T.C.
ATATÜRK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DIVISION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

WRITING APPREHENSION OF ENGLISH FOREIGN LANGUAGE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

(İngilizce Eğitim Gören Lisans Öğrencilerinin Yazma Kaygıları)

MASTER THESIS

Canan AKSAKALLI

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Oktay YAĞIZ

ERZURUM
February, 2011

KABUL VE ONAY TUTANAĞI

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Oktay YAĞIZ danışmanlığında, Canan AKSAKALLI tarafından hazırlanan "Writing Apprehension of English Foreign Language Undergraduate Students" başlıklı çalışma 04 / 02 / 2011 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı'nda Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Oktay YAĞIZ   İmza:

Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Muzaffer BARIN   İmza:

Jüri Üyesi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Savaş YEŞİLYURT   İmza:

Yukarıdaki imzaların adı geçen öğretim üyelerine ait olduğunu onaylarım.

04 /02 / 2011

Prof. Dr. H. Ahmet KIRKKILIÇ

Enstitü Müdürü

TEZ ETİK VEBİLDİRİM SAYFASI

Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak sunduğum Writing Apprehension of English Foreign Language Undergraduate Students"başlıklı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden olduğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve onurumla doğrularım.

Tezimin kâğıt ve elektronik kopyalarının Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü arşivlerinde aşağıda belirttiğim koşullarda saklanmasına izin verdiğimi onaylarım.

Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca gereğinin yapılmasını arz ederim.

■ Tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

☐ Tezim sadece Atatürk Üniversitesi yerleşkelerinden erişime açılabilir.

☐ Tezimin 3 yıl süreyle erişime açılmasını istemiyorum. Bu sürenin sonunda uzatma için başvuruda bulunmadığım takdirde, tezimin tamamı her yerden erişime açılabilir.

04/02/2011

İmza

Canan AKSAKALLI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER FIVE

ABSTRACT

MASTER'S THESIS

WRITING APPREHENSION OF ENGLISH FOREING LANGUAGE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Canan AKSAKALLI
2011, 112 Pages

For many undergraduate EFL students, learning to compose in English is a difficult and challenging process. They avoid writing because of their unpleasant past experiences in English writing classes and negative attitudes toward writing. Also some students consider writing classroom as a hostile environment and this situation leads to negative effects on their writing ability. If the classroom becomes a nonthreatening environment that encourages students to take risks, students may become less apprehensive and more effective writers.

This study investigates writing apprehension in EFL students, to what extend classroom practices affect writing apprehension and how teachers' roles are influential on reducing writing apprehension. It also examines students' feelings and attitudes towards writing. Data for the study involves a quantitative study and Writing Apprehension Test, also known The Daly-Miller Apprehension Scale and accepted as an empirical method to measure apprehension was administered to determine students' writing apprehension levels to 226 undergradute EFL students. Test was analyzed in terms of students' age, gender and class.

The analysis of the data revealed that all participants experienced some form of apprehension in writing classes. Also results display students' age, gender and class influence their levels of apprehension. As this study suggests, writing is an unrewarding and challenging process for undergraduate EFL students and necessary precautions should be taken to reduce students' writing apprehension.

Key Words: Writing apprehension, Foreign language writing, Affective factors

ÖZET

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

İNGİLİZCE EĞİTİMİ GÖREN LİSANS ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN YAZMA KAYGILARI
Canan AKSAKALLI
2011, 112 sayfa

Birçok yabancı dil eğitimi gören lisans öğrencisi için, yazmayı öğrenmek zor ve sıkıntı verici bir süreçtir. Öğrenciler, İngilizce yazma derslerinde edindikleri olumsuz deneyimleri ve yazmaya karşı olumsuz tutumları dolayısıyla yazmaktan kaçınırlar. Ayrıca, bazı öğrenciler yazma dersini soğuk bir ortam olarak görürler ve bu durum onların yazma kabiliyetlerinde olumsuz etkilere neden olur. Eğer sınıf ortamı yıldırıcı olmazsa, öğrenciler yazma konusunda daha az endişeli ve daha yetenekli olabilirler.

Bu çalışma İngilizce eğitimi gören öğrencilerin yazma kaygılarını, sınıf etkinliklerinin bu yazma korkularını ne derece etkilediğini ve öğretmenlerin yazma korkusunu azaltmada ne kadar etkili olduğunu araştırmaktadır. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin yazmaya karşı tutum ve hislerini inceler. Bu çalışma niceliksel bir çalışmadır ve Daly-Miller Test olarak da bilinen ve yazma kaygılarını ölçmede deneysel bir metot olarak kabul edilen "Writing Apprehension Test" 226 lisan öğrencisinin yazma kaygılarını belirlemek için kullanılmıştır. Test öğrencilerin yaş, sınıf ve cinsiyetleri açısından analiz edilmiştir.

Data analizi bütün katılımcıların yazma kaygısı yaşadığın ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ayrıca, sonuçlar öğrencilerin yaş, sınıf ve cinsiyetlerinin onların yazma kaygılarındaki seviyeyi etkilediğini göstermektedir. Çalışma, İngilizce eğitimi gören öğrenciler için yazmanın zor ve istenmeyen bir süreç olduğunu ve yazma kaygılarını azaltmak için gerekli önlemlerin alınması gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yazma kaygıları, Yabancı dilde yazma, Duygusal faktörler

LIST OF TABLES

ABBREVIATIONS

EFL   : English Foreign Language

SLA   : Second Language Acquisition

ESL   : English Second Language

EAP   : English for Academic Purposes

FLCAS   : Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

FLA   : Foreign Language Anxiety

STAI   : State-Trait Anxiety Inventory

MAS   : Manifest Anxiety Scale

WAT   : Writing Apprehension Test

WA   : Writing Anxiety

WB   : Writer's Block

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A person writing a dissertation needs extensive support from his professional and social communities. There are many people who deserve acknowledgements for their contributions to me to complete this work.

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Oktay YAĞIZ at Atatürk University of Erzurum who was a constant source of much needed prodding. Without his knowledge, unwavering patience, and wisdom, I would not have succeeded. I must be lucky to have such a brilliant supervisor to help me to pursue the dissertation.

I am very grateful to Assist. Prof. Dr. Savaş YEŞİLYURT, who took his own time to revise the drafts of my thesis. I would also wish to Express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr Muzaffer BARIN for his contributions.

I want to thank my family, especially to my endlessly supportive husband Emre Aksakallı who did everything to help me write this dissertation. I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues who encouraged me to study and took interest in my work for their helps.Finally, undergraduate students participating in this study have my gratitude and my affection.

Erzurum -2011   **Canan Aksakallı**

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Statement and Background of the Problem

Composing process is seen as a series of decisions and choices and it requires inquiry, presence of mind and teacher's total dedication to encourage students to use their writing abilities. In the early years of teaching writing, educators concentrated on written products, grammatical correctness and form. However, new approaches began to arouse the interest of teachers and researchers after 1970's. These approaches required some processes such as generating, formulating and revising writer's ideas, in other words, meaning has been focused more than form, punctuation and correct grammar.

Writing is a process that disturbs many undergraduate students as college writing is more difficult than what high or secondary schools require. Most EFL students remember their past challenges with writing for evaluation and their understandings of themselves as writers are developed by their writing experiences in writing classes. They often keep experiencing difficulties in writing since they are conditioned to anticipate failure. Apprehensive students also are prone to evaluate their writing as a habit composed of apprehension and inhibitions of generating ideas.

