are commonly used by EFL learners. The data collected from the pre-test and post-test results of the Writing Self- Efficacy Scale indicated that there were no significant differences between both groups in their levels of writing self-efficacy. Based on the findings discussed in the previous chapter, students of the experimental group had the highest self- efficacy levels in the use of punctuation marks. That is to say, that punctuation has a significant role in the process of writing as a reader cannot interpret a text without the punctuation marks (Suliman, Ahmeida & Mahalla, 2019). In accordance, punctuation has an impact on understanding the text and convincing the reader with the information presented within the text because the correct addition of commas, semicolons and periods within a sentence can affect the meaning. On the other hand, students of the control group had the highest levels of writing self-efficacy in terms of content which is related to ideas development. Students tended to have a good performance in terms of the coherent presentation of ideas. The interpretation of this good performance is that students had the ability to develop their ideas and enhance the quality of their written content by applying transitions at the beginning of each paragraph and between the sentences. Accordingly, content can be defined as a whole group of

fundamental elements which are needed for a written text and they consist of grammar, vocabulary, coherence, text length and creativity (Bae, Bentler & Lee, 2016). Based on the previous information and the findings discussed in the previous chapter, a convincing written content is based on the coherence of the sentences and paragraphs.

2. The Influence of Clustering Prewriting Strategies on the Students' Generation of Ideas

Based on the second research question, this section will examine the effect of teaching clustering prewriting strategy on students' self-efficacy in writing and their ability to generate ideas. By considering each criterion in the rubric, the researcher considered the criterion of ideas development to assess the impact of teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering on students' generation of ideas. Accordingly, the findings revealed that 85% (17 out of 20) of the students in the experimental group had an exemplary level in their ability to develop ideas while 75% (15 out of 20) of the control group's students excelled in ideas development. By comparing the performance of both groups, it can be revealed that teaching the prewriting strategy of clustering did not influence the experimental group's performance in generation of ideas. There was no difference between both groups in terms of writing self-efficacy. In accordance, this finding contradicts the findings of other researches discussed in the previous chapter which support the effectiveness of the prewriting strategy of clustering on students' writing self-efficacy and generation of ideas. In accordance, it has been approved that clustering has an impact on the generation of ideas within the prewriting phase (Kellogg, 1990).

3. Writing Self-Efficacy Challenges Faced by EFL Learners

According to the third research question, this paragraph clarifies the writing self-efficacy challenges faced by the EFL learners. By considering the essays assessment, the findings revealed that students of the experimental group were less efficacious in the use of language which is related to paragraph unity. According to Oshima and Hogue (1999), unity is defined as the discussion of the main idea through supporting it by several sentences which are related directly to the topic sentence (Oshima & Hogue, 1999). Paragraph unity includes the clear statement of topic sentence and supporting it with correct sentence structure and words.

Accordingly, students were at a moderate level in terms of using language as they tended to present inaccurate sentence structure which does not provide a precise explanation to the topic sentence in addition to their poor practice in the simple, compound and complex types of sentences which cause noticeable confusion in understanding the main idea. Even though, students of the experimental group performed better than the control group's students in the use of language. In reference to the researches done in the area of unity and language use, it was found that the most common problems presented by students in terms of unity were related to the incorrect sentence structure presented in a written text. On the other hand, it was revealed that students who had a good performance in unity and language use tended to use the connectors clearly in addition to the clarification of the thesis statement.

For the students of the control group, they were less efficacious in the use of grammatical rules and spelling which means that they were less efficacious in writing accuracy. Consequently, students tended to misuse capitalizations and they presented spelling errors which are related to poor vocabulary knowledge. Accordingly, Poor vocabulary knowledge could be based on the weakness in reading comprehension as stated by (Anderson & Freebody , 1981). Furthermore, they presented various errors in terms of subject verb agreement since they presented more than one mistake within one paragraph. According to Hartwell (1985) grammar is "the set of formal patterns in which the words of a language are arranged in order to convey larger meanings" (Hartwell, 1985, p. 109). Basically, errors in subject verb agreement could be related to the lack of applying this rule in the students' first language (Nayan & Jusoff, 2009). In addition, students tended to write incorrect morphological structure for certain words. One example of this situation is writing the word *us* instead of *use*.

