

**DEVELOPING THE INSPIRING WRITING MODEL:
INTEGRATING CREATIVE WRITING TASKS AND DIGITAL
LEARNING TOOLS TO REDUCE WRITING ANXIETY AND
ENHANCE WRITING PROFICIENCY IN EFL CONTEXT**

Mohammad Agung Wibowo¹, Isry Laila Syathroh²
agungtafakur2017@gmail.com, islaisya@ikipsiliwangi.ac.id

IKIP SILIWANGI

Received: July 11, 2026; Accepted: September 6, 2026

ABSTRACT

Writing anxiety remains an affective challenge for EFL learners, particularly where students have limited exposure to English. The researcher developed the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM), consisting of nine instructional steps that integrate creative writing tasks and digital learning tools to reduce writing anxiety and enhance writing proficiency. The model was informed by the researcher's experience conducting Inspiring Writing training programs at Indonesian government institutions. This Research and Development (R&D) study employed a mixed-methods approach involving questionnaires, pre-test and post-test, interviews, classroom observations, and expert validation. Participants were 28 undergraduate EFL students. The model achieved a validity score of 93.33%, while the writing assessment instrument obtained validity of 76.00%. Quantitative data were analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test, while qualitative data were thematically analyzed. The results showed a significant decrease in writing anxiety ($M = 21.07$ to 14.32 ; $t(27) = 6.632$, $p < 0.001$; $d = 1.25$) and improvement in writing proficiency ($M = 20.94$ to 27.40 ; $t(27) = -9.785$, $p < 0.001$; $d = 1.85$), accompanied by confidence, creativity, and positive attitudes toward writing and digital learning tools. The novelty of IWM lies in its integration of affective support, creative writing pedagogy, and digital learning tools within one instructional model.

Keywords: Creative Writing, Digital Tools, Inspiring Writing Model, Writing Anxiety, Writing Proficiency.

A. INTRODUCTION

Writing anxiety remains one of the most persistent affective challenges in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. For many learners, writing in English is not only a linguistic task but also an emotionally demanding process requiring them to generate ideas, organize content coherently, apply grammatical knowledge, and select appropriate vocabulary while anticipating evaluation from teachers and peers. These demands become

more challenging in EFL contexts, where opportunities for authentic language use outside the classroom are often limited. Richards (2015) explains that restricted language exposure may reduce learners' confidence and writing fluency, while Kirkpatrick (2020) argues that English language pedagogy should respond to the linguistic and cultural realities of EFL settings. Consequently, writing anxiety frequently becomes a significant obstacle to successful writing development.

Research consistently demonstrates that writing anxiety negatively influences both learners' writing performance and classroom engagement. Across different EFL contexts, studies have shown that anxious learners tend to avoid writing tasks, participate less actively, and produce texts below their actual ability (Cheng, 2004; Quvanch & Kew, 2022; Saghafi et al., 2017; Zhang & Zhang, 2022). Rather than functioning solely as an emotional reaction, writing anxiety interacts with cognitive processes such as idea generation, organization, and language production, ultimately reducing writing quality. Collectively, these studies suggest that writing instruction should address not only linguistic competence but also learners' emotional readiness to write.

Writing proficiency, meanwhile, remains a central objective of EFL instruction. Effective writing requires learners to develop ideas, organize information logically, communicate for specific audiences, and continuously revise their texts throughout the writing process (Hyland, 2016). Contemporary writing pedagogy therefore recognizes that successful instruction should integrate cognitive, affective, and technological dimensions of learning. Within this perspective, creative writing has been found to increase learner engagement, self-expression, and intrinsic motivation (Maley, 2015; Tu, 2021), while digital learning tools facilitate collaboration, immediate feedback, and flexible revision, thereby supporting writing development and reducing learners' anxiety (Dahlström, 2019; Hockly, 2016; Yunus & Suliman, 2020). Viewed collectively, these findings indicate that effective writing instruction requires a balanced integration of emotional support, meaningful learning activities, and technological assistance rather than emphasizing only one instructional component.

Despite these advances, previous instructional approaches remain fragmented. Traditional Process Writing Models (Hyland, 2016) primarily emphasize the recursive stages of planning, drafting, revising, and editing to improve writing quality. Although highly effective for developing writing processes, these models provide limited explicit strategies for reducing learners' writing anxiety or fostering sustained writing motivation. In contrast, Creative Writing Models (Maley, 2015; Tu, 2021) successfully promote imagination, self-expression, and learner engagement but often lack systematic instructional procedures, structured writing assessment, and technology-supported feedback mechanisms. Meanwhile, studies integrating digital learning tools generally employ technology as supplementary instructional media rather than embedding it within a comprehensive pedagogical framework that simultaneously addresses affective and cognitive aspects of writing. Consequently, existing approaches tend to focus on individual instructional components instead of integrating writing anxiety reduction, creative writing pedagogy, and digital learning support into a single coherent instructional model. This fragmentation limits the availability of practical, empirically validated, and replicable models for EFL writing instruction.

