

## **STUDENTS' CHALLENGES AND SELF-EFFICACY IN ACADEMIC WRITING AND RESEARCH IN ELT: A DESCRIPTIVE SURVEY**

<sup>1</sup>Sofwa Maharina Ulfiyati, <sup>2</sup> Alief Noor Farida

*Universitas Negeri Semarang*

<sup>1</sup>sowamaharina2002@students.unnes.ac.id, <sup>2</sup>aliefnoorfarida@mail.unnes.ac.id

First Received: October 30, 2025

Final Proof Received: December 31, 2025

### **Abstract**

Academic writing and research proficiency are important for undergraduates in English Language Teaching (ELT), as they reflect the ability to express academic arguments and conduct evidence-based inquiry. Though indispensable, a great number of students still face problems while trying to master these skills, especially with the linguistic accuracy that is necessary, argument structure, anxiety related to writing, and proper use of research methodologies. There have been studies that focused on the difficulties experienced in writing, researches on skills, or self-efficacy separately, but only a few have analyzed the intersection of these areas in the ELT setting thus far. This research scrutinizes the hurdles that students encounter in academic writing and research along with their self-efficacy regarding such tasks. A quantitative descriptive survey design was adopted with a sample consisting of forty English Education students from Universitas Negeri Semarang who had already taken the courses Academic Writing and Research in ELT. A structured 51-item questionnaire was used to gather data, which was meant to assess students' difficulties in academic writing and research, The students' self-efficacy in these tasks was also evaluated. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results of the analysis showed that the students performed at a moderate level of difficulty in writing ( $M = 3.17$ ) and research ( $M = 3.20$ ) with the greatest difficulty being about time management, writing anxiety, and data handling. Yet, the participants showed moderate to high self-efficacy in writing ( $M = 3.79$ ) and research ( $M = 3.81$ ), indicating strong confidence in conceptual understanding but limited assurance in analytical tasks. These findings suggest that, although students are sufficiently motivated and confident, they require further instructional assistance in research methodology, analytical processes, and academic writing conventions. The study suggests that including systematic instruction, scaffolded practice and formative feedback into ELT curricula can enhance both students' technical competence and academic confidence, eventually developing independent reflective, and research-oriented English language educators.

**Keywords:** Challenges, Self-Efficacy, Academic Writing, Research in ELT

### **INTRODUCTION**

Writing and research proficiency form the core of academic literacy in English Language Teaching (ELT) programs. Students participate in scholarly writing to express and communicate academic arguments and perspectives, as well as to demonstrate knowledge systematically (Teng & Wang, 2022), Research competence is an educational skill that permits

students to pose questions, create frameworks, interpret data, and finish the research project or thesis which is obligatory for graduation (Willison et al., 2018). The ELT students can realize the requirements of the university and also through these skills become reflective and evidence-based teachers.

The said skills, nevertheless, are very difficult to learn for students who often experience problems with them. Common difficulties include grammatical inaccuracies, limited vocabulary range, weak cohesion and organization and insufficient knowledge of academic conventions (Harshalatha & Sreenivasulu, 2024). Undergraduate students in Indonesia struggle with issues such creating clear problem statements, synthesizing relevant literature, choosing appropriate research methodologies and managing citations (Hapsaria, 2024; Nurkamto et al., 2022). Key research components such as problem identification analysis and communication are identified by the Research Skill Development (RSD) framework, which also offers a framework for integrating these abilities into academic programs (Willison et al., 2018). These issues are often intensified by writing anxiety, which reduces engagement with academic tasks and lowering students' confidence (Cheng, 2004). The quality of student work generally suffers as a result of these issues, which usually continue throughout the thesis-writing process. Furthermore, studies on thesis writing have indicated that superficial writing approaches are less effective, whereas systematic and structured techniques supported by higher writing self-efficacy (Mendoza et al., 2022).

Self-efficacy is one psychological factor that has significant impact on how students handle difficulties. According to (Bandura, 1997), self-efficacy is the belief in their capability to complete particular tasks. Higher self-efficacy in writing is associated with increased motivation and persistence (Basaffar & Alzahrani, 2022; Pajares, 2003; Thi, 2020). More recent reviews confirm this, showing that students with better writing self-efficacy tend to be more resilient, less anxious, and more effective in academic writing (Li, 2024). The concept of self-efficacy in academic arenas particularly aids the students facing difficulties connected with their thesis and data preparation (Sasferi, 2022). Giving supportive supervision facilitates the research self-efficacy and persistence (Rivera et al., 2023).