In sum, both groups differed in terms of grammar and spelling while they performed similarly in terms of language use. Accordingly, 35% (7 out of 20) of the experimental group's students got a mark between 11 and 15 in the use of language while 45% (9 out of 20) of the control group students got the same range of grades. In terms of grammar and spelling, 55 % (11 out of 20) of the control group got a grade between 11 and 15 out of 20 while 30 % (6 out of 20) of the experimental group got this target level of performance. Based on the mentioned information, the

difference between both groups in terms of grammar and spelling is due to the students' weak knowledge of words morphology and grammatical rules. Accordingly, these are results of the poor exposure to reading English texts which enhance the students' knowledge of the spelling of new vocabulary terms.

B. Recommendations

The researcher's concept regarding this investigation is that it is part of continuous studies that will be done on the effect of applying the prewriting strategy of clustering on EFL students writing self-efficacy. Therefore, for further researches, it would be better if the researcher was the participants' teacher since that will affect the research's results in several points. Firstly, the researcher would have control over the teaching process, so the study could be conducted at the beginning of the academic year before introducing the students to any of the writing teaching strategies. Secondly, the researcher could communicate directly with the participants and get a better control over the research's procedure such as the questionnaire distribution and the time spent by the participants to fill in the questionnaire. Furthermore, the scope of this study could be generalized over other educational contexts since it observed two dimensions, the prewriting strategy of clustering and the writing self-efficacy which exist in every English teaching context. In addition, the study could be extended over the duration of one whole academic year in order to examine the students' development while learning the prewriting strategy of clustering throughout the research. In accordance, students are recommended to write more than one essay over the duration of the research in order to examine their development in terms of writing self-efficacy. To examine the students' levels of writing self-efficacy, it is recommended to interview the students personally in order to come up with precise results. Moreover, students can enhance their levels of writing self-efficacy in vocabulary knowledge and grammar by getting their peers feedback.

VI. REFERENCES

BOOKS

- BEREITER Carl, & SCARDAMALI Marlene, **The Psychology of Written Composition**,. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987.
- BRAINE George, **Teaching English to the World** (p. 163). New Jersey: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group (2005).
- BRIGHT William, & DANIELS Peter, **The World's Writing systems**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- BROWN Kristin, & HOOD Susan, **Writing Matters (Writing skills and strategies for students of English**, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- CHOMSKY Noam, **Bilgi Sorunları ve Dil: Managua Dersleri**. (V. Kılıç, Trans.) Istanbul, 2009.
- CLARK Sarah Kartchner, **Writing Strategies for Social Studies**, Huntigton Beach: Shell Education, 2014.
- ELLIS Donald, **From Language to Communication**, New York: Routledge, 2012.
- GLANZ Karen, & RIMER, Barbara, **Health Behavior and Health Education Theory. Research and Practice**. San Fansisco: Jossey- Bass, 2008.
- HASPELMATH Martin, & SIMS Andrea, **Understanding Morphology**. Oxon: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2nd Edition, 2010.
- HAYES John, A New Framework for Understanding Cognition and Affect in Writing, In R. Indrisano, & J, Squire, **Research, Theory and Practice** (pp. 6- 44). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 2000.
- ISAAC Stephane, & MICHAEL William. **Handbook in research and evaluation: A collection of principles, methods, and strategies useful in planning, design, and evaluation of studies in education and the behavioral Sciences**. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Services, 3rd Edition, 1997.

