THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY AND ATTRIBUTION THEORIES IN WRITING PERFORMANCE

by

WONDWOSSEN DEMISSIE YAYIE

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS WITH SPECIALISATION IN TESOL
(TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

SUPERVISOR: DR SIBUSISO (CLIFF) NDLANGAMANDLA

2016

Dedication

I dedicate this labour of love to my cherished and respected brother-in-law, Commander Abebe Muluneh, and his beloved son Bisrat Abebe, in appreciation of a life devoted to limitless generosity and resolve.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Sibusiso (Cliff) Ndlangamandla, for his continuous support, useful advice and meticulous review of my thesis. He really went well beyond the call of duty by taking time to consult and assist me meaningfully in the completion of this project.

Next, I am indebted to all the school administrators, teachers, and learners, who whole heartedly sacrificed their precious time and energy to get involved in my study.

Finally, I must thank all my family and my friends who directly contributed to this work, by providing materials, encouragement, comments and assistance. In particular, I would like to thank my brother-in-law, Commander Abebe Muluneh, for his unreserved cooperation in all financial matters and for delivering essential materials at my disposal. Abe, I will always cherish your limitless generosity. God bless you. I am grateful to Tadesse Assefa and Adabay Sileshi for their assistance, Dr Asaminew Demissie and Yidnekatchew G/Yes for proof-reading and commenting on the chapters. I would also like to thank my sister-in-law, Zenebech Muluneh for her quiet, but constant support and encouragement. I will always be grateful to my wife, Assefu Muluneh, for being so supportive, even when I grew grumpy.

A special appreciation is also extended to my son, Be-emnet and my daughter, Manna whose worried glances at my disorderly papers gave me the added motivation to finalise my study and redirect my attention to fatherly duties. In conclusion and above all, I thank God who inspired all the people to help me and made this study a reality.

Abstract

In the last 20 years, various investigators have contributed valuable insights that shed light on the interconnected matrix of self-efficacy and attribution theories of motivation in instilling confidence and desire for academic achievement. However, these two areas of beliefs and their effects on students' achievement have rarely been researched together with writing performance here in Ethiopia.

Both quantitative and qualitative methodologies have been integrated in the analysis of the data gathered from two secondary schools. The quantitative method was employed where participants were involved in taking composition test, filling out the self-efficacy scale and a questionnaire on attribution so as to investigate the relationships among the variables. The qualitative method was also used to examine the teachers' role in boosting students' motivation towards effecting goal-oriented striving at success in English writing performance.

The findings of this study indicated that there is a positive and strong relationship between writing self-efficacy beliefs and awareness and effective performance in writing tasks. It was also found that the learners who attributed their success to their ability and effort rather than to external causes achieved better results. Moreover, the findings of the qualitative data indicated that teachers' interest and motivation to teach writing can play a crucial role so as to raise the learners' feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy to do the writing activity. In other words, teachers need to capitalise on their learners' fervent desire for success and achievement in whatever line of endeavour, and the vital role effective writing skills play in the realisation of life goals.

Key Terms:

Self-efficacy; Attribution; Writing Performance; Writing Self-efficacy; Self-efficacy Scale; Attribution Scale; Achievement; Achievement Attribution; Motivation; Integrative Motivation; Instrumental Motivation

Student number: 43039146

I declare that "**The Role of Self-efficacy and Attribution Theories in Writing Performance"** is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete reference.

_____ _____

SIGNATURE DATE

Wondwossen Demissie Yayie

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationships between predictions based on attribution and self-efficacy theories with excellence in writing performance in a classroom context. This study is a partial replication of Schunk's (1982, 1983, 1984, 1986) research on the linked concepts of self-efficacy and attributions of school children on their academic results. Schunk (1982) investigates the hypothesis that effort attribution feedback concerning past achievements promotes beliefs of self-efficacy and mathematical accomplishments. Schunk (1983) also explores the efforts of ability and effort attributional feedback given in subtraction competency development on children's perceived self-efficacy.

This research differs, however, in that the primary focus addresses the relationships between predictions based on attributions and self-efficacy theories on writing performance in the Ethiopian high school context. To date a number of studies have been conducted in this area (Bond, Biddle & Ntoumanis, 2001; Brown & Weiner, 1984; Covington & Omelich, 1985; Danehower & Houston, 2002; Hsieh, 2004; Nicholls, 1976; Weiner, Russell & Lerman, 1979). However, the relationships between the effects of self-efficacy and attributions theories on writing performance have not been examined concurrently.

The research seeks to establish if and how the positive outcomes of developed country studies on these theories may contribute to similar results in a school setting in Ethiopia. Given the uniformity of educational issues in the socio-economic setting of a developing country such as Ethiopia, variance in terms of teacher training, instructional resources and parental income status, although not the main focus of the study, may reflect on the outcomes of the private and government school continuum. Therefore, bearing this fact in mind, the relationship between learners' performance in composition writing and self-efficacy attitude, and the relationship between learners' performance in composition writing and causal attributions for their performance will be investigated concurrently.

The research will also explore the awareness of English language teachers and learners regarding the existence of research evidence that links ability, performance and competence in several academic domains to the role of an effective teacher. This ought to be viewed not only in terms of teaching the structure and mechanics of English writing, but also in arousing the desire of learners to steer the emotional component of learning from failure, to trial, retrial and leading to the eventual success. The role of the teacher in developing learners' motivation and sparking their cognitive abilities would be probed through the medium of focus group discussion, analyzing the varying techniques, styles, and methodologies that teachers employ to nurture creativity in learners.

The thesis ponders on self-efficacy theory postulated by Bandura (1986) and Schunk (1983, 1984), and attribution theory as posited by Weiner (1979, 1986) and deliberates their pragmatic, pedagogical significance on writing performance of second language English learners in Ethiopia.

1.2. Research problem

The research problem pertains to the drive to upgrade the English language writing proficiency of Ethiopian learners with an effort to familiarize second language English learners with the plethora of motivational theories aimed at boosting the internal desire to learn and achieve academically. Since academic success in any discipline hinges on the ability of learners to augment their vocabulary knowledge, master skills of processing words, ideas and concepts and cementing the ability to think creatively, critically and analytically, English writing proficiency assumes a vital role in mastering the principles of any discipline.

In Ethiopia, educational observers have pointed out for decades the glaring fact that the low level of English language instruction in the school system hinders the maturation of higher education standards to international benchmarks and leads to mediocrity and wastage of resources. As a result, this research aspires to introduce the benefits obtained from the developed country research findings to learners and teachers who may not be familiar with the impact of self-efficacy and attribution theories of motivation on, not only English writing performance, but also to raising general cognitive abilities as well.

1.3. Background to the study

This section will present the historical context of how English language teaching evolved in a traditional, multilingual society with the modernisation of a largely religious-based indigenous education system.

1.3.1 English language teaching in Ethiopia

Ethiopia, situated in the Horn of Africa, is considered to be one of the developing countries based on its economic development and the living standard of its people (Michael, 2004). It has an area of about one million square kilometres with a population of approximately 86 million, of which 85% live in rural areas, according to Central Statistics Agency (2013).

The introduction of the English language to Ethiopia was not a direct legacy of Africa's colonial history since the language of the coloniser was Italian. After the liberation of occupied Ethiopian territories from Italy in 1941, the Ethiopian government voluntarily adopted English as the medium of instruction (MOI). When western education was introduced to Ethiopia in the early 19th century, French was the MOI. English, however, soon took over and it was taught by teachers from the United States, Great Britain, Canada and India.

During the reign of Emperor Haile-Selassie, English served as the link of the country to the International community. The post-independence Africanisation trend led to the Ethiopianisation of the teaching staff; and effort was initiated in the development of instructional books and materials related to the local, social and economic reality. After the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization reported that indigenous languages of instruction facilitate understanding, Amharic took on the role of the MOI in the elementary schools. Presently, English has remained the MOI in secondary and tertiary levels.

Under Colonel Mengistu Haile-Mariam, the aim of education was seen as the creation of the well-rounded communist man and English was seen as a weapon for intensifying the struggle against international imperialism. More emphasis was given to political indoctrination rather than learning and the standards of both English and education fell drastically.

However, with the present government, English is seen as a key language to serve Ethiopia as a medium of international communication. The low standard of the learners' English proficiency persists as a problem. Specific reference is made to the low standard of English in the new educational policy Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE, 1994: 11). However, even in the past, when the learners' command of English was considered to be fairly good, the average university student was said to have had the proficiency of Grade 7-8 American student (Balsvik, 1985: 13).

The role of English as an MOI is being strengthened. The recent introduction of English as a subject starting from Grade 1 and the allocation of greater English contact hours at tertiary level indicates the present government's concern and commitment to improve the quality of English (Michael, 2004).

1.3.2 English language syllabus for Grade 11

According to the Institute for Curriculum Development and Research developed textbook (ICDR, 2001), the English Language Syllabus for Grade 11 contains a mere booklet of 44 pages. It has an introduction and 14 units. The introduction contains the purpose of the syllabus, the length of time the course should be taught, the learners' profile and the general objectives of the course. The language teaching in this book focuses mainly on developing the four language skills. The major themes for the units include:

- People and customs;
- Animal behaviour;
- Animals on the move;
- Clothes and fashions;
- Inventors and inventions;
- Farmers and farming;
- People on the move;
- Crafts and craftsmen;
- Images of Africa;
- Families and groups; and
- Journey into space.

The major aim for the Grade 11 writing section has been described as enabling learners to produce the kinds of writing which will be expected of them in their chosen subject specialisation, for example, essays, reports, notes, and summaries.

The writing activities are integrated into virtually all English learning activities, such as when practising and testing grammatical structures, written answers to comprehension questions, dictation, note-making and summary. But, the main focus for the development of continuous writing occurs within the Writing Section in the text. Therefore, in the Writing Sections of the unit, a variety of writing tasks are presented. These are usually topic-based. They gradually move from 'controlled' writing to 'guided' writing to 'free' writing (Taylor, 1998). According to Richards & Schmidt (2002), the terms 'controlled' writing, 'guided' writing and 'free' writing are highlighted in this way:

- Controlled writing or composition is one in which the learners writing is limited or controlled by various means, such as by providing questions to be answered, sentences to be completed, or pictures to describe;
- Guided writing is a teacher-directed mode of writing instruction in which the teacher directs the purpose, structure and response to the writing activity. This kind of writing can be used to model writing strategies; and
- Free writing or composition is one in which the learner's writing is not limited or controlled in any way, such as essay questions or writing about a particular topic.

The syllabus also states the methods as to how each language skill is to be presented. It mainly encourages the teachers to employ the communicative language teaching method and a learner-centred approach Thus, the methodology in the writing component of the Grade 11 syllabus includes descriptive writing; guided writing based on a text, narrative writing, and free writing, note-making and copying.

The research subjects consist of a tiny fraction of Grade 11 learners who took a National Examination given in the country at the end of Grade 10 in the years 2011/2012. The examining authority does not have any link to any international standards.

1.3.3 Basic information on region and schools

The section below is about the region and schools in which the research was carried out. It is meant to give the reader a broad perspective of the setting and education in the region as a whole.

1.3.3.1 Educational statistics of Region 14 – Addis Ababa City State

At present, Ethiopia is following a federal system of administration and has divided the country into 11 semi-autonomous regions or states. From the 11, there are city states. Addis Ababa is the fifth most populous region with roughly 3.7 million inhabitants. Educational statistics published by the Ministry of Education may not be actually accurate and have some internal inconsistencies. Nevertheless, they can provide one with the general overview, according to the Ministry of Education (MoE, 2001).

According to MoE (2001), Addis Ababa has 68 secondary schools. The learner/teacher ratio in these schools is 40/1. All of the secondary school teachers are qualified with a first degree while 72.2% of the primary teachers are certified. This shows a better degree of certification at secondary school level than at primary. From the secondary school teachers, 32.8% are females whereas 70.2% of them are males, indicating a disparity between male and female which is characteristic of the country. In contrast to other countries, in Ethiopia there are more male teachers than female at all levels. This is because empowering women through education was not given priority in the past. According to Fasikawit (2000: 8), 75% of women had either no education or had very low educational background. However, this gap appears to be closing at the primary level and is most noticeable at tertiary level.

1.3.3.2 Background to schools

One private school and one government school were selected for the study. The private school was established over half a century ago, in 1956. It is located near Addis Ababa Stadium, a place usually known as Meskal Square, with a combined primary and secondary enrolment. It has a student body of 1 400, and three sections for Grade 11. Learners attend full day and have an average class size of 45. The English Department is composed of four teachers, all male with the department head.

The government school, a Senior Secondary School, was established in 1957 named as Girls Christian Academy and was a boarding school. During the socialist revolution, it was renamed as Abiyot Kiris (Heritage of the Revolution in Amharic), and has a student body of 2 498 with six sections at Grade 11. The school has an average class size of 50. The English Department is composed of six teachers – four males and two females, with a female department head.

1.4. Value of the research

The findings and conclusions of the study will acquaint teachers of English with the awareness of the roles of self-efficacy and attribution theories in influencing and predicting learners' performance in writing. The empirical significance to learners would be manifested in their beliefs of competence and the casual attribution they ascribe to factors that hinder or facilitate writing performance. In tandem, teachers and learners may develop strategies to control the emotional and cognitive components that determine learning outcomes.

The findings of the study have another practical implication in creating effective teachers capable of raising their learner's writing self-efficacy levels, as well as their general cognitive capacities. Ultimately, it is the sincere and humble hope of the researcher that the findings and conclusions may inspire future investigations that may lead to empirical knowledge which may boost pedagogy in all disciplines.

1.5. Research questions

The main goal of this study is to investigate the relationships between self-efficacy and attribution theories in the teaching and learning of English composition writing. The following are the research questions, which serve as parameters that delineate the scope of the study.

a. What is the relationship between learners' performance in writing and self-efficacy?
b. What is the relationship between learners' performance in writing and causal attributions they provide for their performance?
c. How does writing self-efficacy and causal attribution influence performance in writing?
d. What is the role of the teacher in developing learners' feelings of self-efficacy?

1.6. Research hypothesis

The interrelations among writing self-efficacy, performance in composition and attribution styles contribute to English writing competency and may predict professional achievement, regardless of line of work.

1.7. Limitations of the study

The limitations of this study can be attributed to the sample size of 90 learners. Some responses from the learners were spoiled. Nine learners did not form part of the study since they gave incomplete responses. Absence and carelessness while responding to some of the items were the major reasons for the failure to provide complete answers. However, the other 81 participants gave complete responses, and the research instruments were found to be valid.

1.8. Dissertation chapter outline

The research is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 consists of the background information of the study and the research problem. It includes background to English language teaching in Ethiopia, the syllabus, basic information on the region and schools, and the value of the research.

Chapter 2 focuses on the review of related literature. This chapter discusses some of the theoretical frameworks relevant to motivation, attribution and self-efficacy. It examines the literature on the relationship between self-efficacy and attribution, the research results and practices related to self-efficacy, attribution and the writing skill. It attempts to give the general background and recent research developments on the interrelationships among the above variables.

Chapter 3 expounds the research methods, describing the research design, and research methodology. The research design relies on descriptive means and the methodology combines qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.

Chapter 4 outlines the findings and discussion of writing self-efficacy and performance in writing, writing self-efficacy and attribution as perceived causes of success and failure. Also it discusses the role of the teacher in developing learners' feelings of self-efficacy in writing performance.

Finally, chapter 5 culminates with the summary, conclusion and recommendations. This chapter is divided into three major sub-sections. The first sub-section attempts to summarise the whole research work especially giving brief explanations on the questions that were raised in the study and results obtained from the research. The second sub-section presents the conclusions arrived at. Finally, based on the findings of the research, certain vital points may be recommended for teachers. Implications for teaching writing will also be suggested as a guide to pedagogical practice and implementation of insights into day-to-day teaching.

CHAPTER 2

2. Review of the literature

Since the main purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships between attribution and self-efficacy in writing performance, this chapter will review the literature on the attribution theory, the self-efficacy theory, writing and the assessment of writing. The first section will introduce motivation. It will also examine some of the theoretical frameworks relevant to attribution published over the last 25 years. The second section will examine self-efficacy, the literature on the relationship between self-efficacy and achievement. Apart from examining the relationship between self-efficacy and achievement, this section will also discuss research findings on the relationship between self-efficacy and attribution theories. Finally, the researcher will attempt to show how the review contributed to his understanding of the relationship among self-efficacy, attributions, writing and inspired him to conduct this research.

2.1. Motivation, self-efficacy and attribution

Motivation stands out as one of the influential factors of learner achievement, and has also been a vital area of research in the field of educational psychology, for many years. Various studies depict the positive correlation between motivation and achievement (Ringness, 1965; Wang, Haertal & Walberg, 1993). Nevertheless, simply recognising the importance of learner motivation and how motivation relates to learners' actions does not prescribe a process whereby the actual skill may be initiated, developed and applied to achieve a significant advantage in learning tasks.

A proper and deeper understanding of motivation demands knowledge of the factors that facilitate motivation to learn and achieve. As a result, teachers have begun investigating why some learners are more interested than others to learn and how learners gain this interest to perform and carry out an activity to a successful outcome. In fact, how learners are interested and motivated to perform a particular task depends on many factors such as value they assign for the task, the nature of the task, past learning experience, and how it relates to the learners' goal.

In social cognitive theory, it has been demonstrated that learners develop types of beliefs about their abilities and about how they explain their success and failure. These beliefs are best understood in the context of social cognitive theory – an approach to understanding human cognition which assumes that we are active sharpers rather than simply passive reactors to our environment (Bandura, 1997).

There are a number of beliefs within the area of motivation. According to Graham & Weiner (1996), learners' self-beliefs are the principal components of academic motivation, grounded on the assumption that the beliefs that learners create, develop and hold to be true about themselves are vital forces in their success or failure in the school. Attribution and self-efficacy factors play major roles in our knowledge of learners' beliefs.

Building on the two strands of research and focusing on writing performance, the researcher will investigate in this study the relationships among self-efficacy, causal attributions and learners' writing performance.

In the past 20 years, many researchers have conducted a number of studies on self-efficacy in order to examine the relationship between learners' self-efficacy and achievement in a variety of domains (Schunk, 1981, 1982, 1984; Wood, & Locke, Edwin, 1987; Lane & Lane, 2001). Schunk (1981), in his Self-efficacy Analysis, showed that leaners perceived self-efficacy was an exact predictor of math performance. Wood and Locke, Edwin (1987) also reported a relationship between performance in a college management course and academic self-efficacy. Lane and Lane (2001) investigated whether self-efficacy measures predicted academic performance.