Writing apprehension is a term firstly coined by Daly and Miller (1975a) and since 1970s, it has been determined that writing apprehension has a major impact on students' success in writing. Daly and Miller developed a scale to rate the degree of apprehension of EFL learners based on their experiences and attitudes toward writing. Studies carried out using Daly-Miller Test led to the results that writing apprehension is a major factor in students' writing skills and does not allow them to write well. Ranging from high to low, writing apprehension has different levels ad it is present in a variety of degrees of severity.

If students have low levels of apprehension, their writing performance may be affected positively since this apprehension encourages students to make more effort for their writing. Outside considerations such as fear of evaluation or making error may shape levels of apprehension. Students with high apprehension are likely to write more shallow and undeveloped papers than those with low apprehension.

Teacher comments are also the main source of writing apprehension. Bardine, (1999); Bardine, Bardine, & Deegan, (2000); Lunsford &Straub, (2006) describe teacher comments as "any written response given on, or with respect to, student papers. These include symbols, words, phrases, complete sentences, or even paragraphs" (cited in Hanna, 2009, p.13). EFL students could regard teachers' evaluations as a confirmation of their self-judgment of lack in second language and they think that writing is a manifestation and revelation of this lack. In conclusion, students avoid taking risks in writing. So teachers should know what kind of comments result in positive effect on student apprehension and writing.

The reason why teacher comments are important is the belief that writing apprehension is caused by negative teacher responses. According to this view, investigating the impact of teacher comments is important and worthy; given teacher comments play a part in occurrence of writing apprehension. Comment placement, appearance, tone as the variables of teacher comments may change student writing apprehension level. It should be recalled that every written comment on the papers must convey a purpose and a distinct goal. The students have to comprehend the comments as well as transfer them for their future writing assignments. Teachers must be sure that they do not allow their students feel that comments on their papers are something like vague, negative, and unfocused. Bardine, Bardine, and Deegan, (2000) also emphasize the importance of giving students opportunity to revise their writing in order to make their comments more influential on students.

Most writing researchers concur that writing is a challenging skill for many undergraduate students even if they attend writing classes. In spite of the view that writing apprehension is a problem for undergraduates and high school students, graduate students also try to cope with this problem interfering with their ability to write well. They often tend to write papers with grammatical and spelling errors.

Error correction has been one of the main concerns of researchers for years and especially teachers are interested in helping their students write more skillfully, but some students tend to fail to write because of their deficit in producing accurate texts. Ferris (2010) investigates this issue and whether there is a distinction between SLA and L2 writing. She (2010) persuasively addresses error correction in L2 writing and the question of whether error correction helps students improve the overall quality of their texts. She defines writing as "a form of language production and the ability to write effectively in a L2 is part of communicative competence for many learners" (p. 182).

Ferris (2010) concludes that corrective feedback would be useful for students in long-term language acquisition and writing development. The fact that error correction which focuses on narrowly drawn features does not emphasize more complex and problematic errors made by students, results in blocking meaning and inhibition of communication and correction feedback. Written CF strategy is not effective for complex sentence structure errors because it sees syntactic, morphological and lexical errors in the same way as narrowly drawn features.

Students' apprehension which they have experienced in communication situations can be assessed in the same way as writing apprehension. Apprehensive students speak less and have less confidence that leads them to protect themselves by avoiding punishing communication issues. Unlike apprehensive speakers, those who are less apprehensive and confident tend to be ready to communicate and to be in efforts to convince and have an impact on others.

Prior conditioning seems to be the source of communication apprehension like the children who are punished because of their attempts to communicate during elementary school or before undergraduate years. Prior conditioning is likely effective on level of writing apprehension as well as communication apprehension because students who have negative experiences avoid the risk of attending writing tasks and the situations have damaging effects on self-esteem.

Students' writing skills do not improve when they are apprehensive and avoid writing situations. Despite mastering certain grammatical structures of the language, they may not know how to control them. They write poorly and expect failure when

writing is compulsory due to the lack of necessary competence which is acquired with experience. Highly apprehensive students choose less intense words and this affects the message intensity of writing. About this issue based on the study they carried out, Daly and Miller (1974) concludes "there is a tendency for individuals with high anxiety about oral communication to also be apprehensive about written communication." (cited in Book, 1976, p. 6).

Hanna (2009) explains the reasons of the lack of writing skills:

Often, the lack of writing skill among college graduates is blamed on poor teaching, inadequate curricular requirements, a lack of stringent grading and evaluation, or simple failure on the part of schools and instructors to teach the basic grammar and punctuation skills that employers remember learning in their own school years. While it may be true that teaching techniques and content have changed over the years, a far greater cause of student inability to write clearly may be writing apprehension (p. 2).

Cognitive processes in writing point the need for more attention on writing skills and teachers' practices used to develop students' writing skills. The relationship between cognitive skills and attitudes toward writing directs researchers toward writing skills students have. Researchers claim that investigating the relationship between cognitive processes and writing leads to a more complex process and it is necessary to examine affective factors to solve this problem.

So for many years, a great body of research has been dedicated to investigate the relationship between students' writing self-efficacy beliefs, other affective factors such as motivation, anxiety and different writing outcomes. At this point, the importance of self efficacy beliefs arises since researchers assume students' success instrumentally depends on beliefs about their writing competence.

Since students' beliefs differ in level, generality and strength, it is important to correlate efficacy to a writing outcome. Self-efficacy beliefs regarded as a component of motivation in writing and produced, developed, and remained by students are

considerable instruments in students' success and failure. For example, confidence leads great interest and attention to a writing task and makes students feel less apprehensive and higher self-esteem.

Pajares, Johnson, Usher (2007) explain Bandura's social cognitive theory (1986) as human agency which enables individuals to be occupied with their own development and to do things with their actions. This theory provides that social environment constructs all meaning and results of behaviors, even if they are positive or negative, support or inhibit their use. It may appear in other people as well as the students observing behaviors and results discussed. People's beliefs play critically a part in the exercise of control and human agency. Pajares (2003) discusses individuals' behaviours in this theory:

> Individuals are viewed as proactive and self-regulating rather than reactive and controlled by biological and environmental forces. Also in this view, individuals are understood to possess self-beliefs that enable them to exercise a measure of control over their thoughts, feelings, and actions (p. 139).

Social cognitive theory clarifies that many facets relevant to teachers' behaviors and beliefs may reduce writing apprehension. Bandura (1986) exemplifies that when students are aware that teachers display the behaviors experienced by them, they will be motivated to take part in classroom activities more willingly. Also experiencing success is a factor that motivates students and leads to a decrease in level of writing apprehension. Students who feel the control of their writing can be easily directed toward writing more.

Pajares (2007) agrees with the notion of social cognitive theory that students will be less apprehensive and tend to engage in different kinds of writing which are apparently appreciated by the teacher. Wood and Bandura (1989) emphasize three aspects of social cognitive theory related to the organizational field; "the development of people's cognitive, social, and behavioral competencies through mastery modeling, the cultivation of people's beliefs in their capabilities so that they will use their talents effectively, and the enhancement of people's motivation through goal systems" (p. 362).

If people have self efficacy beliefs which refer to belief to be able to produce the issues they want, they will have enough motivation to cope with difficulties, stress and depression and the effects of self efficacy beliefs influence each aspect of life. Competence of students and age are effective factors in correlations of writing self efficacy and writing performance.

To find out how individuals improve their beliefs and how their beliefs affect their writing performance, sources underlying students' self efficacy should be examined. Bandura (1997) developed four hypothesized sources of self-efficacy beliefs. These are mastery experience, modeling also known as vicarious experience, social persuasion and physiological and emotional states. Mastery experience refers students' previous performances in academic tasks. If students evaluate their past experiences as successful, these efforts increase their beliefs, unlike this; the evaluations as failure decrease their self efficacy. In second type of source that is not as strong as the first one in developing self efficacy, students observe others' performing tasks and model them and this situation has an impact on their self efficacy. Teachers or students' peers may be presented as models when editing skills and writing are observed.