- KINNEAVY James, **A Rhetoric of Doing Essays on Written Discourse**, Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992.
- LUCAS Frank Laurence, **Style: The Art of Writing Well**. Britain: Harriman House LTD, 2012.
- NUNAN David, **Second Language Teaching and Learning**. U.S.: Heinle & Heinle, 1999.
- OSHIMA Alice, & HOGUE, Ann, **Writing Academic English** Addison-Wesley, 3rd Edition ed, 1999.
- PENNY Ur, **A Course in Language Teaching**. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- RASINGER Sebastian, **Quantitative Research in Linguistics: An Introduction**. New York: Blooms Burry Academic, 2013.
- RICHARDS Jack, & SCHMIDT Richard, **Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics**. Britain: Routledge, 2010.
- RICO Gabriel, & CLAGETT Mary, **Balancing the Hemispheres: Brain Research and Teaching of Writing**, University of California Berkeley, 1983.
- SAUSSURE Ferdinand, **Genel dilbilim dersleri**. (B. Vardar, Trans.) Istanbul 1998.
- SILVA Tony, **Second language composition instruction: development issues, and directions in ESL**. In K. Barbara, **Second Language Writing** , 11-23, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

ARTICLES

- ADRIATI Meliya, “The Use of Clustering Technique in Teaching Writing Narrative Text”, **Journal of English and Education**, Vol. 1 Issue 2, February, 2013, Pages 39-46.
- AHMED Yousuf, “Errors of Unity and Coherence in Saudi Arabian EFL University Studens’Written Paragraph – A Case Study of College of Science & Arts”, Tanumh, King Khalid University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia., **European Journal of English Language Teaching**, Vol. 4, Issue 3, 2019, Pages 125- 155.
- Al ASMARI AbdulRahman, “Investigation of Writing Strategies, Writing Apprehension, and Writing Achievement among Saudi EFL - Major Students”, **International Education Studies**, Vol. 6, Issue 11, 2013, Pages 130- 143.

- ANDERSON Richard, & FREEBODY Peter, "Vocabulary knowledge". In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews*, Newark, DE: **International Reading Association**, 1981, Pages 77- 117.
- ANDRADE Heidi Goodrich, "Teaching with Rubrics: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly", **College Teaching**, Vol. 53, Issue 1, 2005, August, 27-31.
- ANGGRAIN Siti Wahyu, " The Effectiveness of Using Chronological Paragraph Strategy Toward Students' Writing Skill". **Journal of Languages and Language Teaching**, Vol. 9, Issue 1, 2021, Pages 77-84.
- APPLEBEE Arthur, "Problems in process approaches: Toward a reconceptualization of process instruction", In A. R. Petrosky, & D. Bartholomae, **The Teaching of Writing**, Chicago: National Society For the Study of Education, 1986, Pages 95- 113.
- ARNDT Valerie, "Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing", **ELT Journal**, Vol. 41, Issue 4, October, 1987, Pages 257-267.
- ASPERS, Patrik, CORTE, Ugo. What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research. **Qualitative Sociology**, Vol. 42, 2019, Pages 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-019-9413-7>
- AZAR, Betty (2007). Grammar- Based Teaching: A Practitioner's Perspective. **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language**, Vol.11, Issue 2, September, 2007, Pages1-12.
- BAE Jungok, BENTLER Peter, & LEE Yae- Sheik., "On the Role of Content in Writing Assessment" **Language Assessment Quarterly**, Vol. 13, Issue 4, November, 2016, Pages 302- 328.
- BAHAZIQ Afnan , "Cohesive devices in written discourse: a discourse analysis of a student's essay writing", **English language teaching** , Vol. 9, Issue 7, May, 2016, p. 112.
- BANDURA Albert, "Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change" **Psychological Review**, Vol. 84, Issue 2, 1977, Pages 191-215.
- BEKTAŞ Yeşim, (2020). "Writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language: Turkish Context", **International Journal of Language Studies**, Vol. 14, Issue 2, April, 2020, Pages 89- 102.