There also exist vast research investigating the relationship between attribution and achievement. Self-efficacy are the beliefs learners have about whether or not they are capable in successfully completing an activity (Bandura, 1986), whereas attributions are the beliefs learners have for why they have or have not successfully completed a given activity (Weiner, 1979). Even though self-efficacy and attribution greatly influence learners' achievement, they have not been concurrently studied with the learners' writing performance. There have been a number of studies which show the contribution of each belief to our knowledge of how very helpful and important learners' appreciation of themselves can be for their success in their learning endeavours.

Even though there are possible connections between self-efficacy and attribution theories that have been shown by different researchers such as Schunk (1981, 1982, and 1983) and Bandura (1986), studies examining the possible relationship between these two constructs in learners' writing performance have not yet been studied. Schunk's research (1981, 1982 and 1983) has primarily focused on the relationship between efficacy and attribution feedback, where teachers give learners feedback, such as telling the learners that they have done well because they are very talented or that they have not done as well as expected because they did not try hard enough.

Hsieh (2004) also investigated the direct relationship between foreign language learners' attribution, self-efficacy beliefs, general self-efficacy beliefs and their achievement in foreign language classes. Hsieh (2004), in her study on the three foreign languages: Spanish, German and French, reported that there was a significant relationship between learners self-efficacy and attribution. In the study, scores on the self-efficacy scales were positively correlated with internal, stable personal attribution, such as effort and ability.

Furthermore, Zhang and Lu (2002) examined the formation of motivation based on two essential factors. These are self-efficacy and attributional feedback. The study was a test of learners' motor skills. Zhang and Lu (2002) found that attributional feedback and self-efficacy both influenced learners' motivation. These results were in line with Bandura's (1999) hypothesis that self-efficacy is mediated by attribution and that attribution plays a major role by influencing people's self-efficacy.

There have also been a number of studies that portray the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and essay writing. Teachers who have conducted studies on self-efficacy beliefs and essay writing consent that the two are related. For example, Meier McCarthy and Schmeck (1984) reported that writing self-efficacy predicted the writing performance of undergraduates. The research investigated the relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing performance, and found learners' efficacy had direct influence on their performance.

Although previous research in other countries, such as done by Schunk (1984, 1986), Meir, *et al.* (1984), Pajares and Johnson (1996), Burden (2003) has shown that learners with high writing self–efficacy tend to make adaptive (internal) attributions. According to Marsh

(1988), attributional pattern is one in which success is related to ability and effort, and failure is attributed to lack of effort. This kind of attributional process has not yet been proven in Ethiopia as the socio-economic realities (living standards of the people, quality of resource materials at school and teachers) place the country in a unique position. Therefore, research findings that are obtained and successful in other countries may not be valued in Ethiopia. Consequently, a World Bank report on education in Sub-Saharan countries says: "It is difficult to generalise about what will ensure high quality education because the factors determining education are so complexly interwoven and dependent on local context" (Heneveld& Craig: 1996: 12). The report explains that research and data about education are based on the realities of developed countries.

Therefore, this research attempts to examine the relationships among writing self-efficacy, learners' performance in composition and attribution factors for their performance in the Ethiopian high schools context. Since Ethiopia is one of the underdeveloped countries in the world, it is not appropriate to generalise research data and results which were conducted based on the realities of developed countries. This researcher recognizes the challenge and opportunity of this discrepancy and its impact on the path-breaking direction the research points to future investigations.

2.2. Attribution

According to Moyo (1994), attribution theory emerged partly from the need for a more mentalistic approach to the theory of motivation. Attribution theories of motivation start from the premise that people try to bring order into their lives by developing personal, sometimes called implicit, theories about why things happen as they do in their lives and in the lives of others.

Attribution theory, which was developed by Weiner (1979), was an attempt to understand how people see the cause of their behaviour and to look at the way their beliefs may affect the way they behave and become motivated (Fiska & Taylor, 1984). Based on the above explanation, when learners become successful at certain points in their lives and fail at others, they usually try to think back and see their experiences and then they want to understand the causes of their success and failure. Whenever the learners search for elaborations for the causes of their success, it can be easy for them to control the situations that might affect them and keep on working, with the hope of becoming successful time and again. In the same way, the process of ascribing a reason for failure can guide a person in order to avoid failing again.

However, the process is dependent upon one's beliefs. For example, if a learner believes that his or her success is due to the amount of effort he or she has put into the task, the learner will expect to do well the next time he or she approaches similar tasks assuming that effort can determine the outcome. The reasoning process is known as making attributions; and it is a concept introduced in the literature to understand learners' motivation and achievement in the classroom.

Heider (1958) and Kelley (1967, 1972) were among the first to describe the causal attribution process that people use to explain events that occur in their lives.

According to Stipek (2002), attribution is people's behaviour which is determined by their thinking and interpretations. And this is an assumption of cognitive theory that is believed to explain individuals' active response to their surroundings. Attribution theory is, thus, a very good exemplification of cognitive factors in the processes of learning and achievement.

Kelley (1967) stated that, "attribution theory concerns the process by which an individual perceives events, as being caused by a particular part of a relatively stable environment". As a result, attribution is the perception that people form about the causality behind the degree of success of their actions in situations when the causes may not be directly observable.

According to Weiner (1986), there have been three dimensions of causality identified in attribution theory. These are locus, stability and controllability. It is these three causal dimensions that influence individuals to choose to continue doing a task. These dimensions cause individuals to judge themselves when encountering tasks.

The first dimension, locus of causality was originally identified by Fritz Heider in 1958. Heider hypothesised that the result of an action was dependent upon two conditions: (a) factors within the person (internal), and (b) factors within the environment (external). Based on Heider's earlier conceptualisations, Rotter (1966) introduced the notion of an internal-external locus of control.

In Weiner's (1986) model, locus of causality draws extensively from Rotter's paradigm. That is, individuals who adhere to an external locus of causality interpret their behaviour as being caused by external events, whereas individuals with an internal locus of causality perceive their performance outcomes as reflective of attributes that lie within themselves. For instance, when experiencing failure, individuals with an external locus of causality attribute poor results to sources outside themselves, such as unluckiness, teacher bias or difficult examination. Conversely, individuals with an internal locus of causality can probably attribute failure outcomes to internal attributes such as lack of ability or effort.

The second dimension which is called stability reflects the degree of constancy which is found in a given cause. According to Heider (1958), internal causes, such as aptitude or ability, are perceived as unchanging, whereas effort and mood are changing across situations and contexts. External causes, such as school grading system are considered constant, whereas luck is unstable since no individual is able to tell when he/she will have good or bad luck.

The stability dimension classifies causes on the basis of time and constancy, thereby influencing learners' future performance expectations. Presumably, stable factors such as ability are more predictive of future performance than unstable attributions such as effort (Weiner, 1986).

The last dimension, causal controllability, was introduced by Weiner in 1979 to add greater distinction to causes identified as internal or external and stable or unstable. "Controllability" is defined as how much control an individual has over a cause. Effort and strategy would be seen as controllable because the individual can control how much effort to exert to a given task and can decide on the strategy to use. Ability is not controllable because it is often believed to be genetically inherited (Weiner, 1986).

To summarise the main components of Weiner's (1986) attributional theory of achievement motivation, the following table is provided.

Table 2.1: Achievement attributions classified by locus, stability, and controllability dimensions

	Internal		External	
	Controllable	Uncontrollable	Controllable	Uncontrollable
Stable	Long-term effort	Aptitude/Ability	Instructor bias	Difficulty of school requirements
Unstable	Situational effort	Health	Help from others	Chance/Luck

Adapted from: An Attributional Theory of Motivation and Emotion by B. Weiner (1986).

According to Weiner (1986), attribution is more likely to occur when a learner comes upon a situation that is unexpected. Whenever learners fail, they are prone to find reasons why they are not successful. Learners are also more likely to find causes for an event that is important to them. But, the questions are:

- How do learners determine what causes them to pass or fail exams?
- How can they attribute success or failure to internal or external factors, stable or unstable characteristics, controllable or uncontrollable causes?

According to Weiner's claim (1977), learners' attributions come from various factors. These are: the learners' past experiences; the feedback they get from teachers; and when they observe the performance of their fellow learners. Weiner (1986) stated that learners' attribution could also arise from the perception they give to themselves. Learners with high self-confidence attributed their success to effort or ability rather than luck (Ames & Ames, 1984). Regardless of the accuracy of these attributions, they will influence learners' motivation, achievement, and even emotions (Graham, 1994).

Given the universal relevance and significance of attribution theory in predicting achievement, the mitigating influences of the quality of teacher preparation, textbook sophistication and the early background factors of students may pose added complications that challenge a researcher in a third world socio-economic context. Therefore, the investigation of the relationship between learners' performance in composition writing and causal attribution for their performance may generate added complexity that influences research outcomes.

2.2.1 Attribution and Achievement

For learners' beliefs and expectancy, attribution process is one of the major factors, (Graham, 1991). Hence, many researchers studied the relationship between learners' attribution and achievement motivation. These studies have been conducted in the areas of sports, mathematics and foreign language learning.

Powers, Choroszy, Douglas and Cool (1986) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between attribution and achievement. The result of the research indicated that achievement was positively correlated with attribution of success to effort and negatively related with attributions of failure to lack of failure. Bempechat, Ginsburg, Nakkula and Wu (1996) also conducted research to see the relationship between Mathematics achievement and attributions. The result of the study showed that a high achievement was correlated with attribution of success to ability.

A study which has been conducted by Pishghadam and Modarresi (2008) to observe the relationship between attributions and athletics achievement indicated that athletes made stable attributions for negative outcomes and those athletes who made unstable attributions for positive events have poorer achievement.

Burden (2003) delineated ways in which Japanese learners interpreted and constructed reasons for their success and failure in learning a foreign language. The results indicated that the learners saw ability and effort as being the principal attributions for success.

Two studies (Hsieh, 2004; Pishghadam and Modarresi, 2008) have designed a scale for the specific measurement of foreign language learners' attributions. Hsieh (2004) examined the relationship between foreign language learners' attribution and their foreign language achievement. The results showed that those learners who made internal, stable attributions received higher grades in foreign language classes than those who made more external, unstable attributions. Pishghadam and Modarresi (2008) designed a questionnaire of "Attribution Theory for Foreign Language Learners" comprising four subscales of emotions, self-image, intrinsic motivation, and language policy. Then, they employed this questionnaire to learners in Ferdowsi University of Mashhad in the Middle East. The findings indicated that learners attributed success and failure more to intrinsic motivation than language policy.

In another study, Kun and Liming (2007) investigated the role of achievement attributions on self-regulated language learning behaviours. They observed that those learners who attributed success to internal factors, such as ability or effort, demonstrated more self-regulated language learning behaviours.

Despite the fact that there have been many studies investigating the relationship between attributions and achievement in different areas, research and practice of the linkage between attribution theory and writing performance is just currently being pursued, internationally.

2.3. Self-efficacy

Historically, the theory of self-efficacy was conceived and developed by Albert Bandura during the 1970s (Bandura, 1977, 1986). "Self-efficacy" is a theory which refers to a person's belief in how well he or she can accomplish a task (Bandura, 1977). Bandura (1977) introduced the central issue of self-efficacy in an article where he discussed how he believed the theory worked. Self-efficacy, the major element of social learning theory, is the result of cognitive theory, the processing of information which is used by humans to modify and change or reinforce their behaviours. In social learning, behaviour is modified through modelling and cognitive processing. Bandura (1986) postulates that the mechanisms initiating change in humans involve cognitive processing.

According to Bandura (1977), an individual's perceived self-efficacy has a powerful influence over his or her choice of an activity. It can also influence the type of effort the person expends, and to what extent one can control that effort when facing trouble. Thus, self-efficacy beliefs have been proposed to influence learners' motivation. Bandura (1997) cites the four sources of feelings of self-efficacy. These are:

- Performance experience;
- Vicarious experience;
- Verbal persuasion; and
- Learner's physiological state.

The first, “performance experience” refers to knowledge and skills gained through experience and perseverance. To acquire self-efficacy, some failures need to be experienced. If success comes too easily, the learner is likely to feel less of a sense of accomplishment and feelings of mastery are likely to decrease. But whenever certain failures are encountered, the learner has the chance to make adjustments so as to take actions to better control over what is going on. In this way, constant effort leads to a greater sense of self-efficacy.

“Vicarious experience” refers to the experiences of others used as a model and as a level of comparison as to what skills are necessary to complete an activity (Bandura, 1997). This may involve observing the successful performance of other learners. When individuals watch successful performances of other persons, they try to improve and develop their self-efficacy level.

“Verbal persuasion” serves to reinforce feelings of efficacy when facing failures. The verbal persuasion learners receive from various people can help them to have faith in themselves when experiencing doubt.

“Physiological states” also serve as sources of information toward an individual’s self-evaluation of efficiency. If a learner undergoes feelings of stress, he/she is likely to doubt his or her ability to perform the task well. This can have a direct effect on whether a learner is able to maintain feelings of perseverance in the face of failure.

According to Cioffi (1991), changing the individual’s perception of physical reactions to difficult situations, like fear or embarrassment, can greatly affect feelings of self-efficacy. From these sources of efficacy, it is possible to conclude that success raises efficacy and failure lowers it. Those with low self-efficacy respond to difficulties with increased fear and anxiety, which normally disrupts performance.

As Bandura (1993) summarises, learners with low sense of self-efficacy in a given domain perceive difficult tasks as personal threats; they dwell on their own personal deficiencies and the obstacles they encounter rather than concentrating on how to perform the task successfully. As a result, they easily lose faith in their capabilities and are likely to give up.

2.3.1 Influences of Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy beliefs influence learners' choices of goal-directed activities of effort, persistence in the face of challenge and obstacles. How learners perform activities depend heavily on self-efficacy. Self-efficacy theory propagated by Schunk (1984) discusses how learners gain information about their level of efficacy in achievement settings. Self-efficacy measures focus on performance capabilities rather than on personal qualities. According to Bandura (1982), when learners are given sufficient skill, positive outcome expectations, and personally valued outcomes, self-efficacy is considered to influence the choice and learners' behaviour.

Self-efficacy beliefs have been proven to influence academic motivation, level of effort, choice of activities and persistence. Learners who have high self-efficacy beliefs participate actively in the class discussion, work diligently, take part in challenging activities, show constant effort in the face of hardship, and experience little anxiety when they face difficult situations compared to learners with low self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

2.3.2 Self-efficacy and Achievement

There exists a plethora of research that shows the positive and significant relationships between self-efficacy beliefs and learner achievement (Hackett, 1985; Lane & Lane, 2001; Lent & Hackett, 1987; Pajares & Miller, 1994; Schunk, 1983).

Research on self-efficacy beliefs has contributed significantly and critically to learners' beliefs about their ability as they relate to achievement. A fact has been established that as learners' efficacy beliefs are strengthened, their performance also improves.

Lane and Lane (2001) examined whether self-efficacy measures were predictive of academic performance. Findings of the study showed that as self-efficacy scores increased, academic performance also improved. Pajares and Miller (1994) examined the role of self-efficacy beliefs on mathematical problem solving by employing Mathematics confidence scale to measure learners' math self-efficacy and the "Mathematics Problem Performance Scale" to assess learners' performance. The results showed that learners' judgement about their mathematics self-efficacy predicted their ability to solve math problems. Schunk (1981) also showed that learners' judgment about their math efficacy beliefs was predictive of math performance.

In the area of writing, researchers have confirmed that learners' confidence in their writing skills is related both to writing competence and to academic motivation, variables such as writing self-concept, writing apprehension, achievement goals, and the perceived value of writing, as well as to their writing competence (McCarthy, Meier & Rinderer, 1985; Pajares & Johnson, 1994; Pajares, Miller & Johnson, 1999; Pajares &Valiante, 1997). Meier, Meir, *et al.* (1984) explored the relationship between essay writing and writing self-efficacy. These studies reported that writing self-efficacy predicted the writing performances of undergraduates.

Psychology researchers have also studied the relationship between self-efficacy and specific language skills such as speaking (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1990); listening (Schunk& Rice, 1984); writing (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994; and Pajares, *et al.* 1996; reading (Schunk& Rice, 1993); and writing (Zimmerman &Kitsantas, 1999). Recently, Rossiter (2003), and Templin, Shiroku and Taira (1999) have studied and acknowledged the place of self-efficacy in language acquisition.

Firstly, in Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons' (1990) study, 45 boys and girls in Grades 5, 8 and 11 from a school for academically gifted and an identical number from regular schools were asked to describe their use of 14 self-regulated learning strategies and to estimate their verbal and mathematical efficacy. The groups of learners from both schools included Whites, Blacks, Hispanic and Asians. Gifted learners displayed significantly higher verbal efficacy and strategy use than regular learners.

Secondly, in Zimmerman and Bandura's (1994) study, a total of 95 freshmen students from a highly selective university formed part of the research population. A total of 43 were males and 52 were females. The role of self-efficacy beliefs concerning the academic attainment and regulation of writing academic goals and self-standard on writing course achievement were studied by using path analysis. "A statistical procedure to test a researcher's theory of the causal relationships among a set of observed variables by analysing hypothesised causal effects among variables" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 388). Perception of self-efficacy for writing influenced personal standards for the quality of writing.

Thirdly, Schunk and Rice (1993) taught learners a strategy of reading for main ideas. Certain learners had a product goal of answering questions; others had a process goal of learning to use the comprehension strategy and still others had a general goal of working productively. A process goal plus strategy learning feedback led to higher self-efficacy and skill in finding main idea than the product or general goal approaches.

Fourthly, Templin, *et al.* (1999) state that people judge their capabilities differently in different dimensions. For example, a learner may feel self-efficacious in introducing himself/herself orally in front of his or her classmates, but may not think he/she can write descriptive compositions about himself or herself.

Lastly, Zimmerman and Kitsantas (1999) found self-efficacy to be highly correlated with learners committed intrinsic interest in a writing revision task.

2.4. The relationship between self-efficacy and attribution

In spite of an assumed connection between self-efficacy and attribution theories suggested by researchers as Schunk (1981, 1982 and 1983) and Bandura (1986), these linkages have rarely been investigated in writing performance, as in sports and math.

Bond, *et al.* (2001) examined the relationship between self-efficacy and causal attribution in the area of sports. They found that when golfers were doing well in their performance, attribution stability was predictive of post-competition self-efficacy. Golfers whose efficacy increased from pre- to post-competition made more internal and stable attributions for their performance than those whose efficacy level decreased.