Social persuasion is another source influencing self efficacy and received from others such as oral comments. It is something like persuading students to believe that they are capable of writing. Here is an important tip whether judgment made by others is positive or negative. While positive persuasions motivate students to write and believe their capabilities, negative comments destroy and weaken self efficacy. Physiological and emotional states including stress, apprehension, and mood states are based on the situations in which students guess their confidence levels according to their physiological experiences and emotional reactions indicating expected success or failure. Students' negative expectations and fears may lower their self efficacy beliefs and cause inadequate performance in writing.

Studies carried on the influence of four sources on writing self efficacy beliefs are not consistent with each other. While some of them conclude that vicarious experience contributes to self efficacy, others do not accept this. Pajares, Johnson, Usher (2007) explains that these inconsistent results stem from the context sensitivity of

self-efficacy beliefs and the sources affect self efficacy at different levels and in different academic areas and every source prevails at different concepts.

Gender functions differently in terms of sources of self-efficacy. According to the study carried out by Pajares, Johnson, Usher (2007), girls display greater mastery experience, vicarious experience and social persuasions as well as stronger writing self efficacy and lower writing apprehension and are evaluated by their teachers as better writers. School levels also show differences that elementary school students have stronger mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasions and stronger self-efficacy than middle or high school students.

Pajares, Johnson, Usher (2007) conclude mastery experience was founded the strongest predictor of self-efficacy for boys, girls and the students in the elementary, middle and high school. Students at high school are influenced by social persuasions in developing self-efficacy beliefs whereas writing anxiety is more influential in elementary and middle school students' writing self-efficacy beliefs. As a result, girls' self-efficacy is stronger than boys and self-efficacy reduces as students take steps from elementary school to high school and students' writing apprehension and stress stem from a reduced writing self-efficacy.

Pajares (2003) examines three ways of assessing writing self-efficacy. Measurement of learners' confidence through writing skills is the first way. In this type, it is required to measure students' confidence related to use grammar, usage, composition organizing skills, and creating meaning or more specific skills about writing a story in which students should tell characters' feelings, setting or organization of events. Measuring confidence through writing tasks completed by students is the second way of assessing writing self efficacy. These tasks consist of writing a term paper, a short fiction story and a letter.

Pajares (2003) reveals the study made by Pajares and Johnson (1994) investigating the use of writing skills and tasks self efficacy to measure undergraduates' writing performance and it was found that while writing skills self efficacy serves as a predictor of writing performance, writing tasks self efficacy does not. The third way of assessing writing self efficacy beliefs requires asking students to evaluate their own

levels of confidence and then comparison of these evaluations with the actual grades attained.

It is clear that there is a correlation between self-efficacy and writing performance and other variables including writing apprehension, grade goals, deptf of processing and anticipated outcomes (Pajares, 2003). Writing apprehension viewed as one of the motivation constructs has been used in self-efficacy studies and refers a student's willingness to write. Efforts made by researchers have shed light on the fact that if self-efficacy beliefs are under control, the effect of writing apprehension on writing performance can be reduced.

Teachers' behaviors referring expectations about student writing cause an increase of apprehension in student. Bandura (1997) suggests the way of students' perceptions of teachers' skills and behaviors in a class would help students get a success even if students' behaviors are different from them. The fact that students consider writing as functional and helpful leads to decline in writing apprehension.

When the relationship between teachers' behaviors and students' writing apprehension is considered, it can be observed that students may perceive teachers' behaviors as models for them. According to Wood and Bandura (1989), learning through modeling one's actions make students expand their knowledge and skills as this way of learning is based on the information transferred by modeling influences. They claim when students get competence and ability only through direct experience, their development would be restricted.

Wood and Bandura (1989) propose four mechanisms that govern modeling. Attentional processes help people choose the constant activities in which they observe in abundance of models. It is important in this process to remember the observed accomplishments. Representational processes are the second mechanisms working for modeling and involve "an active process of transforming and restructuring information about events in the form of rules and conceptions" (Wood and Bandura, 1989, p.362). People convert modeled knowledge into memory codes and practice the coded knowledge.

Behavioral production processes are the third sub-function in modeling. Wood and Bandura (1989) explain this process as "a conception-matching process, in which people's centrally guided patterns of behavior are enacted and the adequacy of their actions is compared against their conceptual model" (p. 362). People then revise the behavior to attain close correlation between their conceptions and actions. Key point is to have many subskills because integration of the skills will be easier if there are enough subskills.

Motivational processes are the last sub-function. Motivation affects the performance of behaviors learned by modeling. Because successful models motivate people as they think models are similar to them. They pursue self-satisfying activities and refuse disapproval ones.

1.2. Significance of the Study

This study is significant in several ways. Firstly, in study, a consistent definition of writing process and writing apprehension may help provide a common understanding of these constructs. It allows a sampling of undergraduate EFL students in English writing classes to talk about their emotions, fears, likes and dislikes in composing in a foreign language. Meanwhile, the findings of this study will supply ESL writing instructors some insights into the ways that feelings, past experiences, learning styles influence students' apprehension level. Also, findings will clarify some reasons why EFL learners acquire composing skills more easily than others. The results of the study must be attributed to the existing body of research in EFL students' writing apprehension.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

Many students graduated from high school are inadequate to be an undergraduate student. This causes them to have writing apprehension, and prevents them from choosing correct careers. One way of investigating how students view

writing is to measure the effects of writing apprehension on students and what the relationship between writing and apprehension is.

The general purpose of the study is to describe the experience of writing apprehension and to compare highly apprehensive students with students who have low writing apprehension. Another purpose of this quantitative study is to explore to what extend writing apprehension affects English writing development by examining EFL learners' experiences about writing. A quantitative study was conducted to understand the difficulties and feelings that undergraduate students experience in their efforts to learn composing. The study gave students the opportunity to express their feelings, perceptions, and experiences about writing. Results of the questionnaire may serve as an identifying tool to help teachers evaluate the effect of their strategies on learners.

1.4. Limitations of the Study

It is of significance that foreign language writing challenges and affective difficulties described and discussed in this study represent only the undergraduate student subjects in English teaching department. However, as having different pedagogical writing implementations, the undergraduate students from other disciplines were excluded in this study. Therefore, findings in the current study may not encompass all the processes and manners and challenges of all disciplines. Since the undergraduate students of English departments were taken as the scope of the study, it is important to note that the suggestions may not necessarily represent the best methods that all EFL students should follow. Given that the number of the subjects (n=223) as for the data source, the results cannot be generalized to whole Turkish students' context.

1.5. Overview of the Dissertation

In the first chapter, the rationale of the study, the specific questions to be specifically pursued, and significance, purpose and the limitations of the dissertation are given. Chapter 2 examines the related theories and empirical results and analyzes their implications for the current study. This chapter begins with foreign language writing,

which focuses on varying definitions and the approaches of writing. Following this, these approaches are described. This chapter also reviews literature on affective factors of writing, language learning anxiety, definition and types of apprehension and writing apprehension. In Chapter 3, the introduction of the methodology is given. Then the research design, participants, instrument, the procedure of the data collection and the analyses of the data are shown. In Chapter 4, the results of the data of the study are presented. First, the analyses of the quantitative data indicate the effects of writing apprehension and difficulties of the undergraduate student participants. In Chapter 5, the conclusions of the study are discussed, and certain pedagogical implications are provided.

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

    2.1. Foreign Language Writing

Writing became an important factor in language learning in the mid 20th century and since then many studies have been conducted to examine the role of teaching writing and the process of composing in a language classroom. There has been a significant increase in students' needs to improve their writing skills and writing is used almost in all occupational and academic fields as well as oral skills and that being the case, researchers have dedicated much effort to develop more beneficial approaches in foreign language writing.