Researches done recently throw new lights on the importance of self-efficacy in the context of academic research and success. Undergraduates participating in structured research activities normally display more research motivation and higher self-efficacy (Hill et al., 2022). Moreover, the newly developed Comprehensive Research Self-Efficacy Scale (C-RSES) offers a reliable measurement of research skills from topic identification of relevant theories, including synthesis and analysis of relevant literature (Taş et al., 2023). New research from Indonesia shows that encouraging feedback from teachers, students' self-concept, and the academic context have been shown to help improve writing self-efficacy at the postgraduate level (Jonathans et al., 2024).

However, despite these findings, previous studies tend to examine academic writing difficulties, research challenges, or self-efficacy separately (Cheng, 2004; Harshalatha & Sreenivasulu, 2024; Nurkamto et al., 2022). Very few studies have examined how these issues intersect within undergraduate ELT programs, particularly in Indonesia, where challenges in writing, research competence, and self-efficacy often occur simultaneously (Hapsaria, 2024). Although the Research Skill Development (RSD) Framework (Willison et al., 2018) provides a structured approach for research competence, the framework has not been systematically integrated with self-efficacy and academic writing in EFL undergraduate students. This study

fills in the gap by examining the intersection between academic writing challenges, research challenges, and students' perceived self-efficacy. In line with these objectives, the study explores the kinds of challenges students have when they are writing for school and conducting research, as well as their confidence in performing these tasks. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically by linking academic literacies with self-efficacy, and practically by informing curriculum design, pedagogical strategies in ELT undergraduates in Indonesia.

This study draws on two theoretical perspectives. The first, Academic Literacies and L2 Writing Theory, which views academic writing as a complex process encompassing grammar and vocabulary to include cohesion, rhetoric, organization, and critique (Hyland, 2016; Lea & Street, 1998; Silva, 1993). The second foundational theory is Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997). Self-efficacy actually connotes the view that learners have or do not have the ability to carry out their academic responsibilities. Writing and research self-efficacy have been found to be positively related to persistence, motivation and performance (Forester et al., 2004; Pajares, 2003; Prat-Sala & Redford, 2012). Students who have strong self-efficacy perceive academic tasks as hard but not impossible ones, while weak self-efficacy students are likely to see them as problems to avoid.

This study's conceptual framework integrates the aforementioned perspectives by considering the four core dimensions of academic writing and research challenges, self-efficacy in academic writing and research, and so forth. The study aims to explore undergraduate ELT students' perception of their writing and research challenges, as well as their self-efficacy in handling these tasks, with the aim of contributing to more responsive curriculum design and pedagogical frameworks in ELT higher education.

## **METHOD**

A Quantitative descriptive survey design was adopted to provide a systematic description of students' challenges in academic writing and research, as well as their perceived levels of self-efficacy. According to (Creswell, 2014), survey research allows standardized data collection from a group of respondents in order to identify trends and attitudes within a population. Descriptive survey designs are frequently applied in educational contexts because they portray learners' perspectives across multiple aspects of learning without manipulating variables (Cohen et al., 2007).

A total of 40 students from the English Education program at Universitas Negeri Semarang participated and selected through purposive sampling. Participants were required to have finished both the Academic Writing and Research in ELT courses and to either be working on or have completed their undergraduate thesis. The criteria ensured that participants had the relevant academic qualifications and experience in academic writing and research, allowing them to provide relevant insights on the challenges and self-efficacy aspects examined.

A structured questionnaire designed as the main instrument to gather insights into students' perceptions of their challenges and self-efficacy in academic writing and research. The questionnaire included 51 items divided into four sections, with responses recorded on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Among the total of 51 items, 15 were related to challenges in writing academically (look at Table 1 and Appendix A), 14 were connected to issues in research in ELT (check Table 2 and Appendix B), and 22

were about self-efficacy in writing and research (see Table 3 and Appendix C). To guarantee content validity, the technique was evaluated by experts, and then it was pre-tested with a few students to improve the clarity.

Validity was checked by the Pearson Product–Moment correlation applied to a sample of 40 respondents. The correlations for the items were from .316 to .759, which were above the critical value ( $r \approx .312$ ,  $n = 40$ ,  $\alpha = .05$ , two-tailed) and thus the validity of all items was confirmed. The reliability of the instruments was assessed further by calculating Cronbach's Alpha, which produced a coefficient of .919, indicating excellent internal consistency (Sugiyono, 2020). Therefore, the questionnaire was considered both valid and reliable for data collection.