Stajkovic and Sommer (2000) also looked at the relationship between self-efficacy and causal attributions. As their self-efficacy measures, they asked subjects to rate their ability to give as many uses for objects as they could in one minute. In the study, they employed the causal dimension scale, created by Russell (1982) to measure participants' attributions. Multiple regression analysis showed that participants high in self-efficacy attributed success to internal factors and failures to external factors. Findings showed that self-efficacy and attributions are directly and reciprocally related, and both attribution and self-efficacy were found to be significantly predictive of performance.

Recently, Hsieh (2004) investigated the direct connection between foreign language learners' attribution, self-efficacy beliefs, general self-efficacy beliefs and their achievement in foreign language classes. Hsieh (2004), in her study on three foreign languages: Spanish, German and French, reported that there was a significant relationship between learners self-efficacy beliefs and attributions. In the study, scores on the self-efficacy scales were positively correlated with internal, stable, and personal attributions such as ability and effort.

This research emulates such investigations internationally to establish the direct connection among self-efficacy, performance in composition writing and attribution styles which has been reported by Hsieh (2004) in her study that found strong interrelations among foreign language learners' attribution, self-efficacy beliefs and their achievement in foreign language classes.

2.5. Language learning environment and motivation

"Motivation" is a process whereby learning activities are sustained when learning activities require effort and persistence from the learner's part. Motivational prompts from the teacher guide learners to employ their five senses in an exploration and expression of their environment. The writing task involves the integration and organisation of a united sensory perception to formulate meaningful thought, observations and options on any writing topic at hand.

According to Dulay and Burt (1977), simple exposure to language does not guarantee successful language learning. Their research indicated that language learners with positive affective characteristics such as positive opinion of the value of learning the target language and positive attitude to the target language and its speakers are seen more able to acquire language. Motivation in language learning has been closely studied since before the middle of the last century. While earlier theories focused on the personality of the learner, more recent studies have given attention to the learning environment.

Early on, in 1954, Maslow presented his formulation of the hierarchy of human needs. Beginning with the lower "deficiency needs" (physiological, safety, belonging and love) and "growth needs"; the theory culminates in the need for self-actualisation that is to find self-fulfilment and to recognise one's potential. After lower needs have been satisfied, then the person can act on the higher needs. In spite of the fact that these human needs are connected to general human behaviour, each of these levels come into play in the learning situation, and can be seen in later theories of motivation and learning.

After the simple basic needs, food and shelter, safety needs refer to "freedom from fear and anxiety" – fear of failure, anxiety about not understanding, not remembering and not becoming successful (Maslow, 1987). Anything in the learning environment that produces an attitude of fear and anxiety, thus, would decrease the motivation to learn.

Belongingness comes next. Like all of us, the learner desires love, a place in the group, fearing "rejection, friendlessness and loneliness" (Maslow, 1987). Learners might want to learn, but fearing rejection by their fellow classmates, may consider language learning as a threat to their acceptance by their fellow friends. Then there are the esteem needs. All people have a need for self-respect and for the esteem of others. Teachers expect learners to embark on new learning that involves making mistakes, appearing foolish and, thus losing the respect of self and others. Learners who are learning a language are at risk of being in a situation where they lack competence and mastery and where they may achieve nothing. As a result of this, rather than suffer further discouragement, the learner will avoid the fight. Eventually, there is a need for self-actualisation, for "self-fulfilment". Self-actualised people are able to strive for improvement and progress either because the lower needs have been fulfilled or by ignoring these needs and focusing on the problem not the self: they are more "problem-centred than ego-centred" (Maslow, 1987). Such people could see language learning as a means to self-improvement.

Despite the fact that Maslow's ideas can be seen in a number of later theories of motivation, Dornyei (2001) considers that Maslow's concept of needs has been replaced by that of goals. A goal is seen as the 'engine' to fire the action and provide the direction in which to act. Thus, in goal theories, the cognitive perception of goal properties is seen as the bases of motivational processes.

Two goal theories have become particularly influential during the past decade. These are goal-setting theory and goal-orientation theory. Locke and Latham (1994) assert that human action is caused by purpose, and for action to take place, goals have to be set and pursued by choice. Thus, in the case of continuous activities such as language learning, the setting of sub-goals (e.g. taking tests, passing exams, etc.) may have a powerful motivating function in that they mark remarkable progress (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996).

Attainable sub-goals can serve as an important vehicle in the development of the learners' self-efficacy. Goal-orientation theory was specifically developed to explain children's learning and performance in school setting (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Goals that are both specific and difficult lead to the highest performance. High commitment to goals is achieved when the individual is convinced that the goal is vital and attainable (Dornyei, 2001).

Another major notion in the field of motivational psychology is that of "expectancy value". Weiner (1992) lists three concepts which derive from the notion of expectancy value. First is "attribution theory" which posits that an individual's conception of past failures and successes affect future goal expectancy. Second is "learned helplessness" that refers to a helpless state where the individual feels unable to change his lack of success, and so does not try. Third is "self-efficacy", which develops as a result of past success and which inclines the individual to expect more success in the future (Dornyei, 1994).

Positive experiences such as successful or enjoyable language learning at school could therefore bring about a positive attitude which would motivate the language learner to expect further success or enjoyment. Negative experiences could produce negative attitude to language learning and thus lead to demotivation, since they would incline the language learner to anticipate further failure in language learning in the future.

Theories on motivation include those that focus on the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation. The pioneer researchers who studied the relationship between learners' attitudes and motivation for second language (L2) learning were Gardner & Lambert (1972). They provided a differentiation between integrative and instrumental motivation for foreign language learning. Instrumentally motivated learners learn a language for practical and utilitarian purposes such as to get a better job, whereas integratively motivated learners have a desire to learn a language in order to integrate themselves with the

target culture. According to Gardner & Lambert (1972), integratively motivated learners are seen as having more enduring motivation for language learning and are therefore more likely to develop better communicative skills. Gardner and Lambert (1972) proposed that integratively oriented learners might be motivated since the nature of their goals is more likely to sustain the long-term effort needed to master the language. On the other hand, instrumentally motivated learners are more likely to see language learning as enabling them to do special tasks but as not holding personal meaning in itself.

Gardner (1985) suggested that motivation strongly influences the degree to which learners take advantage of opportunities to use the language. Even though the premium given to integrative motivation over instrumental motivation has dominated the research literature, Gardner (2001) in an article, deemphasised the primacy of integrative motivation as the only way to successful language learning. Gardner's social educational model of L2 acquisition was developed in 1985 and revised in 2001 to assess different aspects that contribute to the success of L2 learning. The model is comprised of four sections:

- External influence;
- Individual difference;
- Language acquisition context; and
- Outcomes

All these factors are suggested to influence language acquisition.

The role of motivation for language learning has often been linked to learners' attitudes in Gardner's earlier work. Gardner (1985) defined motivation to learn an L2 as "the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language due to the desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity". According to Gardner's definition, there are three indicators of learners' satisfaction with learning. These are: learner's effort, learner's desire to learn the language, and learners' satisfaction with learning. These three aspects can be assessed with the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) (Gardner, Clement, Smythe & Smythe, 1979). Gardner argued that all the three components are necessary to describe language learning motivation. The scales making up the AMTB were integrativeness (integrative orientation, interest in the languages), attitudes toward the learning situation (evaluation of teacher and course), motivation (motivational intensity, desire to learn the target language, and attitude toward learning the target language), language anxiety (language class and language use anxiety), and instrumental orientation.

Theories on motivation also comprise intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Deci and Ryan (1985) developed the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: intrinsic motivation is engaging an activity because the activity is enjoyable and satisfying, while extrinsic motivation is for some instrumental end. According to the "self-determination= theory" of Deci and Ryan, the various motivations can be placed on a continuum between self-determined (intrinsic) and controlled (extrinsic), depending on how internalised they are. In terms of this theory, extrinsic motivation such as an entrance examination can become adopted and internalised, leading to intrinsic motivation (Dornyei, 2001).

The theory thus stressed the importance of learner's autonomy: their choosing what to study, and how. This means that if learners are to internalise the norms and standards transmitted through schooling, these will need to be presented in a way that paves the way for the learner's feelings of "competence and autonomy" (Vansteenkiste, Lens & Deci, 2006).

Language learners' attitudes to writing in any language could thus be influenced by whether the writing tasks are presented in an autonomy-supportive manner or not. Motivation to write therefore can be influenced by such factors as whether writing at home and school is presented as something pleasurable, an activity which learners can do if they wish or as something that must be done so as to pass exams, and for which the reward will be a pass, not pleasure. Autonomy-supportive learning activities could produce a positive attitude to language learning, which could increase motivation to learn.

From the above studies of cognitive and affective aspects of motivation, attention has focused on the sociocultural aspects, both the society in which the learner lives, as well as the educational milieu of the classroom: fellow learners in the class, the teacher, and the teaching method. Ryan and Deci (2002) assert that the environment is of great importance in promoting self-determined, autonomous behaviour.

Similarly, Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) state that research is needed to explore the possible relationship between learner efficacy and school environment in terms of the support given, in other words, school climate. The study that Hoy and Woolfolk conducted indicate that such a relationship between efficacy and school climate is reciprocal: that is, bi-directional, each affecting the other.

As far as the learning environment is concerned, Dornyei (2001) divides teachers' motivational influence into four dimensions:

- The first one is the personal characteristics of teachers, such as motivation, warmth, commitment, empathy and competence;
- The second is teacher immediacy, that means the perceived closeness and accessibility of the teacher;
- Third is active motivational socialising behaviour by which teachers can exert a direct influence through appropriate modelling, task presentations, and through a system of feedback and rewards; and
- Fourth is classroom management, including setting and maintaining group norms and maintaining authority that is autonomy supporting rather than controlling.

In the learning environment, group norms also play an important role.

The learner is part of a group, and group norms and demands cannot be ignored. According to McCaslin and Good (1996), "the need for students' belongingness has been articulated by educators for some time."

In conclusion, in investigating motivational factors in language learning and writing performance, it should be emphasized that motivation is determined by various factors and attitudes. The factors mentioned above in the learner's environment give rise to the cognitive and particularly to the affective factors. The home environment, parents and siblings; the school environment, teachers, learning experiences, and classmates contribute to learner's interest in language learning/writing. Hence, this study aims to investigate if these places are supportive of autonomy and if they promote learner's enjoyment of writing. Also, this research examines whether they produce positive attitudes to learning the language.

Eccles, Wigfield and Schiefele (1998) state factors on parental influence that shape learner motivation. The teacher's role augments and reinforces the parental nurturing of the learners' feelings of self-efficacy in language learning and its pragmatic utilisation in the expression of internal and external experiences. The actual practice of writing exercises drives the learners' attention and focus deeply into their inner consciousness and being, and centres them in the here-and-now, however briefly. The repetition of this habit and its establishment as a behavioural pattern assists in the development of internalised motivation. Only in this

disciplined and creative engagement of learners does the joy, love and exhilaration of self-expression in writing is fully expressed.

2.6. Writing

"Writing" involves organising information and communicating meaning (Spandel, 2005). Bryne (1979) defines writing as the production of sentences arranged in a particular order and linked together in a coherent whole, which is often called a text. In composing a text, it is agreed that it is neither an easy nor a spontaneous activity. It requires some conscious mental effort and has to be learned in a formal setting, such as a school (Collins, 1998).

According to Graham (2005), writing can be considered to be an artificial activity when compared to speaking in that everyone learns naturally to speak and to listen, whereas fewer people are able to read and write. Writing is said to be more dependent on the use of linguistic resources of a language, resulting in the difficulties experienced by L2 learners, especially at the elementary and secondary levels.

Raimes (1983) identifies the following reasons for the teaching of writing skills:

- Writing reinforces the vocabulary, structures, functions and notions that the learners have been taught;
- It gives the learners the opportunity to be adventurers with the language; and
- The interaction of hand, eye and brain reinforces the learning of language by forcing the learner to think of new or other ways of saying things.

Beach & Birdwell (1984) offer six functions of writing:

(1) Writing has a special advantage for learning;
(2) It enables learners to learn new information;
(3) It makes the integration of old and new information easier;
(4) It teaches pragmatic conventions and audience awareness;
(5) It teaches learners the ability to critically evaluate the information they are learning; and
(6) It can also teach learners how they perceive their personal experiences.

Kaplan (1983) observes that by writing about a specific problem a solution could present itself in the course of the writing process. Also, writing can act as a stimulus for further ideas on a specific topic. It is as though the very process of writing is a stimulus for further thought.

Several researchers including Cox (2002), Urbanski (2006), Collins (1998), Meriwether (1997) and Jordan (1997) note that there has been increasing interest in the way that writing is being approached in English language, with the aim of making writing a more personal and satisfying experience for the learner. Also, a greater impetus is being placed on the role of writing in the language classroom.

2.6.1 Approaches to the teaching of writing

Though Hyland (2003) summarises the various approaches to writing, it might be very important to see two of the approaches to the teaching of writing. These are the product and the process approaches. The next two sections highlight the two types of approaches and present related literature.

2.6.1.1 The product approach to writing

Traditional approaches to writing instruction focus on written products. Teachers evaluate the written product, judge its form and content, according to set criteria. It was also traditionally believed that writing was something that teachers expected learners to do in the class without giving any prior thought to the meaning of the finished product (Meriwether, 1997).

Eschloz (1980) observes that "the approach merely resulted in mindless copies of a particular organisational plan or style". This assertion on the product approach is rooted in the Behavourist Theory which sees language as a system of structurally related elements for the coding of meaning, and the product of language learning being the mastery of elements of this system (Richards & Rodgers, 1995). This view probably accounts for the pre-occupation with 'correctness' and 'form' inherent in the product approach.

Hairston (1982) details some shortcomings in the product approach when she states that "proponents of the product approach viewed the composing process as linear, systematically from prewriting to writing to rewriting". She proceeds by stating the composing process of writers and analysing what goes on while they compose as opposed to the linear orientation of the product proponents:

> Writing is messy, recursive and uneven. Writers write, plan, revise, anticipate and review throughout the writing process, moving back and forth among the different operations involved in writing without an apparent plan (Hairston, 1982).

It is believed that the product writing approach restricts writers to a single product of text as opposed to the multiple re-writes which is allowed in process writing, and while allowing for a certain amount of revision; product writing underestimate the importance of rewriting. Johnston (1987) says that in the product classroom, the teacher is preoccupied with grammatical accuracy and acts as a judge of learners' writing rather than a facilitator.

According to Hedge (1988), in the traditional product classroom, writing was viewed as a tool for the practice and reinforcement of specific grammatical and lexical pattern; accuracy being all crucial and content and self-expression given little or no priority.

It is stated that in product approach to writing, learners' attention focuses on adhering to and duplicating models, and in particular, on correct language. A learner is simply expected to focus on model and form. Escholz (1980) points out that the product approach encourages the learners to use the same plan in various settings, by applying the same form regardless of content, thereby, inhibiting writers rather than empowering them.

Learners in classes adopting the product approach would find themselves studying model texts and attempting different exercises aimed toward attracting attention to relevant features of a text. Young (1978) comments and describes the characteristics of this approach as follows, "The distinguishing features of the traditional approach include; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling and punctuation) and with style." Nunan (1999) writes that the primary goal of product writing is to produce an error free coherent text.

As stated earlier, traditional language arts programmes support the product approach to writing. This shows sequentially ordered writing skills that include grammar, usage, spelling, as well as elements of style and forms of discourse. Nevertheless, it is believed that the breaking down of written expression into component parts does not necessarily translate to the whole process of writing. For instance, Hillocks (1987) finds that knowledge of grammatical rules alone does not improve one's writing or communicative skill.

Nowadays, however, researchers into writing feel that there is more to writing than the product. As Meriwether (1997), Sunflower (2006), Frederickson (2003), Urbanski (2006) and many other writers note, there is now a widespread recognition that writing is a process which involves many steps or stages.

Since the study is aimed at evaluating and investigating the correlations among such variables as self-efficacy, attribution and writing composition, it is vital to discuss current approaches to writing in the secondary schools.

2.6.1.2 The process approach to writing

Writing can be viewed as a process. According to Arthur (1993), writing in primary classrooms was seen as copying and hand writing practice besides grammar exercise. There was no clear understanding of the way that writing is created as part of a process.

The idea of teaching writing as a process was developed during the 1970 and 1980s. With this approach, the focus of writing instruction shifted from the product to the process. The process of writing refers to what writers do. The writers' task has five stages which are pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing (Graves, 1996). Urbanski (2006) states that the process approach offers learners an opportunity to make decision about the direction of their writing through discussions, tasks, drafting, and feedback, thus, encouraging them to be responsible for making improvements themselves.

What is important about this approach is the attempt it makes to highlight the cyclical nature of writing whereby pre-writing, writing and revising go on simultaneously (Graves, 1996). Graves (1996) identifies the basic steps in the writing process as follows:

- Pre-writing (selecting a topic and planning what to write);
- Writing (putting the first version on paper);
- Revising (rewriting to improve writing); and
- Evaluate (assessment of the written work).

King (2006) identifies three stages in the writing process. These are planning, drafting and revising as highlighted below:

- Planning – described as a series of strategies used to find and formulate information in writing.
- Drafting – as a series of strategies employed to organise and develop a piece of writing.
- Revision – as a series of techniques utilised to re-examine in order to create a good piece of writing.

From the above explanations, it can be concluded that the way writing is seen as a process in which learners are given time to think about and discuss their ideas on a specific topic, to write a draft of what they want to say, to discuss this again and then write a more detailed account (Kilfoil & van der Walt, 1997).

Words like pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing are useful to talk about parts of the writing process, which do not necessarily occur in a fixed order for individual writers in specific situations (Graves, 1997). In the process approach, the learners do not write on a given topic in a limited time and hand in the composition for the teacher to correct. Instead, they explore a topic through writing, showing the teacher and each other their drafts and using what they write to read over, think about and move onto new ideas (Meriwether, 1997). A learner needs to be given the time for the process to work, along with the appropriate feedback from readers, such as the teacher or other learners. This would make the learner discover new ideas, new sentences, and new words as they plan, write a first draft and revise what they have written for a second draft. Finally, it is believed that the process approach to writing is good and effective for learners of English language arts.

To write meaningfully, Collins (1988) argues that writers need to have a clear audience and purpose. He states the importance of various purposes for writing in the following assertion: "The purpose of the writing also affects composition, whether it is to entertain, persuade or explain. Purpose influences the linguistic structure of the piece and helps the child consider the language choices to be made."

Writing an effective composition requires a search for information, a time period during which thoughts can be developed, writing, and rewriting until the composition presents the intended message to the appropriate audience (Cox, 2002; Collins, 1998). This process is vital to writing: the writer needs to search, select and reflect about information, main ideas, supporting details and accurate conclusions or ideas. Skills in structuring sentences, paragraph development, grouping, listing and classifying related ideas, identifying main ideas and logical sequence of ideas, are all important and help learners to be effective in writing.