- CANALE Michael, & SWAIN Merrill, "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing", **Applied Linguistics**, 1980, Pages 1-47.
- CHAFE Wallace & TANNEN Deborah, "The Relation Between Written and Spoken Language", **Annual Review of Anthropology**, Vol. 16, 1987, Pages 383-407.
- CORKETT Julie, HATT Blaine, & BENEVIDES Tina, "Student and Teacher Self-Efficacy and the Connection to Reading and Writing", **Canadian Journal of Education**, Vol. 34, Issue 1, 2011, Pages 65-98.
- CROSSLEY Scott, MULDER Kasia, & MCNMARA, Danielle, "Idea Generation in Student Writing: Computational Assessments and Links to Successful Writing", **SAGE Journals**, Vol. 33, Issue 3, June, 2016, Pages 328-354.
- DEMIR Sezgin, "The Relationship between the Awareness Level of Writing Strategies and Writing Self Efficacy", **International Education Studies**, Vol. 11, Issue 5, April, 2018, Pages 59- 73.
- EKOÇ Arzu, "Difficulties Faced by Postgraduate Students of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Thesis Writing in Turkey", Inonu University **Journal of the Faculty of Education**, Vol. 20, Issue 1, 2019, Pages 152-164.
- ERKAN Dilek Yavuz, "Effect of Cross- Cultural E-Mail Exchange on Self-Efficacy in EFL Writing", **Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi**, Vol. 22, Issue 1, 2013, Pages 25- 42 .
- FAJRI Nurul, Assessing Unity, Coherence and Word Usage in Students' Writing. **English Educational Journal**, Vol. 7, Issue 1, 2016, Pages 102- 116.
- GHUFRON Ali, "The Implementation of Clustering Technique to Improve Students Writing Skill in Descriptive Text of The Eighth Graders of MTs Darul Ulum Purwoasri Sukosewu Bojonegoro in The Academic Year of 2012/2013", **Journal Pendidikan Utama**, Vol. 1, Issue 1, 2014, Pages 8-16.
- GINTING FiberYun, "An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Punctuation Marks in Descriptive Paragraph Writing", **Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)**, Vol. 1 , Issue 3, October, 2018, Pages 338-344.

- GRAHAM Steve, "Executive control in the revising of students with learning and writing difficulties", **Journal of Educational Psychology**, Vol. 2, Issue 89, 1997, Pages 223-234.
- HALL Anna , and AXELROD Ysaaca, "Examining Students' Writing Attitudes", **Journal of Research in Education**, Vol. 24, Issue 2, 2014, Pages 34-50.
- HARTWELL Patrick, "Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar", **National Council of Teachers of English**, Vol. 47, Issue 2, February, 1985, Pages 105- 127.
- HASAN Md Kamrul, and AKHAND Mohd, "Approaches to Writing in EFL/ ESL Context: Balancing Product and Process in Writing Class at Teritiary Level", **Journal of NELTA**, Vol. 15, December, 2010, Pages 77-88.
- HASHEMNEJAD Felor, ZOGHI Masoud, & AMINI Davoud, "The Relationship between Self- Efficay and Writing Performance across Genders", **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**, Vol. 4, Issue 5, May, 2014, Pages 1045- 1052.
- HAYES John, and FLOWER Linda, "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing", Vol. 32, Issue 4, December, 1981, Pages 365- 387.
- HUANG Yu & ZHANG Lawrence Jun (2020) "Does a Process-Genre Approach Help Improve Students' Argumentative Writing in English as a Foreign Language? Findings from an Intervention Study", **Reading & Writing Quarterly**, Vol.36, Issue 4, August, 2019, Pages 339-364.
- HYLAND Ken., Writing theories and writing pedagogies. **Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching**, Vol. 2, Issue 4, 2008, Pages 91-110.
- INAL Sevim, "The Effects of The Clustering Pre- Writing Strategy on Turkish Students'Writing Achievement and Their Writing Attitudes", **The Journal of Academic Social Science**, March, 2014, Pages 593- 611.
- IROEGBU Manasseh, "Self Efficacy and Work Performance: A Theoretical Framework of Albert Bandura's Model, Review of Findings, Implications and Directions for Future Research", **Psychology and Behavioral Sciences**, Vol. 4, Issue 4, January, 2015, Pages 170-173 .
- JACKSON Jay, "Enhancing Self-Efficacy and Learning Performance", **The Journal of Experimental Education**, Vol. 70, Issue 3, 2002, Pages 243-254.