To address this gap, the researcher developed the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM), a structured instructional framework integrating creative writing tasks, process-based writing

instruction, motivational learning principles, and digital learning tools within a unified pedagogical design. Unlike conventional Process Writing Models that primarily organize writing into sequential stages, or Creative Writing Models that mainly emphasize creative expression, the IWM intentionally integrates affective support, creative engagement, and technology-enhanced writing assistance throughout the instructional process. Digital tools are not positioned merely as supplementary media but function as integral scaffolding that supports idea generation, drafting, feedback, revision, and publication. Simultaneously, motivational activities are systematically embedded to reduce writing anxiety while strengthening learners' confidence and willingness to write.

The concept of inspiring writing in this study extends beyond producing interesting texts. It refers to instructional experiences that foster learners' intrinsic motivation, creativity, reflective thinking, and meaningful communication. This conceptualization is supported by Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory, which emphasizes that learners' beliefs in their capabilities influence their motivation, persistence, and performance. It is further informed by Fredrickson's (2016) Broaden-and-Build Theory, which explains that positive emotions broaden learners' cognitive resources and creative thinking, enabling them to engage more confidently in writing tasks. In addition, creative writing has been shown to promote imagination, personal expression, and meaningful engagement with writing (Maley, 2015; Tu, 2021). Accordingly, inspiring writing in this study is operationalized both as an instructional process that encourages active engagement through supportive and meaningful learning activities and as a writing outcome characterized by purposeful, engaging, and inspirational texts capable of influencing readers positively.

Accordingly, this study aims to develop and validate the Inspiring Writing Model as an instructional framework capable of reducing writing anxiety and enhancing writing proficiency among EFL university students. Specifically, the study seeks to describe the systematic development of the model and evaluate its validity, practicality, and effectiveness. In this study, validity refers to the extent to which the model is theoretically grounded and appropriate for EFL writing instruction. Practicality concerns the feasibility and ease of implementing the model in authentic classroom settings. Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the model successfully improves students' writing proficiency while simultaneously reducing writing anxiety.

Based on these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How can the Inspiring Writing Model be systematically developed to address writing anxiety and writing proficiency in EFL contexts?
2. To what extent is the developed Inspiring Writing Model valid, practical, and effective in reducing writing anxiety and enhancing writing proficiency among EFL students?
3. What are students' and teachers' perceptions of the Inspiring Writing Model for further improvement?

B. METHOD

This study employed a Research and Development (R&D) design adapted from Borg and Gall (1983) to systematically develop and validate the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM).

Although Borg and Gall originally proposed a ten-stage development cycle, the procedure was condensed into seven stages to accommodate the scope and context of the study while maintaining the essential principles of product development, validation, revision, and evaluation. Such adaptation is considered methodologically acceptable because R&D procedures may be modified according to research needs without compromising their developmental rigor (Sugiyono, 2015; Gustiani, 2019). In this study, several stages with similar functions were integrated to improve efficiency. Operational field testing was incorporated into the main fieldtesting stage, while product revisions were conducted continuously following expert validation and field testing rather than being treated as separate phases. Furthermore, the dissemination and implementation stage was not included because the primary objective of the study was to develop and validate the instructional model rather than to conduct large-scale implementation. Despite the reduction in stages, the core developmental logic of Borg and Gall's framework was preserved, ensuring a systematic and rigorous process for producing a valid, practical, and effective instructional model, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Modified 7 Stages of the Borg & Gall Model

Original 10 Stages (Borg & Gall)	Modified 7 Stages for this Research
a. Research and information collecting	a. Research and information collecting
b. Planning	b. Planning
c. Develop a preliminary form of product	c. Develop a preliminary form of the product
d. Preliminary field testing	d. Preliminary field testing
e. Main product revision	e. Main & Operational product revision
f. Main field testing	f. Main field testing
g. Operational product revision	g. Final product revision
h. Operational field testing	
i. Final product revision	
j. Dissemination and implementation	

Within this developmental framework, a mixed-methods approach was employed to obtain comprehensive evidence of the model's effectiveness. Quantitative data were collected to measure changes in students' writing proficiency and anxiety levels through pre- and post-intervention assessments. Complementarily, qualitative data from classroom observations and interviews were used to explore students' experiences and perceptions during the implementation of the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM). The integration of both data types enabled methodological triangulation, providing a more robust evaluation of the model's instructional and affective impact.