When learners progress into longer composition writing in secondary schools, they will find that there are some special requirements for this type of composition writing.

According to Norton (1985), the learners will have to decide on a topic, narrow the topic, gather ideas and information, organise ideas, write and re-write. Therefore, teacher feedback, learner evaluation of the writing and any rewriting should focus on the clear development of those ideas (Norton, 1985).

If teachers interact with learners during the entire writing process, learners will have both positive feedback and an opportunity to make improvements during each step of the process, instead of having to wait for teacher reaction to the finished product (Adeyemi, 2004). When learners write and the teacher reacts, the learners can decide on changes before the final writing, so that only minor changes may be necessary at that point.

Finally, it is argued by researchers that learners who are learning to write in English L2 can benefit greatly from a process approach to writing. Simpson (2006), Meriwether (1996) and Cox (2002) recommend the use of sharing and talking together, peer-response groups, cooperative learning, dialogues and drawing on prior knowledge and experience in the teaching and learning of process writing. As the main objective of the research is to examine the relationship among writing self-efficacy, attribution and learners' performance in composition writing, it is important to synthesise the current knowledge about writing and how composition writing can be taught.

2.6.2 Assessment of writing

The purpose of the study was to examine the role of self-efficacy and attribution in writing performance. Thus, participants took a writing test and assessment of their writing was part of this research.

Assessing learners writing is not an objective task. It involves an inference by the reader of the quality of a written work, and such inference may include biases and interpretations that can make assessment an imperfect reflection of actual writing ability. There are two ways of evaluation – these are direct and indirect evaluation. Direct evaluation is a test that measures the ability directly by requiring test takers to perform tasks designed to approximate an authentic target language use situation (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 160). An example of a direct test of writing includes a test that asks test takers to write an essay. An indirect evaluation refers to a test that measures the ability indirectly by requiring test takers to perform tasks not reflective of an authentic target language use situation, from which inference is drawn about the abilities underlining their performance on the test (Richard & Schmidt, 2002: 253). An example of an indirect test of writing includes a test that asks test takers to locate errors in a composition. In the field of composition, researchers believe that direct evaluation of writing provides more valid assessment than indirect evaluation.

In order to assess the participants' composition test, the researcher will employ holistic scoring. According to Richards and Schmidt (2002: 240), holistic scoring is a method of evaluating writing in which the composition is viewed as a whole rather than as distinct parts. With a carefully prepared scoring guide, holistic evaluation is an efficient and consistent means of judging learners' work (Hendry, 1985: 201).

There are two types of holistic evaluation – these are the analytic scale and the general impression scale. Using an analytic scale, one can rank each of several features – ideas, word choice, organisation grammar, punctuation and spelling – of writing from high to low (Hendry, 1985: 202). A general impression scale is also keyed to the form of writing, but the individual features of the paper are not ranked separately instead the paper as a whole is judged high, average or low (Hendry, 1985: 203). The researcher will employ an analytic scale (details are in Appendix E) in which the learners receive an evaluation of key features of their papers.

2.7. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed topics pertaining to motivation, attribution, self-efficacy, attribution and achievement, self-efficacy and achievement, the relationship between self-efficacy and attribution feedback, writing and approaches to writing. Several instances and studies have been cited to highlight research conducted on these issues.

The literature review revealed that the relationships between self-efficacy and attributions states in writing performance have not been examined directly. This research is a modest effort to bridge the knowledge gap on the subject in this country. It may also serve as a point of departure for others who may muster the courage to pursue a wider exploration.

CHAPTER 3

3.1. Research design and Methodology

The main purpose of this study is to investigate the significance of self-efficacy and attribution theories to writing performance. This chapter presents the description of the research design and methodology, school settings and population, sampling, data collection, instrumentation, assessment of writing and research procedures and ethics.

3.2. Research design

There are a number of ways to design a study so as to arrive at reliable, well-argued conclusions. Since the researcher's goal was to investigate the relationship among writing self-efficacy, performance in writing and causal attribution, correlation based research has been highlighted in this study.

Hofstee (2006: 123) points out that correlation-based research "compares two or more variables in order to establish whether there is a relationship among them". Sometimes this type of method can be considered a part of survey research because of its non-experimental nature and the way data are collected Wiersma, and Stephen (2008).

Given the research aim targets the relationship among the variables, correlational and descriptive designs were deemed proper methods to this end. According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 117), in descriptive research, the researchers "begin with general questions in mind about the phenomenon they are studying or with more specific questions and with a special focus". Richards and Schmidt (2002) defines descriptive research design as an investigation that attempts to describe accurately and factually a phenomenon, subject or area. Information is obtained from questionnaires and a test needs to be interpreted, described, discussed, and presented in the logical and manageable format, with the data analysis being principally of interpretive and descriptive nature.

3.3. Methodology

The methodology, which was employed in this research, was a combination of quantitative and qualitative designs. Creswell (1994: 189) states that "mixing methods from quantitative and qualitative traditions has contributed to discussions about their value, especially because they raise the question of the operative paradigm being used".

Quantitative research "is the systematic, scientific investigation of quantitative properties and phenomena and their relationships" (Given, 2008). The goal of this type of research method is to develop and employ mathematical models to natural phenomena. According to Given (2008), statistics is the most widely used branch of mathematics in quantitative research. Given (2008) further states, using statistical methods begins with the collection of data, based on the hypothesis or theory. Usually a big sample of data is collected and these would require verification, validation and recording before the analysis can take place. In addition, software packages such as SPSS were typically used for this purpose.

The research techniques such as gathering quantitative data (information dealing with numbers, statistics and tables) were extensively employed in the study. Thus, a quantitative research design was another essential research method that was a proper way to achieve the researcher's objective.

Qualitative research, on the other hand, refers to non-numerical data, such as interviews, case studies or participant observation. It can also have "a broader meaning, implying a holistic approach to social research in which experimental interviews in a research site attempt to isolate phenomena of interest in experiments, and attempt to identify causal relationships among isolated variables are eschewed in favour of the naturalistic observation of complex settings." (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 475). The qualities and advantages of qualitative research have been discussed by Burns (1997). He states that the task of the qualitative researcher is "to capture what people say and do as a product of how they interpret the complexity of their world to understand events from the point of view of the participants" (Burns, 1997: 12).

Since the researcher had a discussion with the six teachers from the two schools, data were obtained during the discussion and interpreted and analysed by using the qualitative method. Hence the qualitative method was another research method apart from the quantitative method that was employed to collect the data.

3.4. The school settings and population

Two high schools in Addis Ababa are part of the population for this study. One of the schools is a private school, established over half a century ago, in 1956 and located near Addis Ababa Stadium. The second is a government Senior Secondary School started in 1957 as Girl's Christian Academy (GCA), but it was renamed after the socialist revolution.

The choice or selection of Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia is done purposefully. In Addis Ababa, there are about 3.7 million people with different nationalities and cultures. In the city, there are about 20 000 learners who are currently learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at different preparatory secondary schools. In order to minimise costs and for organisational convenience, the two schools were selected, by using a non-probability sampling as representatives for all the secondary level schools.

Samples of 81 Grade 11 learners from two different schools in Addis Ababa were targeted, 36 learners were targeted from government school and 45 learners from the private school. There are 68 Preparatory Schools (Grade 11-12) in the whole city. The learner population made up of learners from government-owned public high schools and private high schools, and all are learners studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The subjects, therefore, were taken from these two different schools to include mixed samples that account for variances due to socio-economic factors. The learners who attend the government schools are economically less affluent whereas the learners in the private high schools are socio-economically affluent. The learner population from these schools provided rich and adequate information required for the study.

3.4.1 Focus group: The participants

The six participants of the study were all English Language Arts teachers at the two schools in Addis Ababa. All these participants are of Ethiopian nationality. They are all native speakers of Amharic language. Three have already completed a Master's degree at two different universities in Ethiopia. Another has started to attend classes for his Master's degree at Addis Ababa University in the extension programme. The remaining two had their first degree in Foreign Language and Literature many years ago.

A brief profile of each of the participants

Participant 1 is a male teacher aged 34 years. At Addis Ababa University, he studied School Administration and had his Bachelor's degree in July 2004. And he did his Master's in (TEFL) in 2012 at Awasa University in Ethiopia. He has been teaching English for the last seven years at various schools in Addis Ababa.

Participant 2 is a male teacher aged 37 years and single. He had a Bachelor's degree in Foreign Language and Literature/English (in July 2000). He also completed his Master's in Foreign Language and Literature/English (in June 2010). He has been teaching English for the last 13 years at different public and private schools in Addis Ababa.

Participant 3 is a male teacher aged 38 years. He did his Bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching at the Teacher's Training Institution in Addis Ababa. He also did his Master's degree (TEFL) at Addis Ababa University (in June 2011). He has been teaching English for the last 14 years in various government and private schools outside and in the capital as well.

Participant 4 is a female teacher aged 35 years. She obtained her Bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching at the Teacher's Training Institute in Addis Ababa (in July 2003). Currently, she is studying for her Master's degree at Addis Ababa University in the extension programme. She has been teaching English Language Arts at Andinet International School for the last 10 years.

Participant 5 is a male teacher aged 44 years. He did his Bachelor's degree in Foreign Language and Literature/English (in July 1995). He has been teaching English Language for the last eight years in two government schools outside Addis Ababa and has been teaching English Language and literature for 12 years in two different private schools.

Participant 6 is a male teacher aged 46 years. He obtained his Bachelor's degree in Foreign Language and Literature/English (in July 1992). He has been teaching English language and literature for more than 20 years.

3.5. Sampling

There are 68 preparatory secondary schools in the City of Addis Ababa. The researcher selected purposively two secondary schools. Since the study adopted both quantitative and qualitative methods, it employed a random sampling strategy so as to select participants for the quantitative component, and convenience sampling strategy for acquiring the data for the qualitative part. Convenience sampling, according to Given (2008), is a sample in which research participants are selected based on their accessibility.

Therefore, the individuals who are participating in the study are indeed ready and willing to participate in the study of their own volition. Convenience sampling, sometimes called opportunity sampling, is a method of choosing items arbitrarily and in an unstructured manner from the sampling frame (Brown & Rodgers, 2002). This unstructured discussion or interview which can be held between the researcher and the participants focuses on open-ended questions which could be a helpful strategy that facilitate fruitful discussion. This idea is supported by Patton (1990) who states that the flexibility of unstructured discussion is one advantage in capturing the participants' belief, perceptions and experiences.

3.6. Data collection

Data were acquired through questionnaires, a test and focus group. First, the researcher gathered data by administering the questionnaire and a composition test. In order to obtain the data that would be representative of the larger group of the learners, a variety of participants were surveyed from two different high schools. Before the actual administration of the instruments, pre-tests of the instruments were made. This was done to see the reliability of the instruments. The instruments and the variables that were employed in order to obtain the data had been used by researchers in various investigations of self-efficacy, performance in writing composition and attribution (Pajares, *et al.*, 1999; Pajares & Valiante, 1999;

Weiner, 1979; Tamire, 1995). However, the tools were adapted and modified to measure the variables in the Ethiopian context.

Secondly, qualitative data was acquired by holding focus group discussion with English Language Arts teachers. The focus group discussion was held at the high school's library of the private school. This was done for the purpose of privacy. There was only one session with six of the English Language Arts teachers from the two high schools. The discussion lasted for about one hour and the researcher was a moderator. These discussions garnered a wealth of information on participants' response, beliefs and feelings on each discussion point.

3.6.1 Writing self-efficacy scale

The writing self-efficacy scale developed by Shell, Colvin and Bruning (1989) consists of eight items with reliability scores of 0.95. The self-efficacy scale was not used as it is. It was adapted based on Bandura's (2001) "Guide for Constructing Self-efficacy Scales". The scale asked learners to rate how competently they could perform specific writing skills from 0 (no chance) to 100 (completely certain). Using a similar instrument Pajares and Valiante (1997) reported coefficient of reliability of 0.88 (details of the writing self-efficacy scale are in the appendix F).

Writing self-efficacy scale was based on Bandura's "Guide for Constructing Self-efficacy Scales". All of the items were taken from Shell, *et al.* (1989) as used in Pajares and Johnson (1996).

3.6.2 Attribution scale

Attribution of success and failure was evaluated by using scales that were developed according to Weiner's (1979) "A Theory of Motivation for Some Classroom Experience". The attribution scale (perceived causes of success or failure) consists of 18 items asking learners to rate the importance of various factors for their success or failure on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important). The attribution scale was made up of two parts. If the participants were satisfied about their composition test results, they would use part one of the scale. But, if they think their results were failure, then they would use part two of the attribution scale (details of the research are in the appendix D).

3.7. Data analysis

Data for quantitative and qualitative analysis was coded. On the one hand, the quantitative data was recorded using numerical codes to facilitate analysis. And the analysis should explore data using both tables and diagrams (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2003). On the other hand, since qualitative data were based on meanings expressed through words, the results in the collection of non-standardised data that required classification were analysed through the use of conceptualisation (Saunders, *et al.*, 2003).

Certain statistical approaches were utilised to analyse the data. The first one was factor analysis. Richard and Schmidt (2002) define "factor analysis" as a statistical procedure that is used to determine which unobserved latent variables, called factors, account for the correlations among different observed variable. For instance, if the researcher gives a group of subjects tests in reading, math and writing, the results point to the underlining factors common in all these tests by using a factor analysis. There are two kinds of factor analysis – these are explanatory and confirmatory. Explanatory factor analysis is used to explore a group of observed variables and identify and underlining variables that might explain the relationships among the observed variables (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 198). Whereas confirmatory factor analysis is used to test or confirm a hypothesised factor structure of a group of observed variables, specified a priori on the basis of some underlying theory or previous research, to see if the proposed factor structure is adequate to explain the relationships among the observed variables (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 198).

3.8. Assessment of writing

Consistent with procedures used by self-efficacy researchers (Shell, *et al.*, 1989, Pajares & Johnson, 1996), the researcher conducted a writing test titled "The Advantages and Disadvantages of City Life" (details of the research are in the appendix E) and gathered the written data.

Assessing learners writing can be a subjective task. It involves an inference by the reader of the quality of a written work, and such inference may include biases and interpretations that can make assessment an imperfect reflection of actual writing ability. There are two ways of evaluation. These are direct and indirect evaluation as mentioned in Chapter 2.

In order to assess the participants' composition test, the researcher employed holistic scoring. According to Richards and Schmidt (2002: 240), holistic scoring is a method of evaluating writing in which the composition is viewed as a whole rather than as distinct parts. With a carefully prepared scoring guide, holistic evaluation is an efficient and consistent means of judging learners' work (Henry, 1985: 201). There are two types of holistic evaluation – these are the analytic scale and the general impression scale. Using an analytic scale, one can rank each of several features – ideas, word choice, organisation, grammar, punctuation and spelling – of writing from high to low (Henry, 1985: 202).

A general impression scale is also keyed to the form of writing, but the individual features of the paper are not ranked separately instead the paper as a whole is judged high, average or low (Henry, 1985: 203). Since there is no prescribed format for writing the general characteristics for general impression scale, the researcher used an analytic scale in which the learners received an evaluation of key features of their papers.

3.9. Research ethics

After the researcher had provided the appropriate information to the participants, a consent form was provided that explained the study's purpose, procedures and possible benefits (consent form is attached as appendix A)**.** Then the researcher followed up with a brief explanation that their participation in the study would have no risk on their grades. The researcher also informed the participants of their rights to confidentiality and that no one else would read their responses on the questionnaires.

After the learners had signed the consent form, they were asked to fill out the self-efficacy scale to assess to what extent they were confident about their writing abilities. Then the researcher established with one of the English teachers when the test would be corrected and returned to the learners. The researcher's plan to correct the writing test together with another English teacher was to increase the inter-rater reliability of the writing test results.

When the test results were returned to the learners, a questionnaire on attributions was attached to their test results asking learners to evaluate whether they perceived their score to be a success or failure and to measure attributions for their achievement. Thus, learners who labelled their test score as a "success" filled out part one of the questionnaires whereas learners who labeled their test result as a "failure" filled out part two of the questionnaire.

The above procedure was repeated in one of the government schools in Addis Ababa. The school is a public high school located about 4 km away from the private school where the researcher is currently working as a full-time teacher. Forty-five learners from the private school and thirty-six learners from the government school participated in the study.

The researcher had also provided the appropriate information to the participants in the qualitative components about the study; the participants then were given a consent form that explained the study's purpose, procedures and possible benefits (consent form is attached as appendix A). The researcher also informed the participants of their rights to confidentiality and his responsibility not to allow anyone else to read their responses on the focus group discussion.

CHAPTER 4

4.1 Findings of the Research

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and causal attribution theories and their significance in determining writing performance. This chapter reviews the statistical findings and provides detailed analytical discussion. The first part of this chapter presents such information as number of respondents of private and government school learners, *means* of self-efficacy scale responses and *means of* attribution scale responses. The second part of this chapter presents the internal reliability of the instruments used to measure self-efficacy, the independent variables, and the results of Chi-Square test analyses. And finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of how the evidence leads to the formulation of reliable results which form the basis for the conclusions the researcher has attained in his investigations.

Table 4.1 Number of respondents of private and government schools learners

The table below presents students' attribution for perceived cause of "success" and "failure." For the purpose of simplicity, the responses are by school type: government and private.

School	Items		
	N	Attribution: Perceived causes of Success	Attribution: Perceived causes of failure
Private	45	42	3
Government	36	28	8
Total	81	70	11

From the table above, out of private school respondents 42 out of 45 reported their test scores as "success" while the remaining three students reported as "failure." Similarly, out of 36 students from the government group, 28 reported their test scores as "success" while 8 participants classified their results as "failure". The cumulative aggregated scores break down at a ratio of 86% to 14% respectively.

This demonstrates all respondents who participated and filled the questionnaires on writing self-efficacy scale and attribution scale overall perceived similar causes for success and failure. 45 learners from private school and 36 learners from government school filled out writing self-efficacy scale before taking the writing test. The total number of learners is 81. 42 learners from private school and 28 learners from government school filled out part one of the questionnaires, since they labelled their test score as success. And they are 70 learners all together. Learners who labelled their test result as failure filled out part two of the questionnaire which is referred as attribution: perceived causes of failure. Hence, 3 learners from private school and 8 learners from government school filled out part two of attribution scale questionnaire.

Table 4.2Writing self-efficacy scale responses of private school learners

The following table depicts the summary of item statistics, *means* and standard deviations for each item on the self-efficacy scale.