- JONES Susan, "Composing in the style of Mozart: An exploration of the 'struggling boy writer comparing the composing processes and strategies of boys and girls", **English Teaching: Practice and Critique**, Vol. 6 , Issue 1 May, 2007, Pages 97- 112.
- JR Anthony, "Academic self-efficacy: from educational theory to instructional practice", **Perspectives on Medical Education**, Vol. 1, April, 2012. Pages 76- 85.
- JUNianti Rika , PRATOLO Bambang Widi, & WULANDARI Arifiana Tri, "The Strategies of Learning Writing Used by EFL learners at a Higher Education Institution", **Ethical Lingua**, Vol. 7, Issue 1, 2020.
- KAPLAN Robert, Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education, **Language Learning Journal**, Vol 16, 1966, Pages 1-20.
- KELLOGG Ronald, "Attentional overload and writing performance: Effects of rough draft and outline strategies", **Journal of Experimental Psychology**, Vol. 14, Issue 2, 1988, Pages 355-365 .
- KELLOGG Ronald, "Effectiveness of Prewriting Strategies as a Function of Task Demands", **The American Journal of Psychology**, Vol. 103, Issue 3, 1990, Pages 327- 342.
- KHOSRAVI Maryam, GHORCHAEI Behrooz, & MOFRAD Ali Arab, "The Relationship between Writing Strategies, Self- Efficacy and Writing Ability: A Case of Iranian EFL Students", **International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies**, Vol. 5, Issue 3, September, 2017, Pages 96- 102.
- KIRMIZI Özkan, & KIRMIZI Gülin Dagdeviren, "An Investigation of L2 learners' Writing Self- Efficacy, Writing Anxiety and its Causes at Higher Education in Turkey", **International Journal of Higher Education**, Vol. 4, Issue 2, 2015, Pages 57-66.
- KIZILDAG Ayse, "Teaching English in Turkey:Dialogues with Teachers about The Challenges in Public Primary Schools", **International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education**, Vol. 1, Issue 3, June, 2009, Pages 188-201.
- MACARTHUR Charles, PHILIPPAKOS Zoi, & GRAHAM Steve, "A Multicomponent Measure of Writing Motivation with Basic College Writers", **Sage Journals**, Vol. 39, Issue 1, April, 2015, Pages 31-43.

- MAGOGWE Joel, RAMOROKA Boitumelo Tiny, & MOGANA - MONYEPI Ruth, "Developing Student-Writers' Self-efficacy Beliefs", **Journal of Academic Writing**, Vol 5, Issue 2, 2015, Pages 20-28.
- MCCARTHEY Sarah J. & SUN Yeon, "Approaches to writing instruction", **Pedagogies: An International Journal**, Vol. 6, Issue 4, 2011, Pages 273-295.
- MCCARTHY Patricia, MEIER Scott, & RINDERER Regina, "Self-Efficacy and Writing: A Different View of Self-Evaluation", **College Composition and Communication**, Vol. 36, Issue 4, December, 1985, Pages 465-471.
- MEI - CHING HO, (2016). "Exploring Writing Anxiety and Self-Efficacy among EFL Graduate Students in Taiwan", **Higher Education Studies**, Vol. 6, Issue 1, December, 2016, Pages 1-16.
- NASSAJI Hasan, "Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis", **Language Teaching Research**, Vol. 9, Issue 2, 2015, Pages 129- 132.
- NAYAN Surina, & JUSOFF Kamaruzaman, "A Study of Subject-Verb Agreement: From Novice Writers to Expert Writers", **International Education Studies**, Vol. 2, Issue 3, August, 2009, Pages 190- 194.
- OLIVARES Cedeno, and ANDRES Jose, "Online Clustering to Improve IB Students' Writing: A Mixed Design Study", **Guayaquil: Universidad Casa Grande Repositorio Digital**. Facultad de Comunicación Mónica Herrera, June, 2019.
- PAJARES Frank, & VALIANTE Gio, "Influence of Self- Efficacy on Elementary Students' Writing", **The Journal of Educational Research**, Vol. 6, Issue 6, 1997, Pages 353-360.
- PAJARES Frank, "Self- Efficacy Beliefs, Motivation, and Achievement in Writing: A Review of The Literature", **Reading and Writing Quarterly**, Vol. 19, Issue 2, November, 2003, Pages 139- 158.
- PAJARES Frank, JOHNSON Margaret, & USHER Ellen, "Sources of Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Elementary, Middle, and High School Students" **Research in The Teaching of English**, Vol. 42, Issue 1, August, 2007, Pages 104- 120.