According to Warnock (1983) there are many definitions of writing varied by culture, society and time. Thornton (2010) defines writing as "a part of the literacy instruction in which ideas and thoughts are presented in a written form" (p. 12). Writing in all ages can be very challenging for most learners and it may be helpful to know how writing is perceived by students and samples of students' writing assignments should be analyzed to investigate if there are changes in their writing and it is fundamental to point out that teachers provide students the necessary writing skills and strategies to get professional experiences.

Writing can be viewed as a process in which some theoretical principles and approaches are examined and by means of writing process students and teachers communicate ideas and thoughts and teachers encourage students with new techniques and methods to improve the writing process of students. Grinnell (2003) defines writing as "learned process of shaping experiences into text, allowing the writer to discover, develop, clarify, and communicate thoughts and feelings" (p. 14). Approaches based on form and correctness of grammar discouraged students from more significant considerations such as discovery, creativity and composing process itself, but new methods adopted by teachers focus on communication and the composing process rather

than usage and supply teachers with strategies to learn how to write before teaching writing. In this case Grinnell (2003) implies improvement of thinking skills are needed and supported in writing.

Harris and Hodges (1995) define writing process as "the many aspects of the complex act of producing a written communication; specifically, planning or prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing" (p. 285). Flower and Hayes (1981) identify three skills including planning, translating, revising within writing process. The first process is planning in which students generate content and organize ideas logically. Flower and Hayes (1981) describe planning that is more abstract and includes sub-processes such as generating ideas, organizing and goal-setting as "the internal representation of the knowledge will be used in writing" (p. 372). Generating ideas refers to the retrieval of related knowledge from long-term memory and writers determine categories and constitute new concepts. According to Flower and Hayes (1981), goal-setting is the process of defining one's own rhetorical problem. It is formed by writer and interrelated to generating ideas and organizing as this process continues during the composing process. Planning increases student's responsibility and writing performance and interactive learning between teachers and students. Translating is a means of committing ideas which are generated in the process of planning to paper and the name of this process is specially chosen as Flower and Hayes (1981) explain "We have chosen the term "translate" for this process over other terms such as "transcribe" or "write" in order to emphasize the peculiar qualities of the task." (p. 373).

Revising the last component of writing process requires making any changes in the writing process. Schnee (2010) argues "Revising strategies will include identifying problems with the text, determining the necessary changes, and implementing the changes." (p. 26).

Zamel (1982) defines writing as "a process through which meaning is created" (p. 195). Since this notion indicates the importance of writing teachers' intervention throughout writing process, revision is regarded as the main component. Shrewsbury (1995) makes a clear definition of revision:

This is the name given to the step in writing which follows an initial draft. It includes activities which change the first draft. It includes such strategies as rearranging words, phrases sentences, paragraphs; selecting the most specific and precise vocabulary; striving for voice, centering on audience; and adding or eliminating details or ideas (p. 15).

Fitzgerald and Markham (1987) argue that revision could influence writer's knowledge and it might progress the quality of writing assignments. Students may encounter some difficulties during revision in finding discrepancies between intended and written paper, knowing where and how to make desired changes and perform it. Schnee (2010) claims that being overloaded and overwhelmed can cause these difficulties. Intervention studies including facilitative efforts and giving feedback and directions to students about revision should be executed in the classroom so as to reduce these writing difficulties and to encourage students to revise. Reducing writing difficulties also, points to how composition could be taught effectively in the EFL classrooms.

Silva and Leki (2004) define foreign language writing as "the study and teaching of writing done in a language other than one's mother tongue__ or perhaps better, one's mother hand" (p. 3). They (2004) summarize the history of EFL writing with the following sentences:

In the latter half of the 20th century, writing and the teaching of writing began to receive significant attention as a legitimate area of inquiry within applied linguistics. With the growth of composition studies in North America and the parallel development of the field of L2 writing, the study and teaching of L2 writing has evolved into an interdisciplinary field, drawing on work in composition studies in addition to work in applied linguistics (p. 5).

Zamel (1976) focuses on how to teach writing and what approaches teachers should adopt to make students write competently. Competence in the foreign language maintains the culmination of other language skills leading to writing and this notion requires the mastery of listening, speaking and reading. Many researches by

methodologists were based on practical exercises concerned with grammatical manipulations of models, sentences or passages not with learning grammar.

According to these methodologists, writing is a habit-formed skill as in audio-lingual methodology. Thus, error correction and revision requiring control and guidance are the main components of this approach. However, it is suggested the necessity of teaching students to compose and express their thoughts without considering revision which does not have enough effect on the syntactic competency of students' composition process and this situation is explained as other areas of writing curriculum (such as reading, sentence patterning, imitation, and oral expression) may have greater effect on the syntactic maturity of student writing.

Frequency in writing is seen as the main aspect by some researchers as they claim writing more than usual frequency results in fewer error and improvement of writing. Kaplan (1967) stresses the importance of rhetoric to improve writing and defines rhetoric as "the method of organizing syntactic units into larger patterns" (p. 15). According to Kaplan (1967), one way of teaching writing in rhetoric is to imitate models by study of paragraphs and to manipulate the controlled models. Students should be taught logic of larger structures and grammatical patterns of language.

In this context, rhetoric, organization and style become main steps of writing development. Reading passages, imitation of their structures and control seem to be crucial.

Researchers beyond these notions have started investigating the composing process itself rather than what students write. Zamel (1976) emphasizes the significance of creative writing and expression of learner's feelings and experiences by writing:

> While this instruction might still entail some indirect teaching concerning particular structural problems, language study and rhetorical considerations, the primary emphasis should be upon the expressive and creative process of writing. The experience of composing could in this way have a purpose, that of communicating genuine thoughts and

experiences. ESL students could begin to appreciate English as another language to use, rather than just a second language to learn *(p. 74)*.

Rahilly (2004) assumes the English foreign language learners should acquire new ways of thinking, organizing and writing ideas in English which might have differences from the student's culturally acquired discourse patterns. He thinks so that organizing thoughts and ideas in a logical discourse is as important as writing down words in a correct syntax, punctuation and meaningful vocabulary. To write well, students should be exposed to good composition samples, which is one of the basic steps of foreign language writing. In this way, students both learn to write effectively and get abilities of thinking, communicating and creating meaning in foreign language.

Composition studies date back to the beginning of the 19th century and earlier studies focused on written product, that is to say, form, usage and structure were taken into consideration. Composing in foreign language means both to write words in correct syntax, spelling, mechanics and vocabulary and to arrange the thoughts and ideas into logical discourse. ESL learners' abilities of thinking, organizing and writing ideas are considerable of difference from writers' culturally learned discourse patterns. In this context Rahilly (2004) defines writing as "a process that requires the creator of texts to communicate, conceptualize, infer, create, organize and summarize thoughts and ideas in a given written language in different rhetorical forms and styles than in speech " (p. 29). By examining this definition, it can be possible to say that writing is different from speaking as writing necessiates mental effort and instruction is not as natural as speaking. Heuring (1985) defines composing processes as "the cognitive activities a writer engages in to facilitate the generation of ideas from the brain, the transfer of these ideas onto paper, and the subsequent improvement of these ideas" (p. 17).

Zamel (1982) states "how writers write, -where, ideas come from, how they are formulated and developed, what various stages of composing entail- was ignored"(p. 195). However, focus on written product was substituted for the focus on the composing process itself. New writing techniques and strategies focus on real communication and discovery of meaning.