The participants of the research were 28 fourth-semester undergraduate students enrolled in the English Department at a private university in Indonesia. They consisted of six male and twenty-two female students, aged 19–21 years, and had an intermediate level of English proficiency, as indicated by their successful completion of prerequisite writing courses in the department. The participants were selected because they had previously completed basic writing courses and represented a typical EFL classroom context in which students possessed fundamental writing knowledge but still lacked confidence and fluency in expressing ideas in written English. Prior to data collection, institutional approval was obtained from the Head of the English Department and the course lecturer to conduct the study. All participants were informed of the purpose and procedures of the research and provided informed consent before participating. Their participation was entirely voluntary, and they were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without academic consequences. To ensure confidentiality, participants' identities were anonymized using identification codes,

and all collected data were used exclusively for research purposes and reported only in aggregate form.

The preliminary version of the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM) was validated by three experts from Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (UPI). The validators were selected based on their expertise in English Language Teaching (ELT), EFL writing pedagogy, curriculum and instructional design, language assessment, and teacher education. All three validators have extensive experience in teaching, research, curriculum development, and academic publication in the field of English language education. Their expertise enabled them to evaluate the theoretical foundation, instructional design, practicality, and pedagogical quality of the proposed model. Their recommendations were subsequently incorporated into the revised version before field testing.

Several research instruments were used to collect data on writing proficiency and writing anxiety. A preliminary questionnaire identified students' initial writing difficulties, anxiety levels, attitudes toward creative writing, and use of digital tools. Writing performance was measured through pre-test and post-test tasks using the Inspiring Writing Model Scoring Rubric, an analytic rubric developed by the researcher. It includes eight criteria—Inspiring, Interesting, Character, Setting, Grammar, Diction, Clarity, and Creativity—each rated on a five-point scale.

Following the intervention, a post-intervention questionnaire was administered to examine changes in students' confidence, perceived anxiety, motivation, creativity, and their responses to the use of digital learning tools. To complement the quantitative findings, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected students to explore their experiences and perceptions in greater depth. In addition, classroom observation notes from three observers were used to provide an external evaluation of the instructional process and classroom dynamics.

Data collection was carried out in several stages. At the beginning of the study, students completed a preliminary questionnaire to provide baseline information about their writing anxiety and learning preferences. This was followed by a pre-test writing task, which served as a reference point for evaluating changes in writing performance. The Inspiring Writing Model (IWM) was then implemented over two lesson hours, during which nine teaching instructions were applied sequentially. The implementation emphasized guided writing stages, creative tasks, Quick Writing activities, and the responsible use of digital learning tools.

After the intervention, students completed a post-test writing task and responded to the post-intervention questionnaire. Interviews were conducted shortly afterward to capture students' reflections while their learning experiences were still fresh. Throughout the implementation, three observers monitored classroom interaction, student engagement, and the practicality of the model. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS, while qualitative data from questionnaires, interviews, and observation notes were thematically analyzed. As the core instructional component of the intervention, the IWM was implemented through nine structured Teaching Instructions developed by the researcher, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Nine Teaching Instructions for The Inspiring Writing Model

NO	INSTRUCTION
----	-------------

1	Motivate the Students to Write
2	Explain in detail the Writing Steps
3	Train How to Use Digital Learning Tools
4	Lower anxiety by anxiety
5	Choose the most familiar topics
6	Write something authentic and inspiring
7	Convince the students that everyone can write
8	Create a fun atmosphere in the class
9	Give samples of Creative Writing

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings and discussion organized according to the three research questions.

1. Findings Related to Research Question 1

RQ1: How can the Inspiring Writing Model be systematically developed to address writing anxiety and writing proficiency in EFL contexts?