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Correctly spell all words in one page composition	3.00	.522	45
Correctly punctuate a one page composition	2.82	.576	45
Correctly use all parts of speech (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) in a written composition.	3.00	.564	45
Write simple. Compound and complex sentences with good grammar.	2.82	.576	45
Correctly use verb tenses.	2.96	.562	45
Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentences or main ideas.	2.76	.609	45
Structure paragraph to support ideas expressed in the thesis statement.	2.76	.609	45
Write a well -organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.	2.82	.576	45
Get ideas in a clear manner by staying founded without getting off topic.	2.89	.532	45

According to the table above, the highest mean score for the self-efficacy scale for private respondents was 3 [correctly spell words in one page composition, and correctly use all parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc...) in a written composition]. The lowest was 2.76 [write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main idea, and structure paragraphs to support ideas expressed in the thesis statement]. The other mean scores for items on the self-efficacy scale were: correctly punctuate a one page composition (M= 2.82, SD= .522); write simple, compound and complex sentences with good grammar (M=2.82, SD= .576); correctly use verb tenses (M=2.96, SD=.562);write a well-organized essay which has introduction, body and conclusion (M=2.82, SD=.576); get ideas in a clear manner by staying founded without getting off-topic (M=2.89 , SD=.532).

Table 4.3 Perceived causes of success for private school learners

The following table portrays the summary of item statistics, *means* and standard deviations of the attribution scale for private school.

Descriptive Statistics			
Perceive causes	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Luck	42	1.40	.497
Mood	42	1.38	.492
God's help	42	1.98	1.024
Self –confidence	42	3.14	.354
Sharp-mindedness	42	3.24	.431
Ability in Writing	42	3.14	.354
Easiness of the test	42	1.36	.485
Easiness of the skill tested	42	1.55	.670
Having good language command	42	3.10	.297
Having interest in Writing	42	1.71	.742
Hard work and constant effort	42	3.31	.468
Parents’ and friends’ help and encouragement	42	1.74	.701
Good study habit	42	3.21	.415
Teacher's competence in teaching writing	42	2.74	.767

Teacher's generosity in marking	42	1.29	.457
Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials	42	3.45	.832
Fastness in understanding and writing	42	3.38	.492
Intensive effort while working on the test	42	3.38	.492
Valid N (list wise)	42		

According to Table 4.3 above, the highest *mean* score for the attribution scale was 3.45 [availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials] and the lowest was 1.29 [teachers generosity in marking]. The other mean scores for items on the attribution scale were: luck (M=1.40, SD=.497); mood (M= 1.38, SD= .492); God's help (M= 1.98, SD= 1.024); self-confidence (M=3.14,SD=.354); sharp mindedness (M=3.24, SD=.431); ability in writing (M=3.14, SD=.354); easiness of the test (M=1.36, SD=.485); easiness of the skill tested (M=1.55, SD=.670); having good language command (M=3.10, SD=.297); having interest in writing (M=1.71 , SD=.742); hard work and constant effort (M=3.31 , SD=.468); parents' and friends' help and encouragement (M=1.74 ,SD=.701); good study habit (M=3.21,SD=.415); teachers' competence in teaching writing (M=2.74 ,SD=.767); fastness in understanding and writing (M=3.38,SD=.492); intensive effort while working on the test (M=3.38.SD=.492)

Table 4.4 Perceived causes of failure for private school learners (for the details, see Appendix: J)

Table 4.4 presents the *mean* and standard deviation scores for individual perceived causes of failure items.

According to table 4.4, the *means* and standard deviations for each item on the attribution scale is presented below

- Unluckiness (M= 3.33, SD= .577);
- Lack of effort (M= 3.00, SD= 1.732);
- Healthy problem (M=3.00, SD=1.732);
- Fear of writing task (M=2.00, SD=1.732);

- Difficulty of the skill tested (M=3.33, SD=.577);
- Having no interest in writing (M=3.00, SD=1.732);
- Teachers incompetence in teaching writing (M=2.00, SD=1.732);
- Teachers do not teach writing skills (M=2.00, SD=1.732);
- Frustrations while working the writing test (M=3.33, SD=.577);
- Giving no attention to writing skills (M=2.00, SD=1.732);
- Poor experience in writing (M=2.33, SD=1.155);
- Scarcity of appropriate writing exercises and materials (M=3.33, SD=.577).

Table 4.5 Writing self-efficacy scores of government school learners (for details, see Appendix: K)

Table 4.5 depicts *means* and standard deviations for each item on the self-efficacy scale of government students.

According to table 4.5, the highest mean score for the self-efficacy scale was 3.11 [correctly use verb tenses and get ideas in a clear manner by staying founded without getting off topic] and the lowest was 2.81 [correctly punctuate a one page punctuation]. The other mean scores for items on the self-efficacy scale were: correctly spell all words in a one page composition (M= 3.00, SD=.586); correctly use all parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc...) in a written composition (M= 2.97, SD= .560); write simple, compound and complex sentences with good grammar (M=2.92, SD= .554); write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main ideas (M=2.81, SD=.467); structure paragraphs to support ideas expressed in the thesis statement (M= 2.94, SD=.475); write a well-organized essay which has introduction, body and conclusion (M=2.92, SD=.280).

Table 4.6 Perceived causes of success for government school learners (for details, see Appendix: L)

Table 4.6 portrays the summary of item statistics, *means* and standard deviations for perceived causes of success among government school learners.

According to table 4.6, the highest *mean* score for the attribution scale was 3.39 [fastness in understanding and writing] and the lowest was 1.14 [teacher's generosity in marking]. The other *mean* scores for items on the attribution scale were:

- Luck (M=1.39, SD=.497)
- Mood (M= 1.36, SD= .488);
- God's help (M= 1.93, SD= .900);
- Self-confidence (M=3.21, SD=.418)
- Sharp mindedness (M=3.21, SD=.418);
- Ability in writing (M=3.25, SD=.441);
- Easiness of the test (M=1.36, SD=.559);
- Easiness of the skill tested (M=1.43, SD=.573);
- Having good language command (M=3.22, SD=.424);
- Having interest in writing (M=2.32, SD=.983);
- Hard work and constant effort (M=2.71, SD=1.084);
- Parents' and friends' help and encouragement (M=1.82, SD=1.188);
- Good study habit (M=3.21, SD=.418);
- Teachers' competence in teaching writing (M=2.89, SD=.629);
- Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials (M=2.64, SD=1.162);
- Intensive effort while working on the test (M=3.25.SD=.441)

Table 4.7 Perceived causes of failure for government school learners

Table 4:7 portrays the *means* and standard deviations for each item on the attribution scale that measures perceived causes of failure among government school learners.

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unluckiness	2.75	.707
Bad mood	2.38	.916
Lack of effort	2.13	.835
Health problem	2.25	.707
Fear of writing task	3.00	.000
Poor language command	2.50	.926
Poor ability in writing composition	2.50	.756
Difficulty of the skill tested	3.25	.463
Difficulty of the skill	3.38	.518
Having no interest in writing	3.00	.000
Teacher's incompetence in teaching writing	1.62	.916
Teachers do not teach writing skills	2.13	.991
Frustrations while working the writing test	3.38	.518
Giving no attention to writing skills	2.75	.707
Writing is a difficult exercise	3.38	.518
Poor experience in writing	2.75	.707
Scarcity of appropriate writing exercises and materials	3.13	.354
Bad marking system	3.50	.535
Valid N (list wise)		

Accordingly, the highest *mean* score for the attribution scale were 3.50 [bad marking system] and the lowest were 1.62 [teacher's incompetence in teaching writing]. The other mean scores for items on the attribution scale were: unluckiness (M= 2.75, SD= .707); bad mood (M= 2.38, SD= .916; lack of effort (M= 2.13, SD= .835); healthy problem (M=2.25, SD=.707); fear of writing task (M=3.00, SD=.000); difficulty of the skill tested (M=3.33, SD=.577); poor language command (M=2.50, SD=.926); poor ability in writing composition (M=2.50, SD=.756); difficulty of the skills tested(M=3.25, SD=.463); difficulty of the skill(M=3.38, SD=.518); having no interest in writing(M=3.00, SD=.000); teachers do not teach writing skills(M=2.13, SD=.991);

frustration while working the writing test(M=3.38, SD=.518), giving no attention to writing skills(M=2.75, SD=.707); writing is a difficult exercise(3.38, SD=.518), having no interest in writing (M=3.00, SD=1.732); teachers incompetence in teaching writing (M=2.00, SD=1.732); teachers do not teach writing skills (M=2.00 , SD=1.732); frustrations while working the writing test (M=3.33 , SD=.577); giving no attention to writing skills (M=2.00 ,SD=1.732); poor experience in writing (M=2.75,SD=.707); scarcity of appropriate writing exercises and materials (M=3.13 ,SD=.354).

4.2 Discussion based on findings

4.2.1 Relationship between writing performance and self-efficacy

To evaluate the correlation between writing performance and self-efficacy, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was conducted.

Research Question: *What is the relationship between learners' performance in writing and writing self-efficacy?*

A. Relationship between learners' performance and writing self-efficacy

HO: Private school learners and government school learners do not differ in the task of spelling words in one page composition.
HA: Private school learners correctly spell words in one page composition more often than government school learners.

Table 4.8 Chi- Square test of self-efficacy scale for private school

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.038[a]	2	.981
Likelihood Ratio	.037	2	.981
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000
N of Valid Cases	45		
a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.87.			

Table 4.9 Chi-Square test of self-efficacy scale for government school

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.330[a]	4	.675
Likelihood Ratio	3.017	4	.555
Linear-by-Linear Association	.260	1	.610
N of Valid Cases	36		
a. 7 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.			

Based on the study, 16.7% of private school learners correctly spelled words in one page composition, whereas 16.6% of government school learners correctly spelled words in one page composition. The difference is statistically insignificant. From the Chi-Square test, it can be inferred that the significance for private school learners' was r=0.981 based on the result generated. And the significance for government school learners' was also 0.675. Due to lack of significance, the null hypothesis was applied that private and government school learners do not differ in correctly punctuating a one page composition. This implies that there was no statistically significant difference in the percentage of private school leaners (16.7%) and government school learners (16.6%) who are really sure to correctly spell words in one page composition. Hence, Chi-Square test for private school learners is $x^2(2, N=45) =0.038, p=0.981$. Whereas, Chi-Square test for government school learners is $x^2(2, N=36) =2.330, p=0.675$.

Table 4.10 Chi-Square test of self-efficacy scale for private school

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.274[a]	2	.529
Likelihood Ratio	1.019	2	.601
Linear-by-Linear Association	.493	1	.482
N of Valid Cases	36		
a. 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .39.			

B. Relationship between students' performance and writing self-efficacy

HO: Private school learners and government school learners do not differ in the task of correctly punctuating a one page composition.

HA: Private school learners correctly punctuate a one page composition more often than government school learners.

Table 4.11 Chi-Square test of self-efficacy scale for government school

Chi-Square Tests	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.862[a]	2	.650
Likelihood Ratio	.837	2	.658
Linear-by-Linear Association	715	1	398
N of Valid Cases	45		
a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.24.			

As can be seen from the Chi-Square test, it is possible to infer that the significance for private school learners was r=0.650, and for government school learners was r=529. In the study, it was observed that 11.1% of private learners correctly punctuate a one page composition. On the other hand, the figure was 7.05% for government school learners who correctly punctuate a one-page composition. This result leads to the alternative hypothesis that private learners correctly punctuate a one- p a g e composition more often than government school learners. A higher percentage of private school learners 11.1% and 7.05% of government school learners correctly punctuate a one-page composition. Hence, Chi-square test for private school learners is $x^2(2, N=45) =0.862$, p=0.650. Whereas, Chi-square test for government school learners is $x^2(2, N=36) =1.274$, p=0.529.

B. Relationship between learners' performance and writing self-efficacy

4.2.2 Correlation of self-efficacy scale for private school and government school

HO: There is no correlation between writing a well-organized essay, which has introduction, body and conclusion, and correctly punctuating a one page composition.

HA: Writing a well-organized essay which has introduction, body and conclusion correlates with correctly punctuating a one page composition.

Table 4.12 Correlation of self-efficacy scale for private school

Correlations				
		Correctly spell all words in one page composition	Correctly punctuate a one page composition	Write a well -organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.
Correctly spell all words in one page composition	Pearson Correlation	1	.454**	.151
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002	.321
	N	45	45	45
Correctly punctuate a one page composition	Pearson Correlation	.454**	1	.383**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002		.009
	N	45	45	45
Write a well –organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.	Pearson Correlation	.151	.383**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.321	.009	
	N	45	45	45
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Table 4.13 Correlation self-efficacy scale for government school

Correlations				
		Correctly spell all words in one page composition	Correctly punctuate a one page composition	Write a well -organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.
Correctly spell all words in one page composition	Pearson Correlation	1	.243	.174
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.153	.310
	N	36	36	36
Correctly punctuate a one page composition	Pearson Correlation	.243	1	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.153		.000
	N	36	36	36
Write a well -organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.	Pearson Correlation	.174	.614**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.310	.000	
	N	36	36	36
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

According to the correlation assessments conducted, the Pearson Correlation for private school is 0.383, and for government school, it is 0.614, suggesting a strong correlation between ability to write a well-organized essay, which has introduction, body and conclusion, and correctly punctuating a one page composition. The significance for private school is .009, and for government school, it is .000; therefore, we can accept the alternative hypothesis that to write a well-organized essay which has introduction, body and conclusion is positively correlated to correctly punctuating a one page composition. This implies that there is a reciprocal correlation between the two variables in the learners' writing performance of private and government schools. Hence, R (45) =0.383, two tailed for private school, and R= (36) =0.614, two tailed for private school.

4.2.3 Internal attribution scale

Attribution is seen from internal/external polarity. Internal attribution includes causal explanations which are within the individual. These include such scales as mood, self-confidence, sharp-mindedness, ability in writing, good language command, hard work and constant effort, good study habit, fastness in understanding, and writing, and intensive effort while working on the test. In short, internal attribution scale refers to ability, effort, and language command. The following tables (table 4.14 and table 4.15) show the correlation among internal attribution scales of private school and government school respectively.

Table 4.14 Correlation among internal attribution scale of private school (Perceived causes of success)

Correlations												
Items			Mood	Self – confidence	Sharp-Minded-ness	Ability in Writing	Having good language command	Having interest in Writing	Hard work and constant effort	Good study habit	Fastness in understanding and writing	Intensive effort while working on the test
Spearman's Rho	Mood	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.380*	.252	.100	.080	.136	.111	.068	.192	.192
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.013	.107	.528	.617	.390	.484	.667	.222	.222
	Self – confidence	Correlation Coefficient	.380*	1.000	.251	.417**	.099	.393**	.168	.118	-.040	.100
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.013	.	.109	.006	.531	.010	.287	.455	.801	.528
	Sharp-mindedness	Correlation Coefficient	.252	.251	1.000	.251	.200	.065	-.012	.389*	.137	.022
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.107	.109	.	.109	.205	.682	.942	.011	.387	.890
	Ability in Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.100	.417**	.251	1.000	-.132	.253	.463**	.284	.240	-.040
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.528	.006	.109	.	.403	.106	.002	.068	.125	.801
	Having good language command	Correlation Coefficient	.080	.099	.200	-.132	1.000	.087	-.042	.226	.080	.247
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.617	.531	.205	.403	.	.583	.793	.150	.617	.115
	Having interest in Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.136	.393**	.065	.253	.087	1.000	.115	.218	-.169	.009
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.390	.010	.682	.106	.583	.	.467	.165	.284	.956
	Hard work and constant effort	Correlation Coefficient	.111	.168	-.012	.463**	-.042	.115	1.000	-.099	.111	.111
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.484	.287	.942	.002	.793	.467	.	.534	.484	.484
	Good study Habit	Correlation Coefficient	.068	.118	.389*	.284	.226	.218	-.099	1.000	.068	.188

		Sig. (2-tailed)	.667	.455	.011	.068	.150	.165	.534	.	.667	.234
	Fastness in understanding and writing	Correlation Coefficient	.192	-.040	.137	.240	.080	-.169	.111	.068	1.000	-.111
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.222	.801	.387	.125	.617	.284	.484	.667	.	.486
	Intensive effort while working on	Correlation Coefficient	.192	.100	.022	-.040	.247	.009	.111	.188	-.111	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.222	.528	.890	.801	.115	.956	.484	.234	.486	.
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).												
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). N = 42 for all attribution scale Items												

Table 4.15 Correlation among internal attribution scale of government school (Perceived causes of success)

Correlations											
			Mood	Self - Confidence	Sharp-mindedness	Ability in Writing	Having good language command	Hard work and constant effort	Good study habit	Fastness in understanding and writing	Intensive effort while working on the test
Spearman's rho	Mood	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.337	.337	.086	-.041	.112	.337	.316	.086
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.079	.079	.663	.839	.570	.079	.101	.663
	Self-confidence	Correlation Coefficient	.337	1.000	.364	.101	.571**	-.512**	.364	.115	.101
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.	.057	.611	.002	.005	.057	.562	.611
	Sharp-mindedne	Correlation Coefficient	.337	.364	1.000	.503**	.143	-.108	.576**	.471*	-.101
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.057	.	.006	.477	.584	.001	.011	.611

	Ability in Writing	Correlation Coefficient	.086	.101	.503**	1.000	.294	-.038	.302	.211	.048
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.663	.611	.006	.	.137	.849	.119	.281	.810
	Having good language	Correlation Coefficient	-.041	.571**	.143	.294	1.000	-.565**	.143	-.081	.143
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.839	.002	.477	.137	.	.002	.477	.689	.477
	Hard work and constant effort	Correlation Coefficient	.112	-.512**	-.108	-.038	-.565**	1.000	-.216	.048	-.162
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.570	.005	.584	.849	.002	.	.269	.809	.411
	Good study habit	Correlation Coefficient	.337	.364	.576**	.302	.143	-.216	1.000	.649**	-.101
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.057	.001	.119	.477	.269	.	.000	.611
	Fastness in understanding and	Correlation Coefficient	.316	.115	.471*	.211	-.081	.048	.649**	1.000	.042
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.101	.562	.011	.281	.689	.809	.000	.	.831
	Intensive effort while working on	Correlation Coefficient	.086	.101	-.101	.048	.143	-.162	-.101	.042	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.663	.611	.611	.810	.477	.411	.611	.831	.
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).											
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).											