Perl (1980) suggests discovery means to start with something which is inchoate and finish with something tangible. So what writers mean is discovered and constructed by seeing new things and discovering new meanings in written words. Writing process comes to an end with a product which leads to learn new things and get new experiences. This process can be regarded as discovery of meaning.

There are terms that Perl (1980) claims writers use in their writings. One of them is retrospective structuring used by skilled and unskilled writers to discover meaning by adopting themselves to write what they planned and using a formulaic method that refuses to discover new things and give emphasis on correctness and form. As for the term "projective structuring" coined by Perl (1980), it refers that writers consider themselves as the reader. Projective structuring requires not only to know certain grammatical rules and structure but to know how to address to reader's feelings. To do this, writer should experience being a reader so as to call up a felt sense of a reader.

Perl (1980) considers these two terms as parts of composing process and explains:

The former relies on the ability to go inside, to attend to what is there, from that attending to place words upon a page, and then to assess if those words adequately capture one's meaning. The latter relies on the ability to assess how the words on that page will affect someone other than the writer, the reader (p. 369).

Sommers (1980) explains writing strategies of student writers and experienced writers and investigates their writing procedure in terms of revision. While students make lexical changes in their writing, they do not view revision as making semantic changes. Also, less skilled writers do not take into account of modifications and developments of ideas and perspectives because they are more concerned with form and usage and grammar than with making the argument more effectively, revising an idea or discovering new meanings. In contrast to unskilled writers, the more experienced writers major on discovery of meaning in their revision activities. Skilled writers define their revision process as "finding the form or shape of their argument" (Sommers, 1980, p. 384). Emphasizing and exploiting the lack of clarity and

to discover the differences of meaning are the activities carried out by experienced writers. According to Sommers (1980), their revision process is based on two elements "a holistic perspective" and "a recursive process". The former sees revision as a whole necessity for form, balance, rhythm and communication and directs writer to revise all details. The latter includes recurring activities used by experienced writers. Sommers (1980) concludes that "It is a sense of writing as discovery-a repeated process of beginning over again, starting out new-that the students failed to have." (p. 387).

New approaches and orientations to foreign language writing have been achieved since 1945 and the most prominent approaches are controlled composition, current traditional rhetoric, the process approach, and English for specific purposes.

2.1.1. Controlled composition

Controlled composition has its origins in linguistics and applied linguistics and is based on audio-lingual method. Two tenets can be included in controlled composition; first one is language is speech and learning is habit formation. By undertaking these two ideas, Silva (1990) discusses that "writing was regarded as a secondary concern, essentially as reinforcement for oral habits." (p. 12). Controlled composition is a way of guiding students to write a correct composition. Paulston (1972) defines it as "applying techniques of control to writing exercises in order to achieve a correct composition" (p.36).

Owens (1970), (cited in Paulston, 1972) also discusses the advantages of using controlled composition as follows:

1. The new materials can be used at various levels.
2. They provide plenty of practice in writing correct forms, rather than practicing the incorrect forms of too hastily required free composition.
3. They allow the teacher to gauge and control the advance of the student towards such types of free composition as may be possible within the course.

4.They cover teaching points systematically and gradually, and hence link composition work to classroom instruction, and copy-writing to free-writing.

5. They are planned to fulfill a specific purpose, and are based on discernible principles.

6. They permit the learner to pace his own progress within limits.

7. They are not too difficult to produce, provided one has an itemized graded syllabus to work from, and a clear idea of the register restriction involved.

8. They lighten the teacher's load, since they are quick and easy to correct (p. 39).

Paulston (1972) represents the advantages of using techniques of controlled composition one of which enables teachers to "teach one thing at a time while focusing the student's conscious attention on the critical features of the language pattern " (p. 37). Meanwhile, students can practice writing correct paragraphs as much as they want. That is, frequent writing assignments can be given to students. It gives students a chance of asking questions when they are not sure that they have written in correct structures.

Rhetorical devices allow students to receive skill in composition by controlling these devices consisting of steps of determining a central idea, using this idea in all parts of composition and constituting material in a correct sequence. Since composing is based on control of sentence structures and correct mechanics, students do not practice errors, just write correctly the first time. Rhetorical devices include imitation of relevant sentence structures and this situation makes it inevitable to read well before writing grammatical patterns. By choosing some structures students have read, they manipulate these patterns and control their usages in writing papers.

Silva (1990) defines learning to write in second language as "an exercise in habit formation", writer "is simply a manipulator of previously learned language structures", and the reader "is the ESL teacher in the role of editor or proofreader, not especially interested in quality of ideas or expression but primarily concerned with formal linguistic patterns" (p. 13). So Silva (1990) claims that controlled composition is still

used in ESL composition classrooms and textbooks although recently it is not mentioned much.

2.1.2. Current-traditional rhetoric

Controlled composition was not comprehensive enough to supply students' needs and demands and to write more than building grammatical structures and this situation made methodologists aware of a new approach "current-traditional rhetoric" based on Kaplan's theory of contrastive rhetoric. Kaplan's theory of rhetoric refers to "the method of organizing syntactic units into larger patterns" (Kaplan, 1967, p. 15). He (1967) advocates it is necessary to teach paragraph patterns in the same technique as syntactic patterns are taught and it requires teaching how to determine what form they are supposed to make lower and why. Contrastive rhetoric is regarded with the way linguistic and cultural backgrounds affect the way that ideas are most strongly communicated in. Kaplan (1967) explains this theory with the statements as following:

> It needs to be accomplished at the rhetorical level by teaching the larger structures of modification; that is, the kinds of paragraphs which are intended to advance the thought of the whole essay as well as the kinds of paragraphs which are intended to go back over ground already covered and supply the necessary support, analogy, metaphor, illustration, etc. (p. 15).

As primary concerns are logical construction, arrangements of discourse forms and paragraphs, it is not surprising that various options such as illustration, exemplification, comparison, contrast, partition, classification are fundamentally taken into consideration. Since paragraphs are main concerns in this view, teachers can use such activities as asking students to analyze a model or select possible sentences within the context of a paragraph or discourse.

According to this view, a fully skilled writer can identify and execute related discourse patterns. Silva (1990) defines writing in this view of current traditional rhetoric as "basically a matter of arrangement of fitting sentences and paragraphs into prescribed patterns" (p. 14). Filling in a preexisting form with provided content may

lead a confusion of reader to an unfamiliar pattern of expression. Silva (1990) concludes current-traditional rhetoric is still used in ESL writing materials and classrooms like controlled composition.

Young (1978) advocates the features of this approach involve:

the emphasis on the composed product rather than the composition process; the analysis of discourse into description, exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis) ; the preoccupation with the informal essay and the research paper; and so on (p. 31).

2.1.3. The process approach

Since the early 1980's, the dominance of controlled composition and current-traditional rhetoric have faded away and attention has been given to the techniques of expressing ideas, generating meaning and thinking in writing process. The research carried out by Zamel (1983) shows that "composing is a non-linear, exploratory, and generative process whereby writers discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning." (p. 165). Experienced writers' behaviors of discovering and creating meaning directed researchers towards "the process approach". In process approach, writing procedure includes step by step brainstorming, prewriting, composing, editing and revising in the guidance of teachers. Based on her studies, Zamel (1983) explains students' writing attitudes as following:

These students explore their ideas and thoughts on paper, discovering in the act of doing so not only what these ideas and thoughts are, but also the form with which best to express them. Moreover, they recognize the importance of being flexible, starting anew when necessary, and continuing to rework their papers over time (p. 168).