Data collection was conducted online. The questionnaire was distributed via Google Forms to all qualified participants, and participation was voluntary and anonymous. Quantitative data were exported to Microsoft Excel and analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to produce descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations (Ary et al., 2010; Creswell, 2014). The statistics gave a glimpse of the difficulties students went through and their self-efficacy levels.

## **FINDINGS**

The results of the research present a summary of the difficulties pupils face in academic writing and in doing research, also the self-efficacy they have for performing these activities. A broader illustration of the way students manage language, analytical, and methodological challenges is provided by presenting the quantitative results. The following sections outline the patterns that emerged from the data and discuss them in relation to previous research and relevant theoretical perspectives.

### ***Challenges in academic writing***

According to the descriptive analysis, students found academic writing to be moderately challenging (overall  $M = 3.17$ ; see Table 1). By taking the mean scores of all the fifteen items together (see Appendix A) the overall mean score for Challenges in Academic Writing was computed, which means that each item contributed equally to the composite index rather than being determined by the average of dimension factors. The results point out that Time pressure (Item 15,  $M = 3.55$ ) and writing anxiety (Item 13,  $M = 3.43$ ) were the most significant factors, bringing out the challenges that undergraduates encounter when writing under tight deadlines and the fear of being negatively evaluated.

**Table 1**

*Students' perceptions of challenges in academic writing (n=40)*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Grammar and Vocabulary	3.33	0.92	Moderate difficulty
Cohesion and Coherence	2.93	0.91	Low–moderate
Organization and Structure	2.80	0.88	Low
Critical Thinking and Argumentation	2.95	0.93	Moderate
Language Anxiety / Confidence	3.42	0.90	High difficulty
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>3.17</b>		Moderate

*Note. See Appendix A for the complete list of survey items used to measure each dimension.*



At the same time, maintaining linguistic control remained moderately challenging. The range of items measuring grammar and vocabulary (e.g., sentence accuracy, lexical precision, and synonym choice) was low to mid-3 range (Item 3  $M = 3.30$ ; Items 1–2  $M = 2.99$  and  $2.86$ ), suggesting that students are still having difficulty to achieve sentence level accuracy and discipline specific vocabulary.

Students' performance on organization and cohesion suggests partial mastery of macro-structure and rhetorical flow. The mid-range means for items about logical organization and cohesion (Items 4, 5, 9, 12, 14;  $M \approx 3.15$ – $3.23$ ) showed that many students can organize and plan their texts, but often struggle to maintain coherence across paragraphs or showing how ideas relate to each other. In contrast, lower means on vocabulary precision, citation practices, and paragraph structuring (Items 2, 6, 8;  $M < 3.00$ ) imply that some students prioritize getting content quickly rather than focusing on precise word choice, cohesive referencing, and well-developed topic sentences.

Overall, the results indicate a layered difficulty profile: affective factors such as time pressure and anxiety are the most difficult, while linguistic accuracy and vocabulary remain moderately challenging, whereas rhetorical organization and cohesion appear uneven yet gradually improving.

### ***Challenges in conducting research in ELT***

The analysis of responses in the *Challenges in Conducting Research in English Language Teaching (ELT)* section revealed that students encountered a moderate level of difficulty overall ( $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ; see Table 2). This value was calculated using the mean scores of all fourteen items so that each item contributed equally, rather than relying on the five dimension averages. The moderate overall mean indicated that, although students were confident in managing research tasks, several areas still presented considerable difficulties.

**Table 2**

*Students' Perceptions of Challenges in Conducting Research in ELT (n = 40)*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Formulating Research Questions	3.16	0.88	Moderate difficulty
Design and Methodology	2.94	0.87	Low–Moderate difficulty
Data Collection and Analysis	3.54	0.91	Moderate difficulty
Writing Research Reports	2.95	0.85	Low–moderate difficulty
Presentation and Dissemination	2.98	0.88	Low–moderate difficulty
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>3.20</b>		<b>Moderate difficulty</b>

*Note. See Appendix B for the complete list of survey items used to measure each dimension.*

The five dimensions had the highest mean scores. The best score was for Data Collection and Analysis with ( $M = 3.54$ ,  $SD = 0.91$ ). It was followed by Design and Methodology with ( $M = 2.94$ ,  $SD = 0.87$ ) and Formulating Research ( $M = 3.16$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ). Such scores suggest that the most significant hardships of students were met in the early stages of research either in the form of technical execution or conceptualization. Writing Research Reports ( $M = 2.95$ ,

SD = 0.85) and Presentation and Dissemination (M = 2.98, SD = 0.88) The scoring system has lower values that suggest slightly lesser difficulty for learners during the reporting and communication phases.