The internal attribution output of both private and government schools suggest a correlation matrix for the nine correlations requested in the above dialog boxes. Correlations are a measure of the linear relationship between two variables. A correlation coefficient has a value ranging from -1 to 1. Values that are closer to the absolute value of 1 indicate that there is a strong relationship between the variables being correlated, whereas values closer to 0 indicate that there is little or no linear relationship. The sign of a correlation coefficient describes the type of relationship between the variables being correlated. A positive correlation coefficient indicates that there is a positive linear relationship between the variables: as one variable increases in value, so does the other. Note that in spite of the fact that there are eighty-one cells in each of above matrix; the researcher tries to isolate some of the correlations coefficients of interest among the internal attribution factors for private and government schools**.** The correlations between the internal attribution scales of private school are: the correlation between self-confidence and ability in writing, the correlation between having interest in writing and self-confidence, the correlation between hard work and constant

effort and ability in writing, the correlation between good study habit and sharp-mindedness, the correlation between mood and self-confidence. Also, the correlations between the internal attribution scales of government school are: the relationship between self-confidence and having good language of command, the correlation between ability in writing and sharp-mindedness, the relationship between good study habit and sharp-mindedness, the correlation between good study habit and fastness in understanding and writing, and the relationship between fastness in understanding and writing and sharp-mindedness. In the study, the correlation coefficients show there is a positive correlation among all the relationships created to show the internal attribution scales. The linear relationships in both tables show that the variables are statistically significant and there is a positive linear relationship. This implies that internal attribution scales have great impact in the writing performances of both private school and government school learners in order to produce successful results.

4.2.4 External attribution scale

External attribution stands for casual explanations the learner provides outside of the individual. These are luck, God's help, easiness of the test, easiness of the skill tested, parents' and friends' help and encouragement, teacher's competence in teaching writing, teacher's generosity in marking, availability of writing exercises and materials. Briefly, external attribution scale refers to test difficulty, nature of tasks, teacher and parent related facts. The following tables (table 4.16 and table 4.17) show the correlation among external attribution scales of private school and government school respectively.

Table 4.16 Correlation among external attribution scale of private school (Perceived causes of success)

Correlations										
			Luck	God's Help	Easiness of the test	Easiness of the skill tested	Parents and friends help and encouragement	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	Teacher's generosity in marking	Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials
Spearman's Rho	Luck	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.017	-.007	.214	.155	.123	-.092	-.217
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.913	.964	.174	.327	.438	.562	.168
	God's help	Correlation Coefficient	.017	1.000	-.241	-.236	-.172	-.214	.132	-.021
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.913	.	.124	.133	.276	.174	.403	.893
	Easiness of the test	Correlation Coefficient	-.007	-.241	1.000	.044	.215	.097	-.361*	.138
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.964	.124	.	.783	.172	.540	.019	.384
	Easiness of the skill Tested	Correlation Coefficient	.214	-.236	.044	1.000	.136	.299	-.232	.081
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.174	.133	.783	.	.390	.054	.139	.610
	Parents and friends help and encouragement	Correlation Coefficient	.155	-.172	.215	.136	1.000	.236	-.081	-.024
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.327	.276	.172	.390	.	.133	.611	.881
	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	Correlation Coefficient	.123	-.214	.097	.299	.236	1.000	-.313*	.109
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.438	.174	.540	.054	.133	.	.044	.492
	Teacher's generosity in Marking	Correlation Coefficient	-.092	.132	-.361*	-.232	-.081	-.313*	1.000	-.010
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.562	.403	.019	.139	.611	.044	.	.950
	Availability of appropriate writing	Correlation Coefficient	-.217	-.021	.138	.081	-.024	.109	-.010	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.168	.893	.384	.610	.881	.492	.950	.

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Note:- N = 42 for all attribution scale Items

Table 4.17 Correlation among external attribution scale of government school (Perceived causes of success)

Correlation among external attribution scale of government school(Perceived causes of success)										
			Luck	God's Help	Easiness of the test	Easiness of the skill tested	Parents and friends help and encouragement	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	Teacher's generosity in marking	Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials
Spearman's Rho	Luck	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.101	.400*	.132	.145	-.109	.090	.184
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.610	.035	.502	.462	.583	.650	.347
	God's help	Correlation Coefficient	.101	1.000	-.166	-.210	.023	-.412*	.294	.084
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.610	.	.398	.283	.907	.029	.128	.672
	Easiness of the test	Correlation Coefficient	.400*	-.166	1.000	.277	.120	.063	-.279	.019
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.398	.	.153	.543	.749	.151	.924
	Easiness of the skill tested	Correlation Coefficient	.132	-.210	.277	1.000	.036	-.081	.074	.032
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.502	.283	.153	.	.857	.680	.709	.873
	Parents and friends help and encouragement	Correlation Coefficient	.145	.023	.120	.036	1.000	-.046	.077	.191
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.462	.907	.543	.857	.	.817	.698	.330
	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	Correlation Coefficient	-.109	-.412*	.063	-.081	-.046	1.000	-.445*	-.002
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.583	.029	.749	.680	.817	.	.018	.992
	Teacher's generosity in Marking	Correlation Coefficient	.090	.294	-.279	.074	.077	-.445*	1.000	-.020
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.650	.128	.151	.709	.698	.018	.	.920
	Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials	Correlation Coefficient	.184	.084	.019	.032	.191	-.002	-.020	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.347	.672	.924	.873	.330	.992	.920	.
		N	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**Note:-** N =28 is common to all attribution scale

4.2.5 Regression analysis of attribution scale for private school

Table 4.18 Regression analysis of attribution scale for private school

ANOVA[a]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	A	.672	.416	.340	1.982

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intensive effort while working on the test, Easiness of the skill teste, Having, interest in Writing, Sharp-mindedness, Hard work and constant effort, Teacher's generosity in marking, Having good language command, Mood, Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials, Luck, Easiness of the test, Good study habit, Fastness in understanding and writing, Self -confidence, Teacher's competence in teaching writing, God's help, Parents and friends help and encouragement, Ability in Writing

b. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing

When we examine the output from the regression analysis of attribution scale for private school, we look into the p-value of the F-test to see if the overall model is significant. With a p-value of zero to three decimal places, the model is significant for most of the variables. The R-squared is 0.672 meaning that approximately 67.2% of the variability of writing performance is accounted for by the variables in the model. In this case, the adjusted R-squared indicates that about 41.6% of the variability of writing performance is accounted for by the model, even after taking into account the number of predictor variables in the model. The coefficients for each of the variables indicates the amount of change in writing performance given a one-unit change in the value of that variable, given that all other variables in the model are held constant.

Table 4.19 Analysis of Variance for private school

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.457	18	.303	2.619	.016[b]
	Residual	2.662	23	.116		
	Total	8.119	41			

a. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intensive effort while working on the test, Easiness of the skill tested, Having interest in Writing, Sharp-mindedness, Hard work and constant effort, Teacher's generosity in marking, Having good language command, Mood, Availability of

appropriate writing exercises and materials, Luck, Easiness of the test, Good study habit, Fastness in understanding and writing, Self -confidence, Teacher's competence in teaching writing, God's help, Parents and friends help and encouragement, Ability in Writing

Table 4.20 Regression analysis of attribution scale for private school

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.758	1.226		2.249	.034
	Luck	.034	.133	.038	.254	.801
	Mood	-.222	.140	-.245	-1.583	.127
	God's help	-.221	.074	-.509	-2.972	.007
	Self–confidence	.766	.241	.610	3.184	.004
	Sharp-mindedness	.191	.162	.185	1.174	.252
	Ability in Writing	-.261	.274	-.208	-.954	.350
	Easiness of the test	-.263	.142	-.287	-1.849	.077
	Easiness of the skill tested	-.212	.101	-.319	-2.104	.046
	Having good language command	.090	.215	.060	.421	.678
	Having interest in Writing	.020	.100	.033	.198	.845
	Hard work and constant effort	-.516	.171	-.543	-3.027	.006
	Parents and friends help and encouragement	.103	.123	.162	.836	.412
	Good study habit	-.182	.169	-.170	-1.078	.292
	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	.213	.099	.368	2.150	.042
	Teacher's generosity in marking	-.360	.146	-.369	-2.467	.022
	Availability of appropriate writing exercises and mate	-.087	.078	-.162	-1.117	.276
	Fastness in understanding and writing	.115	.141	.127	.810	.426
	Intensive effort while working on the test	.221	.145	.244	1.528	.140
a. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing						

4.2.6 Regression analysis of attribution scale for government school

Table 4.21 Regression analysis of attribution scale

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.765[a]	.586	.347	.581	1.900

a. Predictors: (Constant), Intensive effort while working on the test, Having interest in Writing, Fastness in understanding and writing , Teacher's generosity in marking, Parents and friends help and encouragement, Easiness of the test, God's help, Mood, Teacher's competence in teaching writing, Self-confidence, Easiness of the skill tested, Luck, Ability in Writing, Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials, Good study habit, Sharp-mindedness, Having good language command, Hard work and constant effort

b. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing

Also, when we examine the output from the regression analysis of attribution scale for government school, we look into the p-value of the F-test to see if the overall model is significant. With a p-value of zero to three decimal places, the model is significant for some of the variables. The R-squared is 0.586 meaning that approximately 58.6% of the variability of writing performance is accounted for by the variables in the model. In this case, the adjusted R-squared indicates that about 58.6% of the variability of writing performance is accounted for by the model, even after taking into account the number of predictor variables in the model. The coefficients for each of the variables indicates the amount of change in writing performance given a one-unit change in the value of that variable, given that all other variables in the model are held constant.

Table 4.22 Analysis of Variance for government school

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.817	18	.212	.628	.804[b]
	Residual	2.702	8	.338		
	Total	6.519	26			

a. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing

b. Predictors: (Constant), Intensive effort while working on the test, Having interest in Writing, Fastness in understanding and writing, Teacher's generosity in marking, Parents and friends help and encouragement, Easiness of the test, God's help, Mood, Teacher's competence in teaching writing, Self-confidence, Easiness of the skill tested, Luck, Ability in Writing, Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials, Good study habit, Sharp-mindedness, Having good language command, Hard work and constant effort

Table 4.23 Regression analysis of attribution scale for government school

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.639	2.236		.733	.485
	Luck	.635	.547	.435	1.162	.279
	Mood	-.091	.336	-.090	-.271	.793
	God's help	.069	.230	.123	.300	.772
	Self-confidence	.126	.690	.106	.182	.860
	Sharp-mindedness	.532	.797	.450	.668	.523
	Ability in Writing	-.573	.573	-.511	-1.000	.347
	Easiness of the test	-.721	.605	-.813	-1.191	.268
	Easiness of the skill tested	.242	.423	.277	.573	.582
	Having good language command	.594	.823	.503	.722	.491
	Having interest in Writing	.274	.343	.547	.799	.447
	Hard work and constant effort	.051	.344	.113	.149	.885
	Parents and friends help and encouragement	-.113	.186	-.272	-.607	.561
	Good study habit	-.501	.599	-.424	-.836	.427
	Teacher's competence in teaching writing	.073	.284	.094	.258	.803
	Teacher's generosity in marking	-.434	.611	-.314	-.711	.497
	Availability of appropriate writing exercises					
	Fastness in understanding and writing	-.171	.466	-.171	-.366	.724
	Intensive effort while working on the test	-.020	.432	-.017	-.047	.964

a. Dependent Variable: Score of learners' performance in writing

To compare the strength of one variable coefficient to the coefficient of another variable, it is necessary to refer to the column of Beta coefficients, also known as standardized regression coefficients. Because the beta coefficients are all measured in standard deviations, instead of the units of the variables, they can be compared to one another. In the study, private school learners' self-confidence has the greatest Beta coefficient, 0.610 (table 4.20), and hard work and constant effort has the smallest Beta coefficient -.543. For government school learners, we can see that having interest in writing has the greatest Beta coefficient, 0.547 (table 4.23), and easiness of the test has the smallest Beta coefficient, -.813. Thus, a one standard deviation increase in self-confidence of private school learners leads to a 0.610 standard deviation increment in writing performance, with the other variables held constant. Similarly, a one standard deviation increase in having interest in writing of government school learners leads to a 0.547 standard deviation increment in writing performance, with the other variable held

constant.

In conclusion, the result of the descriptive statistics on writing self-efficacy and performance showed that when learners perceived their writing competence as high, their writing composition results coincided with their expectations. That means scores of learners' writing self-efficacy and performance in writing was almost similar. The standard deviation for each of the variables showed a duplicate outcome.

From the data, it can be inferred that learners from private school and government school perceived their ability of writing composition as high. They believed that they have the power and abilities to succeed in writing tasks. The composition results also showed that these learners performed well. Thus, though there were differences among learners, it can be concluded that learners' perception of their ability and their real performance in composition were high.

The correlation statistics about the learner's writing self-efficacy and performance in writing revealed a strong positive relationship. Learners who rated high in writing self-efficacy obtained higher scores on a composition test than those who rated low in writing self-efficacy. This finding is consistent with researchers who have investigated self-efficacy belief and composition writing as strongly related variables. To illustrate this fact, Shell, Murphy and Burning (1989) assessed the confidence of undergraduates to perform certain writing skills and reported significant correlation between students' confidence in their writing skills and in their holistic score on a twenty-minute essay writing. McCarthy, Meiner, and Rinderer (1985) reported significant positive correlation between writing self-efficacy and performance in writing.

Similarly, Pajares and Valiante (1997), Pajares and Johnson (1994) found that learners' confidence in their writing skills is related to their writing competence. Bandura (1986) warned that judgements of self-efficacy should specifically correspond to the assessed performance. As the cumulative findings of this research highlight, writing self- efficacy predicted the writing performances of learners. The result of this is consistent with

the above findings that showed significant correlation between performance in writing and writing self-efficacy.

Progressing to internal attributions for success (e.g. ability, sharp mindedness, good language command, interest, etc), these factors significantly correlated with writing self-efficacy. This proves that students with high writing self-efficacy tend to attribute their success to internal factors. Likewise, performance in writing is positively related to internal attribution for success. Performance in writing is negatively and significantly related to external attribution for success.

Internal attributions for failure (e.g. lack of ability, lack of effort, poor language command, lack of interest, etc) are negatively related to writing self-efficacy, and in the same way internal attributions for failure are negatively related to performance in writing, but with statistical significance. In other words, lack of ability, lack of effort, lack of interest, etc are negatively related to performance and self-efficacy. External attributions for failure (e.g. difficulty of the skill tested, teacher related problems, etc) negatively correlated with performance in writing.

Learners who perceived their score on a writing test derived from their own individual abilities attributed their achievement to internally and externally perceived causes. But the correlation showed that learners' writing self-efficacy was significantly correlated with internal attribution. The relationship between performance in writing and internal attribution converged in a meaningful way, substantiating earlier research findings by other investigators.

4.3. Findings based on qualitative data

4.3.1 Focus group discussion

Since investigating the role of the teacher in developing learners' feelings of self-efficacy in their writing performance determines the outcomes of the study, the following qualitative data were acquired from the focus group discussion that was held based on certain topics. These topics are the factors classified by Dornyei (2001) as teacher's motivational influence on the learners learning environment.

The discussion points are listed below:

- Teacher's approach of teaching;
- Teacher's accessibility; and
- Teacher's feedback to learners' written response.

4.3.1.1 The question of teacher's approach of teaching/presentation

With regard to teacher's presentation, all the participants acknowledged that teaching writing is a very difficult job and most do not like teaching this skill. One of the female participants mentioned that the negative attitude of the teacher could also be shared by the learners, as the psychological dynamics conveys that negative attitude. However, the participant continued to reiterate that if the topics given for writing task are beyond the knowledge of the learners, the writers develop the resistance and avoidance traits that kill motivation. Learners do not feel confident enough to write on a topic they have no idea at all. The participants' mentioned that reasons for the learners' failure is not only the learners' inability to understand the topic given, but learners have the problem of spelling, vocabulary, grammar, and lack of organisation skill. However, there was a unanimous agreement in that, by providing topics within the knowledge and ability of the learners, teachers would assist them to develop positive attitude toward the skill and help them to gain self-confidence.

4.3.1.2 The question of teacher's accessibility

As far as teacher's accessibility is concerned, the respondents emphasized that because the teacher is a very vital figure in helping learners to show a remarkable progress in their writing skills, he or she has to present himself or herself as a facilitator not as a kind of person that is "authoritative" who could simply give order. The teacher has the responsibility to direct the learners and provide support and talk to them frequently and also listen to their needs and address them as far as possible. In short, if the teacher is close and accessible, he or she could realise the learners' difficulties in writing and assist accordingly. This idea, forwarded by one of the fellow participants, was unanimously supported.

4.3.1.3 The question of teacher's feedback to learners' response

With regard to teacher's feedback to learners' response, all the teachers agreed that feedback is connected with motivation for learning. They also admitted that motivation is dependent on the learners' confidence to do a task well. One of the participants strongly stated that feedback could be viewed as something that creates a two-way communication between the learner and the teacher. Especially, if there is a large class, then the feedback given to the learners would help the learners to communicate with the teacher. Other teachers also mentioned that they could share this idea. What all the participants stressed was that the form of feedback given by the teachers could motivate or demotivate learners. One of the participants raised the idea of using words that could break instead of make. For instance, such words and phrases as "how could you write like this?", "you don't know how to spell this word!", "It is better for you to try another thing instead", and others make the learners develop negative attitude toward learning to write and eventually stop trying. They all came to terms on this idea.

4.3.2 The role of the teacher

In the above data, it can clearly be observed that the teacher could play a very important role in the development of learners' positive feelings in learning writing skill. This means that teacher's values and beliefs influence learners and the task they do. The central figure is the learner. The teacher is, therefore, a facilitator who supports and gives continuous feedback and also notices the learners' needs so as to address them.

CHAPTER 5

5. Summary, conclusion and recommendation

5.1. Introduction

In view of the hypothetical assumption of the study that writing self-efficacy and causal attribution influence performance in writing, this chapter contains three major sub-sections. The first sub-section summarises the whole research work, especially resolving the questions raised in the study and the results obtained from the research. The second sub-section presents the conclusions arrived at, while the last sub-section offers recommendations.

5.2 Summary

The general purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship among the theories of self-efficacy and attribution to English composition writing. This general objective was managed through specific objectives that attempted to search for the relationships among variables. Particularly, writing self-efficacy, performance in writing and causal attributions were taken as the major variables whose relationships were the cornerstone of the study.

Writing self-efficacy is learner's perceived competence in accomplishing a writing task. Attribution is explanation that learners give for their success or failure. Performance in writing is the cumulative score of learners' ability in writing a composition. This research addressed the relationships among these variables.

To assess the relationship among these variables, Grade 11 (from private and government schools) learners were targeted. Out of the total school population in Addis Ababa two schools (one government and one private) were selected. A total of 90 learners were randomly selected to be the sample of the study. Since 9 learners gave incomplete answers, only 81 were considered.