The development of the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM) followed the seven modified R&D stages proposed by Borg and Gall, ensuring a systematic, iterative, and empirically grounded instructional design process. This framework emphasizes progressive refinement through cycles of analysis, design, validation, field testing, and revision, allowing the model to evolve based on real classroom evidence and stakeholder feedback. By adhering to these structured stages, the development process maintained methodological rigor, internal coherence, and alignment between theoretical foundations and practical implementation.

a. Research and Information Collecting

The preliminary study revealed that students experienced considerable writing anxiety, particularly related to grammar accuracy, vocabulary limitations, and fear of negative evaluation. A total of 81.08% of respondents (30 of 37 students) either *agreed* or *strongly agreed* that they worry about grammatical or spelling mistakes when writing. None of the students disagreed with this statement. These findings confirmed previous studies (e.g., Cheng, 2004; Quvanch & Kew, 2022) that writing anxiety functions as both an affective and cognitive barrier.

b. Planning

Based on the needs analysis, the instructional framework was designed to integrate process writing stages, Quick Writing strategies, familiar topic selection, digital scaffolding, and structured confidence-building activities to address both affective and cognitive dimensions of writing. The planning phase resulted in the formulation of the Outline of the Inspiring Writing Model, which operationalized these components into a coherent sequence of nine instructional procedures aimed at systematically reducing writing anxiety while enhancing writing proficiency.

c. Developing the Preliminary Form of the Product

The preliminary product consisted of structured teaching modules, PowerPoint-guided instruction, an analytic scoring rubric, and integration of digital platforms such as WhatsApp, Google Search, ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Microsoft Word Online. The model was intentionally designed to reduce anxiety by emphasizing production before correction, particularly through timed Quick Writing tasks. In addition, the integration of digital tools was strategically aligned with specific stages of the writing process to provide scaffolding support without undermining students' authorship and independent thinking.

d. Preliminary Field Testing

Preliminary field testing was conducted in a small class of four students to examine practicality and initial responsiveness. The implementation demonstrated high student engagement, increased writing fluency, and reduced hesitation during writing tasks. Although this phase emphasized qualitative observation rather than statistical testing, early behavioral indicators suggested decreased anxiety and greater spontaneity in writing production. Students began composing texts more confidently during Quick Writing sessions, indicating that the model's emphasis on structured freedom and idea generation was functioning as intended.

e. Main Product Revision

Based on feedback from the small-class trial and the three expert validators, several revisions were implemented. These included clearer sequencing of writing stages, more explicit pedagogical guidance on digital tool usage, and improved time allocation per instructional activity. The revisions strengthened the internal coherence and practicality of the model. By mapping digital tools more explicitly to specific stages of the writing process, the model became more systematic and easier to implement in broader classroom contexts.

f. Main Field Testing

The refined IWM was implemented in a class with 28 undergraduate EFL students. Multiple instruments were used to evaluate effectiveness, including pre-test and post-test writing assessments, writing anxiety questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations.

g. Final Product Revision

The final stage involved refining the model based on the results of the main field test, including feedback and recommendations from students, observers, and validators. The evaluation findings were carefully reviewed to ensure that the model was both effective and practical for classroom implementation.

The final product included complete lesson plans, a PowerPoint presentation, and assessment tools. The output of this stage was the finalized version of the Inspiring Writing Model, ready for use and future dissemination.

2. Findings Related to Research Question 2

RQ2: To what extent is the developed Inspiring Writing Model valid, practical, and effective in reducing writing anxiety and enhancing writing proficiency among EFL students?

The answer to this question is derived from a comprehensive analysis of the pre-test and post-test results, complemented by questionnaire data collected after the implementation of the Inspiring Writing Model. The comparison of students' performance before and after the intervention provides empirical evidence of changes in writing proficiency and anxiety levels, while the questionnaire responses offer insight into students' perceptions, confidence, and motivation. Together, these quantitative and perceptual data sources provide a holistic basis for evaluating the model's validity, effectiveness, and practicality in EFL writing contexts. The results of the pre-test and post-test are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Scores of Writing Anxiety and Writing Proficiency

STUDENTS	PRE- ANXIETY	POST- ANXIETY	PRE- PROFICIENCY	POST- PROFICIENCY
S-01	23	21	19.5	34
S-02	17	15	18.5	25.5
S-03	20	14	20.5	27.5
S-04	27	11	23.5	29.5
S-05	19	18	19.5	30.5
S-06	18	11	22	29.5
S-07	16	7	19	26.5
S-08	23	18	19.5	25.5
S-09	24	13	19.5	32
S-10	12	13	20	25.5
S-11	23	14	26	27.5
S-12	16	16	23.5	26.5
S-13	18	17	19	25.5
S-14	25	14	19	28.5
S-15	24	14	22.5	25
S-16	15	7	23	29
S-17	23	17	16.5	26.5
S-18	10	18	18.75	23.25
S-19	20	18	19	27
S-20	23	15	21	26.5
S-21	23	15	20	26.5
S-22	25	14	18	26
S-23	24	11	23	27.5
S-24	31	16	20.5	32
S-25	21	12	25.5	30.5
S-26	29	16	22	21
S-27	18	12	22.5	26
S-28	23	14	25	26.5