At the item level, the three most difficult tasks were quantitative data analysis (Item 8, M = 3.83), qualitative data analysis (Item 9, M = 3.50), and troubleshooting validity and reliability (Item 6, M = 3.38). In contrast, topic narrowing (Item 2, M = 3.28) and writing methodology or results sections (Items 10, M ≈ 2.75) received the lowest means, thus revealing areas of relative strength.

Presentation and dissemination were low moderate (M = 2.98) it shows that the students overall are able to handle the reporting tasks but nonetheless, they still have a considerable amount of anxiety when presenting their research in English.

### ***Self-Efficacy in academic writing and research***

According to the research, the students' self-efficacy in academic writing and research was found to be moderate to high (Table 3). The overall average for academic writing self-efficacy was M = 3.79, demonstrating students' confidence in completing complex academic writing. Students demonstrated high self-efficacy in modifying drafts and composing coherent introductions and conclusions (M ≈ 3.90 - 3.94), indicating they were confident in their writing's overall structure. Among the different writing tasks, self-efficacy was the least when combining ideas from different sources (M = 3.75) and following referencing guidelines (M = 3.86). Even though students were easy with organizing the content, they still had problems with technique and style, especially in the case of using sources and citation styles properly.

In the study self-efficacy domain, the total mean was M = 3.81, comparably high confidence. Students were most confident in their capacity to identify researchable problems and successfully finish research projects (M = 3.96). Participants reported a strong belief in their ability to create precise, well-defined research questions (M = 3.90) and to draw meaningful conclusions from research results (M = 3.85). These results suggest that the students, at a conceptual level, considered themselves to be able to do research without any help. However, the confidence levels dropped for the technical-related activities like operating data analysis programs (M = 3.55) and using statistical or programming techniques (M = 3.78) where they had to execute the technical part of the research. Additionally, there were only a few students, under half, that were somewhat low in self-confidence in presenting/publishing their work (M = 3.88).

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of students' reported self-efficacy across both dimensions. The results paint a picture of an encouraging level of academic confidence, the comparatively lower averages for the analytical and technical elements highlight the need for targeted help through specific programs for the development of statistical literacy and research communication skills.

**Table 3**

*Summary of Self-Efficacy in Academic Writing and Research (n = 40)*

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Academic Writing Self-Efficacy	1 – 10	3.79	0.87	Moderate to High Confidence

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
Research Self-Efficacy	11 – 22	3.81	0.85	Moderate to High Confidence
<b>Overall Average</b>		3.80	0.86	Moderate to High Confidence

*Note. See Appendix C for the complete list of survey items used to measure each dimension.*

The quantitative results underscore that self-efficacy functions as a crucial motivational construct supporting students' engagement in both academic writing and research activities. The moderate-to-high confidence levels reported in this study suggest that the participants were not passive learners; rather, they actively perceived themselves as capable of meeting academic expectations

## **DISCUSSION**

The discussion chapter examines the results of the study by explaining how the quantitative findings relate to previous research, theoretical perspectives, and the broader context of academic writing and research in ELT.

### ***Challenges in Academic Writing***

This pattern corresponds to the Cognitive Process Model, which involves planning, translating, and reviewing, in which anxiety competes for limited attentional resources and inhibits effective revision (Flower & Hayes, 1981). It is also consistent with evidence from L2-writing studies showing that anxiety reduces fluency and strategy use (Cheng, 2004; Wei, 2024). According to recent studies, writing anxiety is still a significant challenge for EFL and ELT students, which has a negative effect on coherence and writing skills (Hapsaria, 2024; Harshalatha & Sreenivasulu, 2024).

Previous EFL studies also report persistent limitations in grammatical control and academic vocabulary, particularly when exposure to genre-specific discourse is limited (Fareed et al., 2016; Hyland, 2016; Teng & Wang, 2022). From an Academic Literacies perspective, these are not merely “errors” but evidence that students are still in the process of acculturating to academic discourse as a social (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis & Tuck, n.d.). Recent search suggests that EFL learners require assistance and formative feedback to become proficient in academic conventions (Jonathans et al., 2024).