In contrast to their skilled counterparts, unskilled writers view writing as "a static transcription of "a series of parts-words, sentences, paragraphs," rather than the creation of a whole discourse" (Zamel, 1983, p. 180). EFL teachers should teach

students to control language and to experience the processes of discovery and revision rather than teaching language form and correctness. In this view, Silva (1990) describes teachers' role with the sentence below:

> The teacher's role is to help students "develop viable strategies for getting started (finding topics, generating ideas and information, focusing, and planning structure and procedure), for drafting (encouraging multiple drafts), for revising (adding, deleting, modifying, and rearranging ideas); and for editing (attending to vocabulary, sentence structure, grammar and mechanics) (p. 15).

It can be brought to an end from the perspective of this type of the process approach writer can be seen as someone who integrates new ideas and revise them, reader concentrates on content, ideas and meaning and the text is a collection of ideas constructed and assessed by writer. Taylor (1981) describes writing as "a discovery procedure which relies heavily on the power of revision to clarify and refine that discovery" and this definition leads to three important teaching practices:

1. teaching students to fully outline and plan prior to writing rather than using writing as a discovery procedure;

2) teaching revision as a mechanical and formal editing job rather than as a powerful writing tool;

3) teaching students to fit their ideas into pre-existing organizational molds (implying that there is a limited number of supposedly correct ways to organize) rather than teaching them that organization grows out of meaning and ideas (p. 8).

The complexity of writing reveals the need of long practice and extensive experience. By considering the possible advantages of a writing program, creativity should be emphasized and the writing process should be central. Many written and oral activities which discover meaning lead to the process of putting those ideas together cohesively in writing. The situation of ESL students' active involvement and self discovery to express feelings and experiences competently is the basis of process approach. Taylor (1981) suggests extensive reading and by stressing its value, he adds:

This value stems not just from content but also from the exposure it gives students to a variety of culturally appropriate rhetorical and stylistic writing options, organizational patterns, and patterns of logic and support. Extensive reading also fosters vocabulary growth and the acquisition of syntax, all in context (p. 12).

2.1.4. English for academic purposes

English for academic purposes was developed because of reaction to the process approach and the attempt to create new perspective on composition. Flowerdew and Peacock (2001) states: "English for Academic Purposes (EAP) - the teaching of English with the specific aim of helping learners to study, conduct research or teach in that language- is an international activity of tremendous scope." (p. 8). This approach fulfills the needs related to "differences in individuals, writing tasks, and situations; the development of schemata for academic discourse; language proficiency; level of cognitive development; and insights from the study of contrastive rhetoric" (Silva, 1990, p. 16).

EAP can be regarded to be one of two branches of English for Specific Purposes and related to English for Biology, English for Mathematics, and English for Economics. Strevens (1988a) suggests four characteristics of ESP/ EAP including in English language teaching that is:

1. designed to meet specified needs of the learner
2. related in content (i. e. in its themes and topics) to particular disciplines, occupations and activities
3. centered on the language appropriate to those activities in syntax, lexis, discourse, semantics etc., and analysis of this discourse
4. in contrast with 'General English' (cited in Flowerdew and Peacock 2001, p. 13).

English for Academic Purposes prepares students for academic work and a variety of academic writing tasks. While process approach stresses psychological

functioning of individuals much, this approach is a way of being socialized to the academic life. It included in the activities of "recreating the conditions under which actual university writing tasks are done and involves the close examination and analysis of academic discourse formats and writing task specifications; the selection and intensive study of source materials; the evaluation, screening, synthesis, and organization of relevant data from these sources; and the presentation of these data in acceptable academic English form (Silva, 1990, p. 17).

In view of English for academic purposes, students are generally asked to evaluate and synthesize material from different sources to create a perspective on a given topic. To Spack (1988), skills such as evaluating and selecting and synthesizing information can be transferable to the writing assignments which should be performed by students in their academic professions. So, the transferability of these skills needs insuring by ESP teachers. Teachers can do this effectively when they clearly know the tasks faced in the university; have an understanding of the information-processing problems which these tasks involve, and control in reproducing these tasks in the EAP classroom.

2.2. Affective Factors of Writing

In examining the issue of composing in language learning classes, it seems clear that writing is a very complex process with its social, cognitive and affective factors. Affective factors influence all phases of the writing process. A variety of affective factors include emotions, feelings, moods, motivations and attitudes which affect students' writing negatively or positively. These factors influence a developmental writing process and writer's performance as they are related to writer's thinking and creative processes. Mcleod (1987) argues:

> The term "affective" refers to the domain of emotions and feelings. These can vary in intensity from "cold" (preferences, moods attitudes, where the organism is not highly aroused) to "hot" (emotional states characterized by activation of the autonomic nerves system- tense muscles, increased heartbeat, sweaty palms) (p. 427).

Gay (1983) divides attitudes into three dimensions as cognitive, affective and behavioral and explains affective dimension as "a situation of representing the degree of positive or negative feeling an individual toward an attitude object" (p. 13). Affective factors could prevent students from writing and class participation as well as encouraging them to participate in classroom activities and write since they could be negative and positive. It is highly probable that students may experience positive feelings of satisfaction, joy and excitement if they manage to write successfully while increased negative feeling may occur when students are forced to write skillfully. Stevick (1976b, 1999) explains two reasons that influence foreign language writing as following. First of all, it can be encountered with positive or negative effects of emotions on foreign language learning process. This situation is seen especially in academic writing acquisition processes which are viewed as difficult processes. The second reason is that apprehension, fear of evaluation, low self esteem and other negative emotions may cause psychological damage in English foreign language learners and as a result of this, language learning may decrease or essentially stop (cited in Rahilly, 2004, p. 42).

Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) created a theory called affective filter indicating "part of the internal processing system that subconsciously screens incoming language based on what psychologists call affect": the learners' motives, needs, attitudes and emotional states" (p. 46). This view was developed by Krashen (1984) in his Affective Filter Hypothesis including a variety of variables such as motivation, self esteem, self confidence, and anxiety. Krashen (1985) describes affective filter as "a mental block that prevents acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition" (p. 100).

These variables have a facilitative role in foreign language learning and try to find out why ESL students have difficulties, anxiety and stress in English language learning. According to this hypothesis, when learners have high motivation, self confidence and a low level of anxiety, which means if students' emotional filter is low, they are more inclined to learn language. In contrast, if they have low motivation, low self esteem and high levels of anxiety, they develop a mental block, that is their emotional filter is high, and they show little actual improvement in language learning.

Krashen (1982) contends that an affective filter masters on the variables of apprehension, motivation, and self-confidence throughout the process of learning a foreign language. Students' abilities may be developed or destructed by these psychological variables. Being relaxed, motivated and self confident is required to develop their learning capacity.

Experienced writers are better equipped with positive emotional reactions to the writing assignments which are unfamiliar while unskilled writers have more negative feeling towards unfamiliar writing tasks. Practice, experience and exposure to writing make students acquire more positive feelings. Writing anxiety, fear of evaluation, writer's block, test anxiety, lack of motivation may be observable when students are forced to write efficiently about subjects under stressful timed and situations.

Empathy mentioned as an affective factor in the writing process is a means for increasing the quality of writing. Miller (2009) suggests that empathy encourages dialogue between writers and teachers and he states: "When students understand what they say and write will result in dialogue (and improvement that comes from it) rather than judgment (and discouragement that ensues) educational opportunities arise" (p. 50).

It would be valuable to investigate empathy in terms of teachers' attitudes toward students as their abilities to understand students' behaviors make learning more qualified. They could use classroom activities in order to strengthen dialogue between teacher and student and improve teacher understanding of students.

2.2.1. Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to feelings about one's capacity to accomplish a task. Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (p. 391). Beliefs are more determining in executing writing tasks than one's real abilities. Parajes and Johnson (1993) suggest:

It is self-efficacy that helps explain why people's behavior may differ markedly even when they have similar knowledge and skills. That is, what people do is often better predicted by their beliefs about their capabilities than by what they are actually capable of accomplishing (p. 4).