a. Validity & Reliability

In terms of validity, the model demonstrates strong content and construct validity. It was explicitly grounded in the identified learner needs, particularly grammar-related anxiety and fear of negative evaluation, and its components align with established theories of process writing and affective learning. The integration of cognitive scaffolding and emotional

support further strengthens its construct coherence. Instrument reliability analysis supports this validity claim. The analytic scoring rubric achieved acceptable interrater reliability coefficients of 0.705 in the pre-test and 0.863 in the post-test, indicating consistent scoring between raters and improved agreement after model implementation. The higher reliability coefficient in the post-test may reflect greater consistency in students' writing performance, which enabled the raters to apply the analytic scoring criteria more consistently. These values confirm that the assessment instrument was stable and dependable for measuring writing proficiency changes.

Based on the three expert validators, the Inspiring Writing Model demonstrates initial validity in terms of theoretical foundation, instructional design, and the preliminary assessment framework. The model achieved a high validity score of 93.33%, while the writing assessment instrument obtained an acceptable validity of 76.00%. The validators confirmed the overall feasibility and conceptual soundness of the model, along with several recommendations for improvement. Therefore, the Inspiring Writing Model is considered appropriate for application after revisions addressing the clarity of objectives, critical literacy indicators, and assessment descriptors.

Furthermore, the reliability of the questionnaire was examined using Cronbach's Alpha. The analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.865, indicating good internal consistency. This result suggests that the questionnaire items consistently measured the intended construct and were therefore considered reliable for collecting students' perceptions of the Inspiring Writing Model.

b. Effectiveness

Regarding effectiveness, the Paired Sample t-test revealed statistically significant improvements in both writing anxiety and writing proficiency. The results showed a significant decrease in writing anxiety ($M = 21.07$ to 14.32 ; $t(27) = 6.632$, $p < 0.001$; $d = 1.25$) and a significant improvement in writing proficiency ($M = 20.94$ to 27.40 ; $t(27) = -9.785$, $p < 0.001$; $d = 1.85$). The corresponding effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 1.25$ for writing anxiety and Cohen's $d = 1.85$ for writing proficiency) indicate large practical effects, suggesting that the observed improvements were not only statistically significant but also educationally meaningful. Mean score improvements were observed across nearly all participants, particularly in idea development, clarity, creativity, and structural organization. These findings support the theoretical assumption that reducing writing anxiety facilitates better cognitive engagement in writing, thereby contributing to improved writing proficiency.

c. Practicality

In terms of practicality, post-intervention questionnaire data show high levels of positive student perception. A total of 92.9% of students reported increased confidence, 85.7% experienced reduced anxiety, and 85.8% felt more motivated to write. Students described the model as clear, enjoyable, engaging, and structured yet flexible. Classroom observations further confirmed high engagement, manageable implementation procedures, and a strong motivational climate. Collectively, these findings indicate that the IWM fulfills the practicality criterion within the R&D framework, demonstrating feasibility and positive reception in real classroom contexts.

3. Findings Related to Research Question 3

RQ3: What are students' and teachers' perceptions of the Inspiring Writing Model for further improvement?

The answer to this question is based on qualitative data from post-intervention questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations. These sources provide insights into students' perceptions, experiences, and responses to the Inspiring Writing Model. The findings are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution of Responses to Three of the Seventeen Questionnaire Statements

No	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	The Inspiring Writing Model made me feel more confident in my writing.	67,9%	25,0%	7,1%	0%	0%
2	I feel that the Inspiring Writing Model has reduced my writing anxiety.	35,7%	50,0%	14,3%	0%	0%
3	I am motivated to write more after participating in the Inspiring Writing Model.	42,9%	42,9%	14,3%	0%	0%

The questionnaire results show a consistently strong positive response toward the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM), particularly in students' confidence, anxiety reduction, and motivation. A total of 67.9% strongly agreed, and 25% agreed that the model increased their confidence, while 35.7% strongly agreed and 50% agreed that their writing anxiety decreased during the learning process. In addition, 42.9% strongly agreed, and 42.9% agreed that they felt more motivated to write after participating in the program. These findings indicate that the structured guidance and creative tasks effectively create a supportive environment that makes writing less intimidating and more engaging.

Qualitative findings reinforce these results. Initially, students reported limited vocabulary, grammatical difficulties, and fear of making mistakes, but after implementation, they described feeling less anxious, more confident, and better able to organize ideas. Digital tools were perceived as helpful for revising and refining their work. Observers likewise highlighted the model's practical value and its effective integration of creative and humanistic approaches, while recommending clearer guidance to prevent overreliance on AI tools.