This pattern supports with the view that rhetorical awareness and discourse-level cohesion often develop later than sentence-level control in L2 writing (Hyland, 2016; Silva, 1993). Pedagogically, these findings align with recent studies on writing self-efficacy (Hapsaria, 2024; Teng & Wang, 2022) that support integrating affective-strategy instruction (e.g., time-management routines, low-stakes drafting and peer review) with explicit modelling of discourse structures (move analysis, transition frameworks) and scaffolded practice in citation and paraphrasing, which are approaches that the Academic Literacies framework recommends for contextualized induction into academic genres (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis & Tuck, n.d.).

### ***Challenges in Conducting Research in ELT***

From these findings Mandl et al., (2024), Beginners at the start of their research journey, reported, experienced difficulties of understanding and going through the mental workload

when passing over from basic understanding to statistical analytical methods. The outcome of the study pointed out a twofold problem for ELT students: unclear concepts at the beginning of the research process and limitations in data analysis due to the use of quantitative methods. Not only the mean scores for the quantitative analysis but also the instrument design clearly indicated that a large number of students lacked the required technical confidence to conduct their inquiries independently. This trend corresponds with Mandl et al., (2024) who noticed that the lack of statistical literacy led to the use of procedural methods rather than analytical ones for data interpretation due to the lowered empirical rigor.

The linking of research questions to theoretical frameworks ( $M=3.15$ ) brings up consequences similar to those of the research questions' formation. The Research Skill Development (RSD) Framework has been used for this purpose (Willison et al., 2018). The disconnection that is observed suggests an insufficiency in the "Conceptualize and Synthesize" stages where learners are to merge literature, come up with hypotheses, and justify their methodologies. Comparable findings by Nurkamto et al., (2022) Research uncovered that Indonesian college students often leaned on their supervisors' critiques to fill this theoretical gap, signifying a demand for organized scaffolding in reasoning rather than back-fitting.

On the other hand, the lesser difficulty ratings for the narrowing of topics and report writing suggested that students had partially mastered the procedures. They could comply with the prescribed writing rules, but only after the research method was established. Their output was still sporadic, especially in connecting data to theoretical interpretation. According to Hapsaria (2024), undergraduate ELT teachers frequently present descriptive results without explaining their pedagogical importance. Problems with study were also caused by emotional and linguistic factors

### ***Self-Efficacy in Academic Writing and Research in ELT***

Research by Pajares (2003) and Basaffar & Alzahrani (2022) indicates that self-efficacy is a factor that promotes persistence and academic engagement in L2 writing. Similar observations were reported by by (Li, 2024) and (Nimehchisalem & Mukundan, 2015). Research by (Sasferi, 2022) and (Hill et al., 2022) indicates that limited experience with analytical tools results in a lower self-efficacy of students in conducting empirical research.

The relationship between writing and research self-efficacy marks the multifaceted nature of academic performance confidence. Even though the students' convictions concerning the totality of writing and research skills are quite powerful, the continuous rift between the understanding of concepts and the practical transfer of skills points out to the necessity of teaching strategies that would bridge the gap between theoretical and procedural competencies. According to Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (1997), Self-efficacy is built up through mastery experiences, observation learning, and social persuasion.

As a result, the self-regulated learning skill along with academic self-efficacy might be strengthened through providing a set of organized extracurricular activities such as continuous feedback, joining research projects, analyzing data, participating in workshops, etc. Rivera et al., (2023) The researchers determined that good supervisory feedback was a vital factor among others improving research self-efficacy. They, therefore, pointed out the great importance of mentoring and providing feedback right at the beginning of the thesis process.



Integrating technology-assisted instruction and scaffolding strategies may promote deeper engagement and enhance students' perceived capability to complete advanced research assignments.

However, the minor reduction in confidence for analytical and procedural activities supports by Taş et al., (2023) it is that particular instruction in data management, interpretation, and dissemination is a prerequisite for the formation of research self-efficacy. Theoretically, the combination of academic literacy teaching with confidence-boosting measures and feedback mechanisms, peer co-working, and non-academic research participation in ELT programs can help the learners to consider academic writing and research as useful skills rather than scary difficulties thus, they will become more confident and competent. Consequently, enhancing self-efficacy in these areas may not only improve performance but also sustained academic independence. The study aims to enhance the teaching and learning process, especially with the help of technology, by giving academic support and providing writing workshops aligned with the objectives of analytical, research-oriented English language educators in Indonesia.