Three instruments were used as data collecting tools. Writing self-efficacy was measured in a quantitative way before the learners took a test of composition writing. The self-efficacy scale is made up of four Likert scale from "maybe" to "really sure". The 100-point scale is found to be more accurate when measuring self-efficacy for writing tasks. Pajares& Miller

(1994) suggestions were considered while preparing the self-efficacy scale. The reliability of the instrument was 0.90. This study has 0.84, internal reliability for self-efficacy scale from Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items. This implies that the research shows high internal reliability to measure both self-efficacy scale and attribution scale to measure writing performances of learners under study.

A test of composition writing was administered after the learners had rated the writing self-efficacy scale. Similar to the procedures used by self-efficacy researchers (Shell, *et al.*, 1995; Pajares & Johnson, 1996), a teacher-made composition test was administered. The researcher and a language teacher, based on the procedure used by self-efficacy researchers, marked the composition. In other words, the items of the scale of writing self-efficacy were considered while marking the test.

Attributions of success and failure were assessed using scales widely used in the literature. It was made up of two major sections – perceived causes of success and perceived causes of failure. Then those who evaluated their result as "success" completed Part I, and those who perceived it as "failure" completed Part II. Both parts of the scale were composed of 18 items. The scale is made up of a five-point Likert scale that ranges from "unimportant ‘’ to "very highly important" causes. This study has 0.65, internal reliability for attribution scale from Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items.

Descriptive statistics and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) were used to present analysis and discuss the results. Results from the descriptive statistics indicated that learners had high performance in writing composition. Though there was difference among learners, Grade 11 learners' perception of their ability and their actual performance were relatively similar and high.

The correlation result showed that there is a strong positive relationship between learners' writing self-efficacy and performance in writing. Learners rated high in writing self-efficacy and obtained high scores on a composition test. Hence learners' confidence in writing was related to their writing ability. As previously stated, there have been a number of studies that can portray the relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and essay writing. Researchers who have investigated self-efficacy beliefs and essay writing agree that the two are related. For

example, Meir, *et al.* (1984) reported that writing self-efficacy predicted the writing performance of undergraduates. Despite the report made by the World Bank, the result of this study was in line with the findings that are obtained in other countries outside of Ethiopia.

The learners were self-efficacious about spelling, parts of speech, coherence, cohesion, and punctuation, tense and using simple and complex sentences (from the highest to the lowest). All of these linguistic issues were positively related to learners' performance in writing composition. This is to say that their belief of the sub-skills considered matched with their performance in a holistically scored composition test.

As far as results of the attribution scale are concerned, learners attributed their performance more to internal causes (e.g. ability, sharp-mindedness and language command) than external causes (e.g. task, teacher related factors and availability of materials). It was found that learners with high writing self-efficacy and high performance attributed more to internal causes than external causes.

The result of the correlation among the variables (writing self-efficacy and internal attribution) shows positive relationship whereas writing self-efficacy has no high self- efficacy tend to explain the causes of their performance more to internal than external causes. Internal attributions for success are significantly correlated with writing self-efficacy. That means learners with high writing self-efficacy tended to attribute their success to internal factors. Similarly, learners' performance in writing is positively related to internal attributions whereas external attributions were negatively correlated to these variables. For those who labelled their performance as failure, performance and self-efficacy were negatively related to both internal and external attributions.

As far as success is concerned, having ability correlated positively with self-efficacy whereas easiness of the task, effort, luck and mood are related negatively and teacher related factors had no relation with self-efficacy whereas easiness of the task, effort, luck and mood are related negatively and teacher related factors had no relation with self-efficacy in writing. It was only ability that had positively related with performance. But, with regard to perceived failure, task related difficulty was related positively with writing self-efficacy. It was only teacher related problems that were related (positively) to performance in writing.

According to the descriptive statistics of each item of perceived causes of success, divine intervention, self-confidence, sharp-mindedness, ability in writing, interest, effort and fastness in understanding were rated as important causes of success while easiness of the test, good language command, parents' and friends' help, good study habit and availability of materials were found important causes. However, lack of effort and giving no attention to writing exercises and materials were the only important causes of failure.

5.3 Teacher's role in developing learners' motivation

The research corroborated that teachers augment the nascent feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy by removing emotional and psychological roadblocks to the writing task/activity. This is accomplished through generating interest, confidence and initiative that kindle an internal desire to overcome fear, doubt and anxiety and forge ahead as competent would-be writers. This ideal scenario proved the indispensable role of the teacher in cultivating attitudes of competence and excellence in writing tasks, regardless of the private and government school dichotomy.

5.4 Conclusion

From the descriptive and the correlation results, it is possible to conclude and imply pedagogical implications. The strong positive relationship between writing self-efficacy beliefs and performance in English composition writing indicates that writing self-efficacy predicts or determines someone's performance. Self-efficacy has predictive validity. Hence, concentrating only on skill-based kind of approach excluding affective factors such as self-efficacy is not an exhaustive way of helping learners to improve their writing skill. Thus, influencing the writing confidence of our learners puts us on a better position to improve learners' performance in writing.

Explanations (attributions) learners give for their performance were related to their self-efficacy and performance in writing. When we see them in light of locus of causality (internal and external), high performing, self-efficacious learners attribute their performance to internal causes than external. The relationship among these three variables indicates that internalising causes for success or performance in general is what high performing self- efficacious learners prefer. Among the internal factors, ability (internal and uncontrollable) and effort (internal and controllable) were very important causes for success next to God's help (external) and self-confidence (internal and uncontrollable). Lack of effort and giving no attention to writing tasks were important causes for failure.

From this, it can be inferred that causal attributions have inherent relationships with performance and self-efficacy. Internal attribution causes are chosen more by those who evaluate their work as success. External attributions are not under the control of the learners.

It can be concluded that learners with high self-efficacy performing high and internalise causes for their success.

As it has already been stated, there is a positive and stronger relationship between writing self-efficacy and performance due more to internal causes than external. Learners mainly attribute their success to their ability and effort. It is when learners attribute their success or failure to internal and controllable (i.e. effort) that they have control upon their performance. Language pedagogy should facilitate such attributions (internal and controllable causes).

Finally, it can possibly be concluded that the role of a teacher in language pedagogy derives from the overwhelming evidence gathered through cognitive and motivational studies that language instruction transcends mere teaching of the mechanics of writing. It assumes the catalytic function teachers play in applying and acquainting learners to write well. The synergy of an internal locus of control for the outcomes of effort and daily and persistent practice in the process and mechanics of writing lead to the improvement of writing ability and build a bed-rock of confidence. It is from such a continual dialectic of practical "doing" and supportive feedback from teachers that the fear, doubt and anxiety of "writer's block" are overcome and mastered.

5.5. Recommendations

The findings of this study have beneficial ramifications both for the teaching and learning of English language composition writing in Ethiopia. Effective writing skills develop when both teachers and learners realize that feelings of self-worth and self-efficacy induce a fervent desire for continuous, conscious effort towards success and achievement which form the basis to the realization of life and career goals.

Based on the findings of this research, therefore, it is confidently recommended that teachers should play a vital role by praising learners for any progress they have made so as to improve the performance of the learners, for there is a strong relationship between writing self- efficacy and performance in writing.

While some English teachers may feel that it is not their job to include lessons to aid learners in managing their physiological and affective states, as the correlation showed, it is very important to influence the writing self-efficacy of learners to improve the learners' performance. This is possible through the following essential ways (Bandura, 1997):

1) Past (Enactive mastery) experience: Learners must experience success.
2) Vicarious experience: Learners should experience observing others performing writing tasks. This could be done through observing classmates (collaborating) and teachers (modelling) doing writing activities.
3) Physiological and affective states: Physiological and affective states can affect learners' self-efficacy. Excessive stress negatively influences learners' self-efficacy.
4) Verbal persuasion: Learners need verbal persuasion, especially praise. Learners' are heavily dependent on teachers emotionally. Teachers' responses are, therefore, very important to them. Praise builds the learners' self-confidence (self-efficacy) in mastering the subject and encourages the rest of the class to make similar efforts.

Ultimately, since causal attributions, self-efficacy and performance in writing are interrelated in a statistically significant way, research on attribution into language instruction may contribute to the quality and quantity of student writing production. More research is needed in this area. If learners fail to recognize the significant variation between internal and external attributions, learned helplessness may replace self-efficacy as their dominant affective mode to a writing exercise.

References

Adeyemi, D.A. 2004. Relative Effectiveness of the Individualised and the Cooperative Learning Approaches in Teaching Composition Writing at the Junior Secondary Level: A Case Study. An Unpublished Med Research Project Submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of Botswana.

Ames, C. & Ames, R. 1984. Goal structures and motivation. *The Elementary School Journal,* 85, 39-52.

Arthur, J. 1993. English in Botswana Classroom: Functions and Constraints. In Rubbagumya, C. M. (Ed.). *Researching Language in African Classrooms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 66-78.

Bandura, A. 1977. Self – efficacy: Towards a Unifying of Behavioural Change. *Psychological Review*, 84: 191.

Bandura, A. 1982. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologyist, 37*, 122-147.

Bandura, A. 1986.*Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NI: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. 1997.*Self – Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bandura, A. 1999. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. The self in social psychology. R. F. Baumeister. Philadelphia, PA: 285-298.

Bandura, A. 2001. Guide for Constructing Self-efficacy Scales. From http://www.des.emory.edu/mfp/014-Bandura Guide 2006.pdf (22 July 2011).

Balsvik, R.R. 1985. *Haile-Sellassie's students: The Intellectual and Social Background to Revolution*. Michigan State University.

Banhardt, S. 1997. Self-efficacy and second language learning. The NCRC language Resource, 1,5.

Bar-Tal, D. 1978. Attributional analysis of achievement-related behaviour. *Review of Educational Research.*48 (2), 259-271.

Beach, R. & Birdwell, L. S.1984. *New directions in composition research*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Bempechat, J. Ginsburg, H, Nakkula, M & Wu, J. 1996. Attributions as predictors of mathematics achievement: A comparative study. *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* 29(2), 53-59.

Bond, K.A., Biddle, S.J. & Ntoumanis, N. 2001.Self-efficacy and causal attribution in female golfers. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 243-256.

Bryne, D. 1979. *Teaching Oral English*. London: Longman

Burden, P. 2003. *How do Japanese Students perceive Success and Failure? A Study using attribution theory. Paper presented from Japan Association for Language Teaching.*

Brown, J.D. & Rodgers, T.S. 2002. *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burns, R.B. 1997. *Introduction to Research Methods*. Australia: Longman.

Collins, J.L. 1988. *Strategies for Struggling Writers*. New York City, NY: The Guildford Press.

Covington, M. & Omelich, C. 1985. Ability and effort valuation among failure-avoiding and failure-accepting students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 77, 446-459

Cox, C. 2002. *Teaching Language Arts*. Boston, MA: Atlyn & Bacon.

Creswell, J.W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* London: Sage Publications.

Danehower, V.C. & Houston, D.A. 2002. Anchoring Attribution and Self-efficacy: An Examination of Interactions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27, 99-117.

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. 1985. *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York City, NY: Plenum.

Dornyei, Z. 1994. Motivation and Motivating in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, (3), 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. 2001. *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. 1977. Remarks on creativity in language acquisition. In M. Burt & H. Dulay (Eds). *Viewpoints on English as Second Language.* New York City, NY: Regents Publishing Co., Inc.: 109-110.

Cioffi, D. 1991. Beyond attentional strategies: A cognitive-perceptual model of somatic interpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 25-41.

Eccles, J.S. Wigfield, A & Schiefele, U. 1998. Motivation to Succeed. In W. Damon, & Eisenberg, N. (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development*. New York: Wiley.

Escholz, P. 1980. The prose models approach: using products in the process. In Donovan, T. and McClelland, B. (Eds.) *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 21-35.

Fassikawit, A. 2000. Parenting Children with Disabilities. Forum for Street Children. Mimeo.

Fiske, S.T. & Taylor, S.E. 1984. *Social Cognition.*MA: New York. Addison-Wesley.

Frederickson, E.F. 2003. *A New World of Writers*. New York City, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Gardner, R.C. 1985. *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R.C. 2001. Language learning motivation: the student, the teacher, and the researcher. Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education 6(1).

Gardner, R.C., Clement, R., Smythe, P.C. & Smythe, C.L. 1979. The Attitude /Motivation Test Battery – Revised Manual. Research Bulletin No. 15. Language research Group. University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation in second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Given, L.M. 2008. *The encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Los Angeles, Calf: Sage Publications, ISBN 1-4129-4163-6.

Graham, S. 1991. A review of attribution theory in achievement contexts. *Education Psychology Review,* 3(1), 5-39.

Graham, S. 1994. Motivation in African Americans. *Review of Educational research*, 64, 55-117.

Graham, S. 2005. *Writing Better: Effective Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning Difficulties*, Baltimore, MD: P.H. Books Publishing Company.

Graham, S. & Weiner, B. 1996.Theories and principles of motivation. In D. C. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.). *Handbook of educational psychology*, (pp. 63-84). New York: Macmillan.

Graves, D. 1996. *Writing: Teacher and Children at Work.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Griffee, D.T. 1997. Validating a questionnaire on confidence in Speaking English as a Foreign Language. *JALT Journal*, 19(2), 177-197.

Hackett, G. 1985. The role of mathematics self-efficacy in the choice of math-related majors college women and men: A path analysis. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 32, 47-56.

Hairston, M. 1982. 'The winds of change Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing'. *College Composition and Communication,* 33(1), 76-88.

Hatcher, L. 1994.*A Step-by-Step Approach to Using the System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modelling*, Cary, NC: The SAS Institute. Review pp. 325-339.

Hedge, T. 1988. *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heider, F. 1959. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations.* New York City, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Hendry, D.D. 1985. *Adventures in Reading: Teachers Manual.* New York City, NY Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Heneveld, W. & Craig, H. 1996.*Schools Count: World Bank Project Designs and the Quality of Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa,* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Hillocks, G. 1987. Synthesis of research on teaching writing. *Educational Leadership,* (44) 71-82.

Hofstee, E. 2006.*Constructing a Good Dissertation: A Practical Guide to Finishing a Master's, MBA or PhD on Schedule.* Johannesburg, South Africa: EPE.

Hoy, W.K. & Woolfolk, A.E. 1993. Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organisational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 93, 355-372.

Hsieh, P. 2004. How college students explain their grades in a foreign language course: The interrelationship of attributions self-efficacy, language learning beliefs, and achievement. PhD Thesis. University of Texas at Austin, United States of America.

Hyland, F. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Institute of Curriculum Development and Research. 2001. English Language Syllabus for Grades 11-12. Addis Ababa: ICDR.

Johnston, B. 1987.*Assessing English: Helping Students to Reflect on their Work.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Jordan, R.R. 1997. *English for Academic Purposes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, R.B. 1983. Reading and writing, technology and planning: to do with what and to whom? In James, C. Alatis, E., Stern, H.H. & Stevens, P. (Eds). *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 163-168.

Kelley, H.H. 1967. Attribution theory in social psychology. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* 15, 192-238.

Kelley, H.H. 1972. Attribution in social interaction. In E.E. Jones, D.E. Kanouse, H.H. Kelley, RE.Nisbett, S Valins and B Weiner (Eds.).*Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behaviour* (pp 1-26). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kilfoil, L. & Van der Walt, C. 1997. *Learn to Teach: English Language in a Multilingual Context,* Pretoria: JL van Schaik Publishers.

King, K.B. 2006. *The Writing Template Book*, East Lansing, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Kun, L. & Liming, Y. 2007. The influence of achievement attributions on self-regulated language learning behaviours. *CELEA Journal, 30* (1), 82-89.

Lane, J. & Lane, A. 2001.Self-efficacy and academic performance. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 29(7), 687-694.

Lent, R. & Hackett, G.1987. Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 30, 347-382.

Locke E.A. *& Latham, G.P.*1990. *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.

Maslow, A. 1954. *Motivation and personality*. New York City, NY: Harper.

Maslow, A. 1987. *Motivation and personality*. New York City, NY:

Harper.

McCarthy, P. Meier, S. & Rinderer, R. 1985. Self-efficacy and writing. College Composition and Communication, 36, 465-471.

McCaslin, M. & Good, T.L. 1996. The informal curriculum. In Berliner, D.C. and Calfee, R.C. (Eds). *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 622-670). New York: Macmillan.

Meier, S. McCarthy, P.R. & Schmeck, R.R. 1984. Validity of self-efficacy as a predictor of writing performance. *Cognitive Therapy and writing Research*, 8,107-120.

Meriwether, N.W. 1997. *Strategies for Writing Successful Essays.* New York City, NY: NTC Publishing.

Michael, D. 2004. The effect of primary English readers on reading skill in Ethiopia: A study in African educational needs. PhD Thesis. University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Ministry of Education. 2001. *Educational Statistics Annual Abstract.* Addis Ababa: Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprise.

Moyo, T. 1994. *Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Does it have a method?* In ELTIC Reporter, Vol. 18(3) 34-41.

Nicholls, J.1976. Effort is virtuous, but it is better to have ability. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 10, 306-315.

Norton, D.E. 1985. *The Effective Teaching of Language Arts*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill.

Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Boston. Cambridge, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Pajares, F. Hartley, J. & Valiante, G. 2001. Response format in writing self-efficacy assessment: Greater discrimination increases prediction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and Development,* 33, 214-221.

Pajares, F. & Johnson, M.J. 1996. Self-efficacy Beliefs in the Writing of High School Students: a path analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*, 33, 163-175.

Pajares, F. & Miller, M.D. 1994. Role of self-efficacy and self-concept beliefs in mathematical problem solving: a path analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 86(2), 193-203.

Pajares, F, Miller, M.D. and Johnson, M.J. 1999. When Shared Decision Making Works: A Three Year Longitudinal Study. *American Educational Research,* 33: 599-662.

Pajares, F, Miller, M.D. & Valiante, G. 1997.Predicative and Mediation Roles of Writing Self-efficacy of Upper Elementary Students. *Educational research*, 90: 353-360.

Patton, M.Q. 1990. Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods. Newbury Park: Sage.

Pintrich, P.R. & Schunk, D.H. 1996. Motivation in Education: *Theory, Research and Application*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Education.

Pintrich, P.R. 2003. A Handbook of Psychology. (http://onlinelibrarywiley.com). New York City: NY John Wiley and Sons, Inc. (accessed 25 February 2011).

Pishghadam, R. & Modarresi, G. 2008. The construct validation and application of a questionnaire of attribution theory for foreign language learners (ATFLL). *Iranian Journal of Language Studies,* 2(3), 299-324.