4. Discussion

The findings suggest that the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM) provides a systematic instructional framework for addressing two major challenges frequently encountered in EFL writing classrooms: writing anxiety and limited writing proficiency. Developed through the modified Borg and Gall Research and Development framework, the model underwent iterative stages of needs analysis, planning, expert validation, classroom implementation, and revision. This systematic development process ensured that the instructional design was theoretically grounded while remaining responsive to authentic classroom needs. Rather than merely producing an instructional product, the iterative refinement strengthened the coherence, practicality, and pedagogical relevance of the model.

The effectiveness of the IWM can be understood from its integration of several complementary instructional components that have often been examined separately in previous studies. Traditional process writing models primarily emphasize planning, drafting, revising, and editing to improve writing quality (Hyland, 2016), whereas creative writing approaches mainly encourage imagination, self-expression, and learner engagement (Maley, 2015; Tu, 2021). Likewise, many technology-enhanced writing studies focus on the benefits of individual digital tools without embedding them within a comprehensive pedagogical framework (Dahlström, 2019; Hockly, 2016). In contrast, the IWM systematically combines affective support, process writing, creative writing pedagogy, motivational strategies, and digital learning tools into a unified instructional model. This integration may explain why the implementation of the model was associated with improvements in both learners' emotional readiness and writing performance.

The findings may also be interpreted through Bandura's (1997) Self-Efficacy Theory, which argues that individuals' beliefs in their capabilities strongly influence their motivation, persistence, and performance. Students who participated in the IWM reported greater confidence after experiencing structured writing activities supported by manageable learning tasks and constructive feedback. Rather than expecting students to produce polished texts immediately, the model gradually built confidence through scaffolded writing experiences. As learners experienced repeated success in completing increasingly challenging writing tasks, their beliefs in their writing abilities appeared to strengthen, contributing to lower writing anxiety and greater willingness to write.

The reduction of writing anxiety can also be explained through Fredrickson's (2016) Broaden-and-Build Theory. Positive emotional experiences broaden learners' cognitive resources, allowing them to think more creatively, generate ideas more freely, and engage more actively in learning. Within the IWM, supportive classroom interactions, encouraging feedback, familiar writing topics, and enjoyable creative activities created a psychologically safe learning environment in which students felt more comfortable expressing their ideas. Consequently, emotional support functioned not merely as an additional classroom activity but as an essential instructional component that facilitated both cognitive engagement and writing development.

One instructional component that appears particularly influential is Quick Writing. Unlike conventional writing activities that often emphasize grammatical accuracy from the beginning, Quick Writing encourages learners to prioritize idea generation within a limited time before focusing on revision and editing. This approach reduces fear of making mistakes and minimizes the cognitive overload commonly experienced by anxious writers (Cheng, 2004). As a fluency-oriented pre-writing activity, Quick Writing allows students to develop writing confidence through repeated low-pressure practice before progressing to more accurate and polished compositions (Hyland, 2016). These findings support previous studies suggesting that separating fluency from accuracy during the early stages of writing promotes greater confidence, creativity, and writing engagement.

Another important contribution of the IWM lies in the pedagogically differentiated use of digital learning tools. Rather than treating technology as a generic instructional aid, the model assigns each digital tool a specific function within the writing process. Google Search facilitates idea generation, background knowledge development, and vocabulary exploration. ChatGPT serves as a brainstorming and drafting assistant that helps learners

overcome writer's block while maintaining students' responsibility for generating original content. Grammarly primarily supports language accuracy by providing immediate feedback on grammar, spelling, punctuation, and clarity during revision. Microsoft Word Online assists drafting, editing, and document organization through accessible writing features, whereas WhatsApp provides an authentic platform for publishing students' writing, encouraging peer interaction, immediate sharing, and increased writing motivation. This stage-specific integration allows technology to function as instructional scaffolding that supports students' learning without replacing their own cognitive efforts.

The large improvements observed following the implementation of the IWM should not be interpreted solely in statistical terms. Beyond statistical significance, the findings indicate meaningful educational improvements in learners' confidence, motivation, writing fluency, creativity, and willingness to participate in writing activities. These educational gains are particularly important in EFL contexts where emotional barriers frequently discourage learners from expressing their ideas in written English. Therefore, the practical value of the model lies not only in improving writing scores but also in fostering a more positive and confident writing experience.