## **CONCLUSION**

This research focused on the difficulties encountered by undergraduates learning English, the students' perceived self-efficacy in writing and research as well as self-evaluation of students' competence in these activities. Results suggest that students had a moderate level of difficulty in general, but the greatest difficulties appeared in writing with a time limit, dealing with academic writing anxiety, and carrying out both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. These patterns are consistent with earlier findings that emotional factors and insufficient analytical training mostly obstruct students' performance in L2 academic contexts (Cheng, 2004; Mandl et al., 2024)

Nevertheless, the students showed self-efficacy of moderate to high degree, especially in the areas of organizing academic texts, revising drafts, identifying topics for research, and asking questions about research. These aspects are likely to be the core of the concept of self-efficacy, which is according to Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory (1997), in that they keep students' persistence and involvement in academic tasks high. The relationship between hurdles and self-efficacy suggests that if learners are confident about dealing with the abstract matters related to writing and research, they still need assistance in the technical and procedural aspects. The results, from a pedagogical perspective, underline the necessity of incorporating explicit teaching of research methodology, analytical procedures, and academic literacy into ELT courses. Structured feedback, scaffolded practice, and the provision of guided research involvement opportunities might contribute to students' mastery experiences and, subsequently, academic self-efficacy, the latter being a consequence of the former (Rivera et al., 2023) essentially, the research shows that the ELT programs have to develop a more comprehensive instructional approach that spreads over the cognitive and affective domains of academic literacy at the same time. Higher confidence along with the technical research skill development can be acknowledged as a strategy of preparing students better for the difficulties of academic writing and empirical inquiry. This topic can be explored further

in the future research with bigger sample sizes, diverse institutional contexts, or longitudinal designs to explore how students' challenges and self-efficacy develop over time.

### **SUGGESTION**

Based on the findings, several pedagogical and institutional implications to enhance students' academic writing and research competence in ELT programs. According to the research, university students face moderate difficulties in the two mentioned areas, with the toughest challenges being time management, writing anxiety, and data analysis methods. It is interesting to note that the students still have moderate to high self-efficacy. Hence, the introduction of a more thorough teaching of academic literacy and research methodology is a must for both curriculum practitioners and students. This would also include vocabulary and grammar development, academic writing lessons should focus on developing students' critical thinking, rhetorical structure, and citation abilities. It is possible to assist students manage their writing anxiety and develop better confidence in their writing performance by scaffolding writing projects through phases, including drafting, formative feedback, and revision.

To reduce technical challenges in managing empirical data, research programs should include structured modules on research design, data analysis and interpretation early on. It is practical workshops that provide the students with hands-on experience of data analysis tools, such as SPSS or Excel, that can greatly enhance the students' procedural confidence. Continuous formative feedback is recommended for teachers and facilitators as this will help in developing students' self-efficacy and self-directed learning. Moreover, to this, institutional initiatives like writing centers, peer mentoring programs, and collaborative research programs can facilitate students' mastery experiences and thus enhance their cognitive and affective engagement with academic tasks.

To reveal the development of students' challenges and self-efficacy over their entire academic career, mixed-methods and longitudinal approaches can be applied in future research. Moreover, the impact of specific teaching strategies, such as the use of technology-assisted writing platforms or scaffolded supervision, may be enlightening for the advancement of academic writing and research in ELT contexts. Universities can better equip students to become confident, reflective, and research-oriented English language teachers who make significant contributions to the academic and professional communities by implementing these programs.

## REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: the exercise of control* (1st ed.). Freeman.
- Basaffar, F. M., & Alzahrani, W. A. (2022). The relationship between self-efficacy and writing achievement among English as a foreign language learners at the University of Jeddah. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 84, 182–198. <https://doi.org/10.33193/jalhss.84.2022.737>
- Cheng, Y.-S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 313–335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Book review research methods in education. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 2, 147–156.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 4(2), 83–94. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess0421604201>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition & Communication*, 32(4), 365–387. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc198115885>
- Forester, M., Kahn, J. H., & Hesson-McInnis, M. S. (2004). Factor structures of three measures of research self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072703257719>
- Hapsaria, A. (2024). EFL students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated strategies in undergraduate thesis writing. *Linguistics and English Language Teaching Journal*, 12(2), 245–260.
- Harshalatha, S., & Sreenivasulu, Y. (2024). Exploring academic writing needs and challenges experienced by ESL learners: A literature review. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 406. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p406>
- Hill, H. M., Zwahr-Castro, J., & Gonzalez, A. (2022). Evaluating research self-efficacy in undergraduate students: Experience matters. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 22(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v22i1.31203>
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Jonathans, P. M., Cahyono, B. Y., Widiati, U., & Kweldju, S. (2024). Enhancing factors for doctoral students' writing self-efficacy: A narrative approach. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i1.70397>
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380364>
- Li, Q. (2024). A review of research on writing self-efficacy. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 14(3), 60–70.
- Lillis, T., & Tuck, J. (n.d.). Academic literacies: A critical lens on writing and reading in the academy. *The Routledge Handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (Pp. 30–43).