Bandura (1986) emphasizes the difference between self efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations by defining perceived self efficacy as "a judgment of one's capability to accomplish a certain level of performance" while defining outcome expectations as "judgments of the likely consequence such behavior will produce. (p. 391). In this context, self-efficacy beliefs are connected to outcome expectations since individuals who believe to be able to write competently will probably gain great admiration and approval for their writing assignments. Parajes and Johnson (1993) assert that behavior can be better predicted by self efficacy beliefs students have about their capabilities than their actual abilities to accomplish a task beacuse individuals' evaluations of their abilities are critically responsible for the outcomes expected. When students regard themselves as competent at performing desired behaviors and know what behaviors will be required for expected outcomes, they can perform a task successfully. On the contrary, the necessary behaviors may not be produced if they do not believe that they can attain the expected outcome. Pajares (1996) states:

Self-efficacy and other expectancy beliefs have in common that they are beliefs about one's perceived capability; they differ in that self-efficacy is defined in terms of individuals' perceived capabilities to attain designated types of performances and achieve specific results. According to social cognitive theory, the events over which personal influence is exercised vary. Depending on what is being managed, it may entail regulation of one's own motivation, thought processes, affective states and actions, or changing environmental conditions (p. 546).

Self-efficacy is an essential part of writing process. Effective writing starts with supplying a positive learning environment, attracting students' attention, making students aware of the importance and relevance of what they learn and giving place writing tasks to build confidence and self efficacy. Many researchers have studied to

discover the relationship between writing performance and writing self-efficacy and they agree writing performance is significantly related to writing self efficacy. McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer (1985) stress the relationship between writers' evaluations of their own writing skills and the quality of their writing products and define self evaluation as "assessment of self- efficacy" (p. 465). According to this notion, the quality of written products and the improvement of writing performance depend on evaluations about one's abilities. Students with strong self efficacy are good at writing, experience less apprehension when they are faced with a writing assignment and find writing more useful while those with weak efficacy display low performance on writing and believe they are poor writers. Because individuals with strong self efficacy think they have an ability to perform different writing tasks successfully. McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer (1985) states:

> Individuals with strong efficacy expectations evaluate themselves as capable, while individuals with weak efficacy expectations evaluate them-selves as less capable of effective performance. Efficacy, then, can affect what behavior people will attempt in the first place and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles (p. 466).

Feedback is an important factor in self efficacy theory because of the influences on reducing or increasing a student's beliefs about his abilities to write successfully. If students get negative feedback due to the paper they have written, they may feel themselves incapable of executing future tasks and this may lead to destructive results in self efficacy beliefs. The opposite is also true of those who receive positive feedback. Positive encouragement, while not as strong as negative appraisal, plays a key role in strengthening self efficacy beliefs. Kroll (2001) suggests teachers can give feedback orally as well as written. Oral feedback enables teachers to directly question students and do not lead to misunderstandings experienced in written feedback.

Success and failure of students in writing classes are other variables that raise or decrease self efficacy. Students who experience success and receive good grades in their writing classes are prone to have more positive self efficacy beliefs. Rahilly (2004) claims lower self efficacy can be attributable to age and gender factors. According to his studies, older people are less self confident about their skills than the younger students.

Also women tend to have lower self efficacy and more feelings of inadequacy about their capabilities to write.

In conclusion, self efficacy theory suggests that students' beliefs about their abilities have an impact on success and failure in writing. Given these findings, students first must make sure that their abilities allow them to write easily and, then they should attempt to write.

2.2.2. Self-perception

Self perception refers to how people perceive themselves. If it is measured in a specific situation such as writing, what is examined is how students see themselves as writers. Perception defined by Vandenbos (2007) is process or result of becoming aware of objects, relationships, and events by means of the senses, which includes such activities as recognizing, observing, and discriminating and also defines self perception as "a person's view of oneself or of any of the mental or physical attributes that constitute the self" (cited in Thornton, 2010, p. 11).

According to Beane, Lipka and Ludewig (1980), self perception can be examined at three levels: specific situation, categorical and general. Specific situation level refers to people's daily lives that they generate new ideas about beliefs, attitudes, skills and knowledge. Second level is based on the roles people play as a member of family or learner and the last one is a global view of self everybody has. And this sense of self stems from decisions about situational and categorical perceptions.

Self concept and self-esteem and values seem to be included in self perception. Beane, Lipka and Ludewig (1980) explains self concept as "the description we hold of ourselves based on the roles we play and personal attributes we believe we possess" and self esteem is defined as " the level of satisfaction we attach to that description or parts of it" (p. 84). Values are viewed as the basis of self esteem so teachers should be careful when communicating with students in terms of their self perceptions because teachers' self perceptions could differ from those of students and teachers can not assume that students perceive certain aspects of their own lives like them.

Hanna (2009) points the correlation between writing apprehension and self perception and predicts that highly apprehensive students have a low self perception of their competence. They consider themselves as less creative than those students with lower level of writing apprehension and it seems highly probable that writing apprehension reduce self perception of students. However, it can be considered selp perception also affects writing apprehension. Hanna (2009) expresses: "While it is indeed possible that high writing apprehension leads to lower perceptions of scholastic competence and creativity, it is equally possible that the factors feed into one another, with apprehension and self-perception affecting each another" (p. 26).

In writing classes, teachers' self perception is as important as students'. They should be confident and feel good about writing to teach students how to be competent writers and to perceive themselves as good writers. They could give positive feedback to enhance students' self perception. Also students can be convinced that they can successfully achieve positive experiences in writing.

2.2.3. Motivation

After the 1970s, emotions of the writers rather than strict rules and adjustments of writing began to gain importance and students approved the new methods for teaching writing. Most students wrote more willingly. One of the significant affective emotions to compose in a foreign language is students' motivation. Studies carried out by researchers, show that a high or low level of motivation to learn a foreign language results from learners' attitudes toward target language and culture. Brown (1994) defines second language motivation as "an inner drive, impulse, emotion or desire that moves one to a particular action" (p.152).

Gardner (1985) describes motivation as "the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language" (p. 10). This concept of motivation is essentially regarded with general reason to learn a foreign language. Masgoret and Gardner (2002) assert:

The motivated individual expends effort, is persistent and attentive to the task at hand, has goals, desires, and aspirations, enjoys the activity, experiences reinforcement from success and disappointment from failure, makes attributions concerning success and/or failure, is aroused and makes use of strategies to aid in achieving goals (p. 173).

There are two concepts of motivation proposed by Gardner and Lampert (1959) one of which is integrative motivation based on positive attitudes toward the target language group, its culture and reqires cultural and linguistic integration. Instrumental motivation refers to learn target language for functional and practical reasons such as finding a job or passing an exam.

Studies show that integrated motivated learners are more successful than instrumental motivated learners. Learners with integrated motivation are keen on learning activities in the classroom. Dornyei (2002) gives importance to integrated motivation which means to desire to learn a language to identify with the people who speak it without considering the age of the learner and the situation of learning second or foreign language. Motivation has of considerable importance so that it improves and mediates learning. Motivation is directed to a large extent by emotions and influenced by psychological characteristic of learners. Masgoret and Gardner (2002) states integratively motivated student is motivated to learn the foreign language, has a desire to identify the other language community and has positive attitudes toward language learning.

Unskilled writers experience difficulties with writing based on motivational factors as they have more negative motivational patterns. So it is important to focus on students' motivation as well as teaching strategies for the control of writing process to develop writing abilities To do this, it is aimed to stimulate students' positive beliefs about their ability to be successful in the writing process and to write skillfully. Also emotional environment in the classroom should be developed to encourage students to write.