- PIERSON Susan Jacques, "The Power of Story: Using Personal Narrative, Computer Technology and Podcasting with Young Adult English Language Learners", **Teaching English with Technology**, Vol. 14, Issue, 4, 2014, Pages 3-16 .
- RAIMES Ann, Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in The Teaching of Writing, **TESOL Quarterly**, Vol. 25, Issue 3, 1991, Pages 407- 430 .
- SCOTT Barbara, VITALE Michael, "Teaching the Writing Process to Students with LD", **Intervention in School and Clinic**, Vol. 38, Issue 4, 2003, Pages 220-224.
- SHAFIEE Sajad, KOOSHA Mansour, & AFGHAR, Akbar, "CALL, Prewriting Strategies, and EFL Writing Quantity", **English Language Teaching**, Vol. 8, Issue 2, January, 2015, Pages 170- 177.
- SHELL Duane, MURPHY Carolun Colvin, & BRUNING Roger (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 81, 9 1- 100.
- SHWEBA Abdulsalam Alhadi, & MUJIYANTO Yan, "Errors of Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation Marks in Writing Encountered by First Year College Students in Al- Merghib University Libya", **English Educational Journal**, Vol. 7, Issue 2, July, 2017, Pages 92- 102.
- SIDDIQUI Malika Anwar, "Evaluating Capitalization Errors in Saudi Female studnts' EFL writing at Bisha University", **Arab World English Journal**, Vol. 6, Issue 1, 2015, Pages 232-250 .
- SOLAK Ekrem, and BAYAR Adem, "Current Challenges in English Language Learning in Turkish EFL Context", **Participatory Educational Research (PER)**, Vol. 2, Issue 1, April, 2015, Pages 105-115.
- STEELE Jeannie, & STEELE Patty, "The Thinking-Writing Connection: Using Clustering to Help Students Write persuasively", **Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts**, Vol. 32, Issue 1, 1991.
- SULIMAN Fatma, BEN- AHMEIDA Manal, & MAHALLA Salma, "Importance of Punctuation Marks for Writing and Reading Comprehension Skills", **Faculty of Arts Journal**, 2019, Pages 29-52.
- SUMARISH M.Pd., & SANJAYA Dedi, "TPS as an Effective Technique to Enhance the Students' Achievement on Writing Descriptive Text", **Canadian Center of Science and Education**, Vol. 6, Issue 12, November, 2013.

SUSSER Bernard, "Process approaches in ESL/EFL writing instruction" **Journal of Second Language Writing**, Vol. 3, Issue 1, January, 1994, Pages 31-47.

SUTIKNO Michael Kaprista, "Responding to students' writing. (Teaching writing or assessing it?)" **Journal Pendidikan Penabur**, Vol. 10, Issue 7, June, 2008, Pages 51-59.

TANGPERMPOON Thanatkun, "Integrated approaches to improve students' writing skills for English major students". **ABAC Journal**, Vol. 28, Issue 2, August, 2008, Pages 1-9.

TILFARIOGLU Filiz Talçın, & CINKARA Emrah, "Self- Efficacy in EFL: Differences among Proficiency Groups and Relationship with Success", **Research on youth and language**, Vol. 3, Issue 2, 2009, Pages 129-142.

WAHDAN Najwa Rebhi, & BUROGOHAIN Dipima, "Investigating the Effects of Using Writing Process on Students' Writing Performance at Foundation Program Hai'l University" **International Journal of Linguistics**, Vol. 10, Issue 3, June, 2018, Pages 14-20.

WANG Chunmei, "A Study of Genre Approach in EFL Writing" **Theory and Practice in Language Studies**, Vol. 3, Issue 11, November, 2013, Pages 2128- 2135.

YILDIZ Canan Demir, "Ideal Classroom Setting for English Language Teaching Through the Views of English Language Teachers (A Sample from Turkey)", **English Language Teaching**, Vol. 13, Issue 3, February, 2020, Pages 31-44.