- Mandl, U., Schmidt, E., & Rauch, C. (2024). Statistical literacy and cognitive overload in novice researchers: Challenges for educational training. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.102293>
- Mendoza, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., Lehtonen, T., & Hyytinen, H. (2022). Writing a master's thesis: Associations between the grade, self-efficacy for thesis writing, approaches to writing, and experiences of the thesis as a teaching and learning environment. *Journal of Writing Research*, 14(2), 257–286. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2022.14.02.04>
- Nimehchisalem, V., & Mukundan, J. (2015). Refinement of the English language teaching textbook evaluation checklist. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(3), 761–780.
- Nurkamto, J., Djatmika, & Prihandoko, L. A. (2022). Students' problems of academic writing competencies, challenges in online thesis supervision, and the solutions: Thesis supervisors' perspectives. *TEFLIN Journal*, 33(1), 123–147. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/123-147>
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 139–158.
- Prat-Sala, M., & Redford, P. (2012). Students' problems of academic writing competencies, challenges in online thesis supervision, and the solutions: Thesis supervisors' perspectives. *Educational Psychology*, 32(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2011.621411>
- Rivera, A. M., Artiles, M. S., & Brunhaver, S. R. (2023). Perceived advisor support and thesis self-efficacy: An instrument development. *Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*.
- Sasferi, N. (2022). The effect of academic self-efficacy on students' thesis writing resilience. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 18(1), 36–44.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 657–677.
- Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D*.
- Taş, Y., Demiral-Uzan, M., & Uzan, E. (2023). Self-efficacy for research: Development and validation of a comprehensive research self-efficacy scale (C-RSES). *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES)*, 5(2), 275–294. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonsets.472>
- Teng, M. F., & Wang, C. (2022). Assessing academic writing self-efficacy belief and writing performance in a foreign language context. *Foreign Language Annals*, 55(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12638>
- Thi, N. K. (2020). Exploring the relationship between writing self-efficacy and writing performance: A review of empirical studies. *Proceedings of the Annual Scientific Conference, Taungoo University*, 487–493.
- Wei, J. (2024). Anxiety in English academic writing of EFL students. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 199, 1001. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202419901001>
- Willison, J., O'Regan, K., & Kuhn, S. K. (2018). *Researcher skill development framework (US English edition)*. University of North Dakota, Open Educational Resources. <https://commons.und.edu/oers/6>



## **APPENDIX**

### **Appendix A**

#### **Students' Perceptions of Challenges in Academic Writing**

<b>No</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>1 (%)</b>	<b>2 (%)</b>	<b>3 (%)</b>	<b>4 (%)</b>	<b>5 (%)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1	I struggle to construct grammatically accurate sentences in academic writing.	10.00	22.05	32.05	22.05	12.05	2.99
2	I have difficulty selecting precise academic vocabulary.	12.05	27.05	27.05	22.05	10.00	2.86
3	I often repeat simple words because I cannot find suitable synonyms.	7.05	15.00	35.00	25.00	17.05	3.30
4	I find it challenging to connect ideas smoothly with transition signals.	10.00	17.05	27.05	30.00	15.00	3.23
5	I have difficulty maintaining logical flow across sentences and paragraphs.	10.00	20.00	25.00	27.05	17.05	3.22
6	I struggle to use citations and references cohesively in my writing.	15.00	27.05	22.05	22.05	12.05	2.84
7	I find it hard to write clear introductions and conclusions.	15.00	20.00	25.00	22.05	17.05	3.08
8	I struggle to organize paragraphs with clear topic sentences.	12.05	25.00	27.05	22.05	12.05	2.92
9	I have difficulty outlining academic papers according to academic conventions.	10.00	22.05	25.00	27.05	15.00	3.15
10	I find it challenging to synthesize ideas from multiple sources.	10.00	25.00	27.05	22.05	15.00	3.08
11	I struggle to critically evaluate the strength of evidence from sources.	12.05	22.05	25.00	25.00	15.00	3.08
12	I have difficulty building arguments and counterarguments in my writing.	10.00	20.00	27.05	27.05	15.00	3.18
13	I often feel anxious when writing academic papers in English.	7.05	17.05	25.00	25.00	25.00	3.43
14	I feel that my writing is less competent than my peers.	10.00	17.05	30.00	25.00	17.05	3.23
15	I find it difficult to write under time pressure in academic settings.	7.05	12.05	25.00	27.05	27.05	3.55