Powers, S., Choroszy, M, Douglas, P & Cool, B. 1986. Attribution for success and failure in algebra of Samoan community college students: A profile analysis. *Journal of instructional Psychology*, 13(1), 3-9.

Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ren, G. 2007. The Reliability of Essay Marking in High – stakes Chinese Second Language Examination. *Bable*, 42(2): 25-31.

Richards, J.C. & Rogers, T.S. 1995. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. 2002. Longman Dictionary of Language Learning and Teaching and Applied Linguistics.3rd edition. Boston: Pearson Education.

Ringness, T. 1965. Affective difference between successful and non-successful bright ninth grade boys. *Personal and Guidance Journal*, 43, 600-606.

Rossiter, M.J. 2003. The Effects of Effective Strategy Training in the ESL Classroom. *TESL*, 7: 2.

Rotter, J.B. 1966. Generalised expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1).

Russell, D. 1982. The causal dimension scale: a measure of how individuals perceive causes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(6) 1137-1145.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. 2003.3rd. Research Method for Business Students, Prentice Hall.

Schunk, D. 1982. Effects of Effort Attributional Feedback on Children's Perceived Self-efficacy and Achievement. *Educational Psychology*, 74, 548-556.

Schunk, D. 1983. Ability verses Effort Attributional Feedback: Differential Effects on Self-efficacy and Achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*.75, 848-856.

Schunk, D.H. 1984. Sequential Attributional Feedback and Children's Achievement Behaviours. *Educational Psychology*, 76, 1159-1169.

Schunk, D.H. 1986. Self-efficacy and Skill Development: Influence of Task Strategies and Attributions. *Journal of Educational Research*.79, 238-244

Schunk, D.H. & Rice, J.M. 1984. Strategy self-verbalization during remedial listening comprehension instruction. *J. Exper. Educat*. 53: 49-54.

Schunk, D.H. & Rice, J.M. 1993. Strategy Fading Progress Feedback: Effects on Self-efficacy and Comprehension among Learners Receiving Remedial Reading Services. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 201-209.

Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shell, D.F. Colvin, C. & Bruning, R.H. 1989. Self-efficacy, Attributions and Outcome Expectancy Mechanisms in Reading and Writing Achievements: Grade Level and Achievement Level Differences. *Educational Psychology*, 81: 91-100.

Shell, D.F. Colvin, C. & Bruning, R.H.1995. Self-efficacy, Attribution and Outcome Expectancy in Reading and Writing Achievement: Grade Level and Achievement Level Differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87: 386-398.

Shell, D.F. Murphy, C.C. & Bruning, R.H. 1989. Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 91-100.

Simpson, J.M. 2006. "Feedback on writing: Changing EFL students' attitude," *TESL Canada Journal*, vol. 24, 1, pp. 96-112.

Spandel, V. 2005.*The 9 Rights of Every Writer: A Guide for Teachers*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Stajkovic, A.D. & Sommer, S.M. 2000. Self-efficacy and causal attributions: Direct and reciprocal links. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(4), 707-737.

Stipek, D.J. 2002. *Motivation to learn: Integrating theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sunflower, S.B. 2006.*Really Writing: Ready-to-use Writing Process Activities for the Elementary Grades*. San Francisco, CA: Jossy Bass.

Tamire Regassa. 1995. The effects of background knowledge and language proficiency of freshman students at Addis Ababa University. PhD Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Templin, S.A., Shiroku, M., &Taira, K. 1999.The Self-efficacy syllabus. *The Language Teacher*, 23(4), 9-12.

Transitional Government of Ethiopia. 1994. Education and Training Policy. Mimeo.

Urbanski, C.D. 2006. *Using the Workshop Approach in the High School English Classroom: Modeling Effective Writing, Reading and Thinking Strategies for Learners Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W. & Deci, E.L. 2006. Intrinsic verses extrinsic goal content in self- determination theory: another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 1:19-31.

Wang, M., Haertal, G. & Walberg, H. 1993.*Educational residence: An emerging construct*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Weiner, B. 1974. Achievement, Motivation and Attribution Theory. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.

Weiner, B. 1979. A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 11, 3-25.

Weiner, B. 1986. *An Attributional Theory of Achievement Motivation and Emotion.* New York City, NY: Springer Verlag.

Weiner, B., Russell, D., & Lerman, D. 1979. The Cognitive emotional process in achievement- related contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1211-1220.

Wiersma, W. & Stephen, G.J. 2008. Research Methods in Education: An Introduction. Boston: Pearson Education.

Wood, R.E. & Locke, Edwin A. 1987.The relation of Self-efficacy and grade goals to academic performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 1013-1024.

Young, R.E. 1978. Paradigms and problems: needed research in rhetorical invention. In Cooper C.R. and Odell, L. (Eds.).*Research on Composing: Points of Departure*. Urbana, iii: National Council of Teachers of English, 29-47.

Zhang, A. & Lu, Q. 2002.The regulation of self-efficacy and attributional feedback on motivation. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 30(3), 281-288.

Zimmerman, J. & Martinez-Pons, M.P. 1990. Students Differences in Self-regulated Learning: Relating Grade, Sex and Giftedness to Self-efficacy and Strategy Use. *Educational Psychology,* 82: 51-59.

Zimmerman, J. & Bandura, A. 1994.Impact of self -regulatory Influence on Writing Course Attainment. *American Educational Research,* 31: 845–862.

Zimmerman, B.J. & Kitsantas, A. 1999. Acquiring writing revision skill: Shifting from process to outcomes self-regulatory goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology.*89, 29-36.

APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM

An Investigation of Learner Attributions and Self-efficacy in Writing Performance

As an investigator of this study, I have explained the purpose, the procedures, the benefits, and modest effort that are involved in this research study:

Signature and printed name of person obtaining consent Date

You have been informed about this study's purpose, procedures, and possible benefits, and you have received a copy of this Form. You have been given the opportunity to ask questions before you sign, and you have been told that you can ask questions at any time. You voluntarily agree to participate in this study. By signing this form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

_____

Printed Name of Subject **Date**

_____

Signature of Subject **Date**

_____

Signature of Investigator **Date**

APPENDIX B: TEST OF COMPOSITION WRITING

Dear Learner,

The purpose of this test is to evaluate how well you write a one-paged composition on a given topic. Please read the instruction given below carefully and write the essay on a page attached.

General Information

Name of school_____

Name of learner_____

ID No _____

Gender**:** _____ F_____ M

Instruction

Now you are going to write a one-paged composition based on a title given below. Write between 250 and 300 words. Please write your work neatly on the space given.

The Advantages and Disadvantages of City Life

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C: SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

The self-efficacy was developed by Bandura &Schunk (1981). The efficacy scale ranged from 10 to 100 with an interval of 10 units, with verbal description occurring at the following points, 10=not sure, 40=maybe, 70=pretty sure, 100=really sure. The scale describes different kinds of tasks learners might consider while writing a composition. For each kind of task, the learners are going to rate how sure they are that they can work on a writing task like the one described and do what they are supposed to do in a reasonable amount of time.

The rating scale goes from 0 to 100. Circling a higher number means they are sure that they can do the activity, while circling a lower number means they are less sure that they can do it.

1- Correctly spell all words in a one-page composition.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

2- Correctly punctuate a one-page composition.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

3- Correctly use all parts of speech (i.e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) in a written composition.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

4 - Write simple, compound and complex sentences with good grammar.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

5- Correctly use verb tenses.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

6- Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main ideas.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

7- Structure paragraphs to support ideas expressed in the thesis statement.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

8- Write a well-organised essay which has introduction, body and conclusion.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

9- Get ideas in a clear manner by staying founded without getting off topic.

_____

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

APPENDIX D: ATTRIBUTION SCALE

Part I: Perceived causes of success on a writing test

Perceived causes

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Luck					
2. Mood					
3. God's help					
4. Self-confidence					
5. Sharp-mindedness					

6. Ability in writing					
7. Easiness of the test					
8. Easiness of the skill tested					
9. Having good language command					
10. Having interest in writing					
11. Hard work and constant effort					
12. Parents and friends help and encouragement					
13. Good study habit					
14. Teacher's competence in teaching writing					
15. Teacher's generosity in marking					
16. Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials					
17. Fastness in understanding and writing					
18. Intensive effort while working on the test.					

Part II: Perceived causes of failure on a writing test

Perceived causes

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Unluckiness					
2. Bad mood					
3. Lack of effort					
4. Health problem					
5. Fear of writing tasks					
6. poor language command					

7. Poor ability in writing composition					
8. Difficulty of the skill tested					
9. Difficulty of the skill					
10. Having no interest in writing					
11. Teacher's incompetence in teaching writing					
12. Teachers do not teach writing skills					
13. Frustrations while working the writing test					
14. Giving no attention to writing skills					
15. Writing is a difficult exercise					
16. Poor experience of writing					
17. Scarcity of appropriate writing exercises and materials					
18. Bad marking system					

Please note:

The perceived causes of the learners' performance are listed above. The degree of influence of each cause may vary from unimportant to very highly important. Unimportant, less important, important, very important and very highly important are labelled as 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

If the participants are satisfied about their composition test result, they will use part one of the scale. But, if they think their results are failure, then they will use Part II of the attribution scale.

1 Unimportant
2 Less important
3 Important
4 Very important
5 Very highly important

APPENDIX E: COMPOSITION TEST

Task or Activity: Composition Writing

Topic: Advantages and Disadvantages of City Life

Number of Learners: 90

Time: 45 minutes (one period)

Objective: At the end of this test, the teacher would be able to evaluate whether the learners can write a well-organised essay titled 'Advantages and Disadvantages of City Life'.

Evaluation of the Composition

The researcher may consider holistic scoring as a method of evaluation. Holistic scoring looks at the whole composition rather than at its specific parts (Hendry, 1985: 242). It is a quick, efficient method of sorting and ranking learners within large groups, and it has been adapted successfully for individual classroom use (ibid: 243). Holistic scoring is more reliable when two or more raters are used, but individual teachers have used holistic scoring guides effectively without other raters. As it is mentioned, it cannot identify the specific writing problems of individual learners, but scoring guides or scales can be used to provide general information to learners about relative strength and weakness in their writing (ibid). Following is a scale that has been developed by Paul B. Diedrich (Measuring Growth in English, Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1974). The researcher, therefore, is going to employ this scale.

Analytical Scale for Literature

Topic _____ Reader _____ Paper _____

	Low	Middle			High
Ideas	2	4	6	8	10
Organisation	2	4	6	8	10
Wording	1	2	3	4	5
Flavour	1	2	3	4	5
Usage	1	2	3	4	5
Punctuation	1	2	3	4	5
Spelling	1	2	3	4	5
Handwriting	1	2	3	4	5

Sum _____

APPENDIX F: LEARNERS' RESPONSE TO WRITING

(PRIVATE SCHOOL)

SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

S/N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Aver.
1	70	40	50	50	40	60	40	40	50	49
2	90	70	80	60	80	70	60	70	70	72
3	80	60	50	70	60	60	50	70	80	64
4	90	90	70	80	70	80	80	70	80	79
5	90	70	90	90	90	80	80	70	80	82
6	50	40	50	40	40	50	50	50	50	47
7	90	100	100	100	100	90	90	100	100	97
8	70	80	70	60	60	60	70	70	80	69
9	80	60	70	90	60	60	60	50	80	68
10	100	100	90	90	100	90	90	90	100	94
11	70	80	90	70	90	60	90	80	90	80
12	90	90	100	60	100	60	70	80	100	83
13	80	60	70	70	70	100	90	80	90	79
14	90	70	80	90	90	80	90	80	80	83
15	80	70	100	70	70	70	80	70	80	77
16	80	70	90	70	80	100	100	90	90	86
17	100	100	90	90	100	90	90	90	100	94
18	80	80	70	90	100	80	80	80	90	83
19	90	90	90	90	80	80	80	80	80	84
20	80	70	70	70	70	60	60	60	60	67

21	90	90	90	90	100	90	90	90	90	91
22	80	90	90	90	90	80	90	80	80	86
23	90	50	90	60	80	90	90	90	90	81
24	80	70	80	70	90	80	80	80	80	79
25	70	60	70	60	70	60	70	60	80	68
26	80	80	70	70	80	70	80	70	80	76
27	80	70	80	80	80	80	80	80	90	80
28	70	90	80	80	90	80	70	70	70	78
29	90	60	80	80	80	60	60	60	70	71
30	70	60	70	70	80	90	60	80	70	72
31	90	70	80	80	80	90	80	90	90	83
32	70	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	70	78
33	60	50	70	60	60	70	60	60	50	60
34	80	80	80	90	70	70	70	70	80	77
35	100	80	90	80	80	90	90	90	90	88
36	90	80	100	100	70	90	90	90	90	89
37	100	80	70	70	80	90	90	90	80	83
38	60	60	60	70	60	60	60	70	60	62
39	60	80	90	50	70	60	80	90	80	73
40	80	80	100	100	80	100	100	100	90	92
41	60	90	90	80	80	70	80	70	70	77
42	100	80	50	70	60	60	60	80	60	69
43	100	100	100	0	10	0	20	30	40	44
44	70	60	60	40	70	50	70	50	50	58
45	60	70	40	50	80	50	50	60	60	58

APPENDIX G: LEARNERS' RESPONSE TO WRITING

(GOVERNMENT SCHOOL)

SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

1	80	60	50	70	70	70	70	60	80
2	80	90	100	70	100	60	60	70	80
3	90	60	60	60	60	50	70	50	60
4	90	50	50	60	80	80	50	80	70
5	90	80	70	80	70	60	60	80	90
6	90	80	80	60	90	70	80	50	70
7	70	60	80	60	80	60	70	70	60
8	80	70	80	80	60	90	70	70	80
9	90	90	100	90	90	90	100	90	100
10	80	70	70	50	60	50	60	70	70
11	70	90	80	100	90	90	100	80	100
12	60	80	90	80	80	70	70	80	80
13	100	70	70	100	70	90	90	70	90
14	80	90	90	60	70	70	60	70	50
15	70	70	90	70	90	60	80	80	70
16	60	50	70	80	60	40	70	80	80
17	20	100	70	90	80	100	90	100	80
18	90	90	100	80	100	70	80	70	70
19	80	80	80	80	90	80	70	80	70
20	70	70	60	60	80	80	70	70	70
21	70	60	60	60	60	60	70	60	60
22	90	80	70	70	70	80	60	70	70
23	100	90	100	90	100	90	80	80	90
24	90	50	80	70	70	80	70	70	80
25	90	80	90	80	90	70	80	80	90
26	100	90	100	100	100	80	90	90	100

27	80	90	80	100	80	90	80	80	90
28	90	80	90	80	10	90	80	90	80
29	90	50	80	70	80	70	80	80	80
30	90	80	80	80	90	90	80	90	100
31	60	70	80	60	70	80	70	80	80
32	100	80	70	80	90	100	60	90	80
33	90	80	70	90	70	80	90	90	80
34	70	80	60	80	70	70	80	80	70
35	60	80	80	70	80	90	70	80	70
36	100	90	100	80	90	80	100	80	90

APPENDIX H: SCORE OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE IN WRITING: PRIVATE SCHOOL

S/N	PW	S/N	PW	S/N	PW
1	**55**	16	**63**	31	81
2	**63**	17	75	32	**66**
3	**60**	18	85	33	86
4	**53**	19	75	34	91
5	71	20	88	35	88
6	**65**	21	87	36	**62**
7	98	22	76	37	87
8	71	23	80	38	**59**
9	85	24	86	39	72
10	83	25	71	40	73
11	72	26	64	41	88
12	72	27	82	42	**66**
13	**68**	28	84	43	**55**
14	90	29	89	44	82
15	**63**	30	78	45	70

APPENDIX I: SCORE OF LEARNERS' PERFORMANCE IN WRITING (GOVERNMENT SCHOOL)

S/N	PW	S/N	PW	S/N	PW
1	63	13	72	25	49
2	63	14	88	26	63
3	65	15	74	27	50
4	71	16	61	28	52
5	65	17	68	29	39
6	71	18	80	30	74
7	84	19	83	31	56
8	59	20	91	32	49
9	78	21	65	33	60
10	80	22	54	34	58
11	66	23	74	35	44
12	85	24	87	36	60

APPENDIX J: Table 4.4 Perceived causes of failure for private school learner

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unluckiness	3	3.33	.577
Bad mood	3	3.67	.577
Lack of effort	3	3.00	1.732
Health problem	3	3.00	1.732
Fear of writing task	3	2.00	1.732
Poor language command	3	1.67	1.155
Poor ability in writing composition	3	1.67	1.155
Difficulty of the skill tested	3	3.33	.577
Difficulty of the skill	3	3.67	.577
Having no interest in writing	3	3.00	1.732
Teacher's incompetence in teaching writing	3	2.00	1.732
Teachers do not teach writing skills	3	2.00	1.732
Frustrations while working the writing test	3	3.33	.577
Giving no attention to writing skills	3	2.00	1.732
Writing is a difficult exercise	3	3.67	.577
Poor experience in writing	3	2.33	1.155
Scarcity of appropriate writing exercises and materials	3	3.33	.577
Bad marking system	3	1.67	1.155
Valid N (list wise)	3		

APPENDIX K: Table 4.5 writing self-efficacy scores of government school students

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Correctly spell all words in a one page Composition	3.00	.586
Correctly punctuate a one page composition	2.81	.401
Correctly use all parts of speech (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) in a written composition.	2.97	.560
Write simple. Compound and complex sentences with good grammar.	2.92	.554
Correctly use verb tenses.	3.11	.523
Write a strong paragraph that has a good topic sentence or main ideas.	2.81	.467
Structure paragraph to support ideas expressed in the thesis statement.	2.94	.475
Write a well -organized essay which has introduction body and conclusion.	2.92	.280
Get ideas in a clear manner by staying founded without getting off topic.	3.11	.465

APPENDIX L: Table 4.6 perceived causes of success for government school

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Luck	1.39	.497
Mood	1.36	.488
God's help	1.93	.900
Self confidence	3.21	.418
Sharp-mindedness	3.21	.418
Ability in Writing	3.25	.441
Easiness of the test	1.36	.559
Easiness of the skill tested	1.43	.573
Having good language command	3.22	.424
Having interest in Writing	2.32	.983
Hard work and constant effort	2.71	1.084
Parents and friends help and encouragement	1.82	1.188
Good study habit	3.21	.418
Teacher's competence in teaching writing	2.89	.629
Teacher's generosity in marking	1.14	.356
Availability of appropriate writing exercises and materials	2.64	1.162
Fastness in understanding and writing	3.39	.497
Intensive effort while working on the test	3.25	.441
Valid N (list wise)		