ZHANG Ying, "Exploring EFL Learners' Self-Efficacy in Academic Writing Based on Process- Genre Approach", **English Language Teaching**, Vol. 11, Issue 6, May, 2018, Pages 115- 124.

ZIMMERMAN Barry, "Self-Efficacy: An Essential Motive to Learn", **Contemporary Educational Psychology**, Vol. 25, Issue 1, January, 2000, Pages 82-91.

ENCYCLOPEDIAS

BANDURA Albert, " Self – efficacy", (V. Ramachaudran, Ed.), **Encyclopedia of Human Behavior**, Vol. 4, 1994, Pages 71- 81.

ELECTRONIC SOURCES

FLEMING, G., "An introduction to essay writing", Retrieved from Thoughtco: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-an-essay-p2-1856929>, (Access Date: 20 June 2021).

NORDQUIST, R., "Prewriting for composition", Retrieved from Thoughtco.: <https://www.thoughtco.com/prewriting-composition-1691676>, (Access Date: 23 March 2021).

STEELE, V., "Product and Process Writing", Retrieved from <http://www.englishonline.org.cn/en/teachers/workshops/teaching-writing/teaching-tips/product-process> (Access Date: 5 December 2020).

VANKOOTEN, C. (2016). "Identifying Components of Meta-Awareness about composition: Toward a Theory and Methodology for Writing Studies". Retrieved from Composition forum: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Identifying-Components-of-Meta-Awareness-about-aVanKooten/50b006ef81c7ca7726706d8242b7d8822a214b5b> (Access Date: 15 November 2020)

DISSERTATIONS

ACHILI, Houda, "Teaching Coherence in Writing. The Case of Second Year Students at The University of Mentouri, Constantine" (Master's Thesis). Department of Foreign Languages Faculty of Letters and Languages, Constantine, 2007.

ANGGRAINI Emilia Putri, " Students' Strategies in Reaching Unity and Coherence in Their Essay Writing" (Master's Thesis). English Education Study Program Faculty of Tarbiyah and Tadris State Institute For Islamic Studies (Iain) Bengkulu, Bengkulu, 2019.

ETINURWATI Dwi Atma, "An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Punctuation in Descriptive Paragraph Writing at The First Semester of The Eighth Grade of SMPN 2 Pardasuka in The Academic Year of 2016/ 2017", (Undergraduate thesis), IAIN Raden Intan Lampung, 2017.

- NEMOUCHI, Ihcene, “The Influence of Punctuation on Writing, and the Difficulties Students Encounter While Using Either the Comma or the Semicolon. The Case of Third Year Students, University of Constantine” (Master’s Thesis). Department of Foreign Languages Faculty of Letters and Languages, Constantine, 2010.
- NGA Nguyen Thanh, “Learner autonomy in language learning: Teachers’ beliefs”. Doctor of Philosophy, Queensland University of Technology, Australia, 2014.
- RAHARJO Priyo, “The Implementation of Clustering Technique for Students’ Writing Ability in Cambridge Checkpoint Test At Al-Izzah International Islamic Boarding School Batu-East Java”, (Master’s thesis), University Of Muhammadiyah Malang, 2018.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Writing Self- Efficacy Scale

Appendix B: Writing Assessment Rubric



Appendix A: Writing Self- Efficacy Scale

Self- Efficacy in Writing Inventory

Read each numbered statement and use the scale below to indicate how you assess your ability in writing in English. The purpose is to get your personal view and there are no right or wrong answers so do not spend too much time on any one statement and just select the answer that best applies to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