The principal contribution of the Inspiring Writing Model extends beyond combining creative writing activities with digital technologies. Its novelty lies in systematically integrating affective support, process writing, creative writing pedagogy, motivational strategies, and stage-specific digital scaffolding into a single empirically validated instructional framework. Unlike many previous instructional approaches that emphasize only one or two of these dimensions, the IWM operationalizes all components through nine interconnected teaching instructions that guide both teachers and learners throughout the writing process. This integrated design provides a more comprehensive pedagogical framework for reducing writing anxiety while simultaneously improving writing proficiency.

The findings also have important pedagogical implications for English language teaching. They suggest that writing instruction should extend beyond teaching grammar and text organization alone. Teachers may reduce writing anxiety more effectively by combining structured writing processes with motivational support, meaningful creative activities, and carefully guided digital technologies. Rather than replacing students' writing abilities, artificial intelligence and other digital tools should be integrated responsibly as scaffolding that supports idea generation, revision, and reflection while maintaining learners' authorship and critical thinking. Consequently, the IWM may serve as a practical instructional framework for teachers seeking to integrate creative pedagogy and responsible AI-assisted writing into contemporary EFL classrooms.

Nevertheless, several alternative explanations should be considered when interpreting these findings. Improvements in students' writing performance may have been partially influenced by repeated writing practice, increased familiarity with writing tasks, or greater familiarity with the assessment procedures. Although these factors cannot be completely separated from the intervention, writing practice alone is unlikely to explain the observed improvements because the instructional program intentionally integrated motivational support, creative writing activities, Quick Writing, structured process writing, and stage-specific digital learning tools into a coherent instructional framework. The combined influence of these complementary instructional components appears more likely to account for the positive outcomes than repeated practice alone.

Despite these encouraging findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study employed a one-group pre-test–post-test design without a comparison group; therefore, causal conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the IWM should be interpreted cautiously. Second, the participants consisted of only 28 undergraduate EFL students from a single institution, limiting the generalizability of the findings to broader educational contexts. Third, the intervention was conducted within a relatively limited instructional period. Future research is therefore recommended to employ randomized or quasi-experimental designs involving larger and more diverse samples, longer implementation periods, and different educational settings, including secondary schools, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) programs, and online or blended learning environments. Such studies would provide stronger evidence regarding the long-term effectiveness, scalability, and transferability of the Inspiring Writing Model across various EFL contexts.

D. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to develop and evaluate the Inspiring Writing Model (IWM) as an instructional approach to reduce writing anxiety and improve writing proficiency in EFL contexts. The findings provide evidence that the model successfully addresses the three research questions.

Regarding RQ1, the Inspiring Writing Model offers a structured instructional framework that integrates creative writing, affective support, and digital learning tools to facilitate students' writing development. The model encourages learners to generate ideas confidently, express themselves meaningfully, and engage actively throughout the writing process.

Regarding RQ2, the findings indicate that the Inspiring Writing Model is valid, practical, and effective for EFL writing instruction. Its implementation was associated with reduced writing anxiety, improved writing proficiency, and positive classroom engagement, demonstrating its potential to support both affective and cognitive aspects of writing.

Regarding RQ3, students and teachers expressed positive perceptions of the model. Students reported greater confidence, lower writing anxiety, improved idea development, and meaningful use of digital learning tools, while teachers viewed the model as practical and applicable in classroom instruction. Their suggestions mainly concerned refining instructional sequencing and promoting responsible use of artificial intelligence to further enhance the model.

Overall, the Inspiring Writing Model provides a pedagogically meaningful contribution to EFL writing instruction by integrating creative writing, motivational support, and digital technologies within a coherent instructional framework. The model offers an alternative approach for helping learners become more confident writers while improving their writing proficiency and may serve as a practical reference for teachers and researchers seeking to address both the affective and cognitive dimensions of writing.

Future studies are recommended to examine the implementation of the Inspiring Writing Model in secondary school settings, where learners may have different levels of writing anxiety and language proficiency. Further research may also explore its application in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) contexts, such as business, tourism, or engineering programs, to determine its adaptability across disciplinary needs. In addition, investigating the effectiveness of the model in fully online or blended learning environments would

provide valuable evidence regarding its scalability and suitability for technology-mediated EFL instruction