**Appendix B**

**Students' Perceptions of Challenges in doing research in ELT**

No	Item	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Mean
1	I struggle to identify clear, researchable problems in ELT.	5.00	20.00	45.00	17.50	12.05	3.12
2	I have difficulty narrowing down topics into specific research questions.	7.50	25.00	25.00	25.00	17.50	3.20
3	I find it hard to link research questions with theoretical frameworks.	10.00	20.00	27.50	30.00	12.50	3.15
4	I find it difficult to decide whether to use qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods.	20.00	40.00	22.50	10.00	7.50	2.45
5	I have difficulty designing appropriate data-collection instruments (tests, questionnaires, rubrics, etc.).	10.00	35.00	12.50	30.00	12.50	3.00
6	I struggle to ensure validity and reliability in research instruments.	7.50	20.00	25.00	22.50	25.00	3.38
7	I feel challenged when collecting data from real classroom settings.	10.00	17.05	30.00	17.50	25.00	3.30
8	I find it difficult to analyze quantitative data (e.g., using SPSS/Excel).	5.00	12.50	15.00	30.00	37.50	3.83
9	I struggle to analyze qualitative data (e.g., coding, themes).	5.00	20.00	22.50	25.00	27.50	3.50
10	I find it difficult to write the methodology section of a research paper.	17.50	17.50	35.00	17.50	12.50	2.90
11	I struggle to write clear Results/Findings.	20.00	20.00	35.00	15.00	10.00	2.75
12	I have difficulty writing the Discussion section that links data to theory.	12.50	17.50	25.00	27.50	17.50	3.20
13	I find it challenging to present my research in English.	15.00	20.00	20.00	35.00	10.00	3.05
14	I struggle to prepare research posters/presentations effectively.	15.00	22.50	32.50	17.50	12.50	2.90

**Appendix C**

**Self-Efficacy in Academic Writing and Research**

No	Item	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Mean
1	I am confident in writing grammatically accurate sentences in English.	2.05	10.00	37.05	35.00	15.00	3.50
2	I can use appropriate academic vocabulary when writing.	0.00	7.05	35.00	37.05	20.00	3.70
3	I can organize my paragraphs with clear topic sentences and supporting details.	0.00	5.00	40.00	37.05	17.05	3.67
4	I can connect ideas logically using appropriate transitions.	0.00	5.00	32.05	42.05	20.00	3.79
5	I can write coherent introductions and conclusions.	0.00	7.05	27.05	45.00	20.00	3.79
6	I am confident in synthesizing ideas from multiple sources.	2.05	5.00	30.00	40.00	22.05	3.75
7	I can write arguments and counterarguments effectively.	0.00	5.00	27.05	42.05	25.00	3.88
8	I can use citations and references correctly in my writing.	0.00	2.05	35.00	37.05	25.00	3.86
9	I can revise my drafts to improve clarity and quality.	0.00	2.05	27.05	45.00	25.00	3.94
10	I believe I can produce an academic paper that meets university standards.	0.00	2.05	25.00	42.05	30.00	4.00
11	I am confident in identifying researchable problems in ELT.	0.00	5.00	32.05	42.05	20.00	3.79
12	I can formulate clear and specific research questions.	0.00	5.00	25.00	45.00	25.00	3.90
13	I am confident in selecting an appropriate research design (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods).	0.00	7.05	30.00	37.05	25.00	3.81
14	I can design effective data-collection instruments (e.g., questionnaires, tests).	0.00	5.00	32.05	40.00	22.05	3.79
15	I am confident in applying correct data-analysis procedures.	2.05	5.00	27.05	45.00	20.00	3.78
16	I can use software/tools (SPSS, Excel, coding programs) when analyzing data.	2.05	10.00	35.00	35.00	17.05	3.55
17	I can interpret research results accurately.	0.00	5.00	27.05	45.00	22.05	3.85

18	I am confident in writing a coherent methodology section.	0.00	2.05	30.00	47.05	20.00	3.85
19	I can write Results and Discussion sections effectively.	0.00	5.00	32.05	42.05	20.00	3.79
20	I am confident in presenting my research in English.	0.00	7.05	30.00	42.05	20.00	3.76
21	I believe I can complete my research project successfully.	0.00	2.05	27.05	42.05	27.05	3.96
22	I see myself as capable of publishing or presenting research in ELT.	0.00	7.05	25.00	40.00	27.05	3.88