1= I cannot do it at all

2= I can't do it well

3= I can do it

4= I can do it very well

	1	2	3	4
1. I can use the grammar rules that I learned in class easily and correctly.				
2. I can match style with topic easily. E.g. If I am asked to write an essay, I can use the appropriate conventions to write a good essay. When asked to write a story, I can write according to the conventions of story writing.				
3. I can express and support my opinion easily.				
4. I can choose and defend a point of view				
5. I can write very-well-organized compositions.				
6. I find it easy to start writing on a given topic.				
7. I can write grammatically correct sentences in my compositions.				
8. I can use a style that is appropriate to the task.				
9. When given a topic to write about, I can think of ideas quickly.				
10. I can write paragraphs that flow well.				
11. When writing a composition on a given topic, I find it easy to decide which style I should use. E.g. If I am asked to write a report, I can use the appropriate conventions to write a report.				
12. When given a topic to write about, I can think of ideas easily.				
13. Although I occasionally make mistakes when writing, I generally write good compositions				
14. I can use nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives in the right position in a sentence.				
15. I can use punctuation correctly.				

16. I find it easy to include all the information that should be dealt within on any given topic.				
17. I can locate and use suitable sources of information for any writing topic.				
18. I can write error-free sentences in my compositions.				
19. I can write coherent compositions.				
20. I can edit my compositions and correct mistakes in punctuation, capitalization, paragraph structure.				
21. When given a topic to write about, I can think of ideas quickly.				



Appendix B: Writing Assessment Rubric

Writing Assessment Rubric

Skills	Unacceptable (0-4)	Acceptable (5-10)	Target (11-15)	Exemplary (16-20)	Score
Logical division of Ideas	Does not present ideas convincingly, ineffective organization and unclear introduction and conclusion.	Presents ideas and paragraphs that are unrelated. Unfocused introduction and conclusion.	Presents coherent ideas within paragraphs using suitable transitions, most ideas are related. Good introduction and conclusion.	Presents ideas convincingly, organizes them logically. Paragraphs are connected with transitions. Clear and specific introduction and conclusion.	
Language use	Utilizes incorrect sentence structure and unclear topic sentence. Paragraphs do not flow well. Insufficient number of words which is less than 300 words. Displays serious and distracting errors.	Utilizes adequate sentence structure that convey the overall meaning and a clear topic sentence. Acceptable number of words which is more than 300 words. Displays errors that cause noticeable distraction.	Display correct sentence structure with clear topic sentence. Acceptable number of words which ranges between 300 and 350 words. Presents few errors that are not distracting.	Develops compact sentences using rhetoric words. Sufficient number of words which ranges between 350 and 400 words. Employs various sentence structures effectively and clear topic sentence.	
Grammar & Spelling	Comprehension is interfered with several grammatical and spelling errors which include incorrect morphological structure.	Presents grammatical and spelling errors that are distracting. Presents few mistakes in words morphology.	Presents few grammar and spelling errors which include two to three incorrect words morphology	Writing contains no grammar and spelling errors. Words are correctly written in terms of morphology.	
Ideas' Development And Generation	Presents unsupported ideas and insufficient reasoning.	Presents ideas generally and inconsistently, presents unclear reasoning	Most ideas are supported effectively with references to certain examples and evidence.	Presents ideas airily with strong subjective and objective index. Makes effective reasoning and provides good examples	
Use of Punctuation	Presents unpunctuated sentences, or places punctuation marks inappropriately.	Presents sentences with little punctuation.	Most sentences are supported with appropriate use of punctuation.	Presents sentences with correct punctuations that clarify the sentences for the reader.	

Total score:



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı :E-88083623-020-4690
Konu :Etik Onayı Hk.

30.12.2020

Sayın Randa ALSAMMAN

Tez çalışmanızda kullanmak üzere yapmayı talep ettiğiniz anketiniz İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonu'nun 22.12.2020 tarihli ve 2020/11 sayılı kararıyla uygun bulunmuştur. Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Dr.Öğr.Üyesi Alper FİDAN
Müdür Yardımcısı

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : *BEL93H6NZ* Pin Kodu : 98912

Belge Takip Adresi :
<https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/en/VisionDogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?>

Adres : Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Kaçıkçekmece / İSTANBUL
Telefon : 444 1 428
Web : <http://www.aydin.edu.tr/>
Kep Adresi : iau.yazisleri@iau.hu03.kep.tr

Bilgi için : Tuğba SÜNNETÇİ
Unvanı : Yazı İşleri Uzmanı

Tel No : 31002