E. REFERENCES

- Barton, G., Khosronejad, M., Ryan, M., Kervin, L., & Myhill, D. (2023). Teaching creative writing in primary schools: a systematic review of the literature through the lens of reflexivity. *English in Education*, 57(3), 1311–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00641-9>.
- Borg, W. R., Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research : an introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Camacho, A., Alves, R. A., & Boscolo, P. (2021). *Writing motivation in school: A systematic review of empirical research in the early twenty-first century*. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(1), 213–247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09530-4> (ERIC).
- 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>.
- Dahlström, H. (2019). Digital writing tools from the student perspective: Access, affordances, and agency. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(2), 1563–1581. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-018-9844-x>.
- Donnelly, D. (2015). Creative writing as knowledge: Whats assessment got to do with it? *New Writing*, 12(2), 222–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2015.1042390>.
- Fang, X., Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., & Chu, S. K. W. (2023). A systematic review of artificial intelligence technologies used for story writing. In *Education and Information Technologies* (Vol. 28, Issue 11). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11741-5>.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). *The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions*. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218–226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>.
- Gazela, A. L., & Suhami. (2024). *The effect of quick write strategy on students' ability in writing exposition text*. *Indonesian Journal of Studies on Humanities, Social Sciences and Education*, 1(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.54783/bdb3wg18>
- Gustiani, S. (2019). Research and Development (R&D) Method as a Model Design in Educational Research and Its Alternatives. *Holistics Journal*, 11(2), 12–22. <https://jurnal.polsri.ac.id/index.php/holistic/article/view/1849>.
- Hockly, N. (2016). *Focus on learning technologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2020). Englishes in the expanding circle: Focus on asia. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(3), 551–568. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-551-568>.
- Maley, A., & Peachey, N. (Eds.). (2015). *Creativity in the English language classroom*. British Council.
- Mansoor, A. (2010). Teaching creative writing to university level second language learners in Pakistan. *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, 7(3), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790726.2010.514052>.
- Nobles, S., & Paganucci, L. (2015). *Do digital writing tools deliver? Student perceptions of writing quality using digital tools and online writing environments*. *Computers and Composition*, 38, 16–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2015.09.001>.
- OECD. (2021). *Beyond Academic Learning: First Results from the OECD Survey on Social and Emotional Skills*. OECD Publishing
- Prescott, L. (2012). Life writing and life-learning: An analysis of creative writing students' work. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 34(2), 145–157.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2011.609163>.
- Quvanch, Z., & Kew, S. N. (2022). Evaluating Afghanistan University students' writing anxiety in English class: An empirical research. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2040697>.
- Rabadi, R. I., & Rabadi, A. D. (2020). Do medical students experience writing anxiety while learning English as a foreign language? *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 13, 883–893. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S276448>.
- Rakhimova, S. (2025). *The role of process writing approach in enhancing student writing performance*. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 5(1), 1035–1038.
- Richards, J.C. (2015). Technology in Language Teaching Today. *Journal on English Language Teaching*, 10, 18-32.
- Sabti, A. A., Md Rashid, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Darmi, R. (2019). The Impact of Writing Anxiety, Writing Achievement Motivation, and Writing Self-Efficacy on Writing Performance: A Correlational Study of Iraqi Tertiary EFL Learners. *SAGE Open*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019894289>.
- Saghafi, K., Adel, S. M. R., & Zareian, G. (2017). An Ecological Study of Foreign Language Writing Anxiety in English as a Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 46(5), 424–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2017.1367954>.
- Sugiyono (2015). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D* (cet. 22). Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). *College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language*. *System*, 90, 102221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221>.
- Teng, M. F., & Yue, M. (2023). *Metacognitive writing strategies, critical thinking skills, and academic writing performance: A structural equation modeling approach*. *Metacognition and Learning*, 18(1), 237–260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-022-09328-5>.
- Tu, I. J. (2021). Developing self-directed learning strategies through creative writing: Three case studies of snowball writing practice in a college Chinese language classroom. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 41(October 2020), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100837>.
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2021). *Teaching and Researching Motivation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351006743>.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997>.
- Widjaja, A., Nabila, D. K., Carissa, N., Anggristiany, T. Y., Salwa, P. A., & Setiasih, S. (2024). *The effectiveness of expressive writing on students' subjective well-being*. *Jurnal Psikologi Tabularasa*, 19(2), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.26905/jpt.v19i2.13980>.
- Yang, W., & Kim, Y. (2020). The effect of topic familiarity on the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of second language writing. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(1), 79–108. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2017-0017>.
- Yunus, M. M., Halem, K. N., Junaidi, Y., & Suliman, A. (2020). *Using "The Write Stuff" module to enhance the writing skills of ESL primary school students*. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 9(4), 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.23.2020.94.315-329>.
- Zhang, C., & Zhang, W. (2022). The Impact of Academic Procrastination on Second Language Writing: The Mediating Role of L2 Writing Anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(May), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.851120>