Another way of increasing students' motivation is to give them simple tasks and then more difficult and complex tasks. As they learn less difficult objectives easily and

successfully, their motivation grows. It seems to be critical that teachers become aware of motivation and create a learning environment that learners will have successful experiences in writing and achieve great confidence from their progressions.

2.3. Definition and Types of Apprehension

In general terms, apprehension can be defined as an emotional response to threats and danger. It is a basic survival mechanism occurring in response to a specific stimulus such as pain or the threats of pain. Given anxiety and apprehension are considered in the same manner, it is possible to describe anxiety. Psychologists describe anxiety as "a state of apprehension, a vague fear that is only indirectly associates with an object." Spielberger (1983) describes anxiety as "the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (cited in Çubukçu, 2007, p. 133). Anxiety interferes with a lot of kinds of learning and is one of the most highly investigated variables in all of psychology and education.

Another definition is provided by Greist and Jefferson (1988). They state "anxiety is a state of nervousness or tension that is generated in response to a threat or to something that is perceived as a threat" (cited in Oh, 1996, p. 11). Also, writing anxiety can be similarly used with writing apprehension and Rahilly (2004) describes writing anxiety as "a generalized state of fear that individuals feel both physical and psychological ways when they perceive a writing situation as potentially threatening and stressful " (p. 46). Bloom (1985) used writing anxiety for people displaying "one or a combination of feelings, beliefs, or behaviors that interfere with a person's ability to start, work on, or finish a given writing task that he or she is intellectually capable of doing " (cited in Cheng, 1998, p. 33).

With its known meaning, apprehension is an emotion that most people will confront at some point in their lives. The concept of apprehension has been used in literature for years and as it is seen in almost all situations, many theoretical models of apprehension have been proposed. The situations in which apprehension is observed were classified. Horwitz (1986) asserts that there are three components of language

anxiety including communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation and test anxiety.

1- Communication apprehension

2- Fear of negative evaluation

3- Test anxiety

Stress and product apprehension can be also examined in addition to evaluation apprehension by using a factor analysis to interpret the results of the Writing Apprehension Survey. However, there are not too many researches that focus on these types. Product apprehension is based on students' papers quality. It is important that tutors see that error is systematic and they should give students an opportunity to improve. This situation makes students feel good about themselves as writers.

2.3.1. Communication apprehension

Communication apprehension is a fear of speaking. McCroskey (1978) defines communication apprehension as "an one's fear or anxiety connected with the effort to communication with another person or group of persons" (cited in Kunt, 1997 p. 19). Some people want to communicate but they might be impeded by their fear or anxiety. Communicative apprehensives can be discussed in two different types. One of them is trait apprehension; this type includes all communication situations. State apprehension that is second type of communication apprehension influences only certain situations. Communication apprehension can occur in the forms of social anxiety, reticence, shyness, and unwillingness to communicate.

Communication apprehension is the first component of Horwitz's framework. This type of anxiety affects a large amount of people. Avoidance communication situations and reactions are observed when a person is forced to participate in speaking tasks. Communication apprehension has been measured by observation, interview and physiological approaches until 1970s. However these methods had lack of reliability.

Language learners have some difficulties to express themselves and this situation creates communication apprehension in them. It is a broadly based fear or

anxiety about real oral communication with one or more people. Highly apprehensive students usually have lower grade point averages and are less successful on standardized measures of achievement than students who are low apprehensive about oral communication. Cheng (1998) explains the communication apprehension with the following statements:

> Because of second language learners' limited command of the new language, the potential for frustrated or failed communication is always present. Learners' awareness of their limited facility in the second language as well as the great likelihood of aborted communication may lead to second language learners' apprehension about communicating in the second language (p. 81).

The structure of communication apprehension is applicable to the conceptualization of foreign language anxiety because of its emphasis on interpersonal interactions. Communication apprehension can be explained as a lack of confidence stemmed from fear of apprehension about communicating with native or non-native people. Communication apprehension indicates itself with challenges in speaking in groups and pairs, in public, in the activity of listening a spoken message and affects language learning.

Students have more difficulties about speaking in foreign language classroom than speaking in a group. Difficulties in understanding others and making oneself understood are other causes of communication apprehension. From this perspective, even people who are talkative experience failure in speaking in a foreign language.

Armendaris (2009) compares adult learners to children. According to Armendaris (2009), adult learners experience higher levels of anxiety than children do. They have more education, mature thoughts and life experiences but they may feel disappointed when they minimally participate in classroom activities. They try to speak more than children as they are aware of considerable importance of speaking correctly. Armendaris (2009) exemplifies adult learners' feelings by writing:

Students have acquired the habit of talking about their ability to use language before they fully identify themselves as people. It is very common to hear some students say, "My name is Tran and my English is very poor." The process of becoming someone else can be very difficult, particularly when the sense of self- efficacy and self-confidence is challenged (p. 23).

Consequently, communication apprehension relatively influences the students in speech communication and their self concept about language learning. Poor self-perception leads to additional negative reactions.

2.3.2. Test anxiety

The second component of Horwitz's model is Test Anxiety. Test anxiety is defined by Sarason (1978) as "the tendency to view with alarm the consequences of inadequate performance in an evaluative situation" (p. 214). Test anxiety occurs prior to a test in many students as a sense of stress or physical discomfort. Students with high levels of test anxiety seem to perform less than low or moderately anxious students. Crumbo (1998) approached to test anxiety by means of two major components. One is a physiological component and the other is cognitive component. Whereas emotionality, that is physiological component, refers to the physiological arousal, worry (cognitive component) refers to the conscious cognitive concern about the test. Moreover both affect the performance negatively. Since oral evaluation is frequently involved in language courses, the possibility of test anxiety stemming from a fear of failure increases.

There are not many studies investigating Test Anxiety particularly for writing tests, quizzes or writing apprehension. First studies show that performance on writing assessments and essays is negatively associated to writing apprehension. Smith and Nelson (1994) claim that nearly 20 percent of learners with test anxiety have also writing apprehension.

It is highly probable to relate test anxiety to foreign language anxiety owing to the fact that performance evaluation is a constant part of language learning classes. It is referred that test anxiety is a kind of performance anxiety derived from a fear of failure. Students' unreal expectations on themselves and a perfect test performance influence students' feelings of tests negatively. Frequent tests and quizzes lead students to make error and experience difficulty and anxiety in foreign language.

These three terms are firmly correlated with each other and to make a clear distinction is difficult. Communication apprehension and a fear of negative evaluation seem to be relatively related to language anxiety. It is possible to propose a conceptual similarity between communication apprehension and fear of negative evaluation. If tests are given orally, communication apprehension can be involved with test anxiety. Further, in the state of oral testing, test anxiety may be associated to fear of negative evaluation.

2.3.3. Fear of negative evaluation

Evaluation established a place in the writing process because teacher plays a role as an indicator of achieved proficiency in a course of study. Direct or indirect evaluation is implemented in school-based writing activities and may result in an encouragement and motivation. Unskilled students, however, may perceive writing process as unrewarding and punishing due to the evaluation of their writing and this situation may bring about learner's ruin in development of writing.

Watson and Friend (1969) defined the fear of negative evaluation as "apprehension about other's evaluation, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively" (p. 449). Fear of negative evaluation can occur at both academic and personal levels in a language course. Students' negative expectations about evaluation may evoke them to avoid participating in classroom activities. Watson and Friend (1969) developed a measurement of evaluation. In conjunction with Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale, they stated that students with high point grade averages incline to become more apprehensive under evaluation.

The Evaluation Apprehension Theory was proposed by Cottrell in 1972. He states that our learners' performances can be enhanced or improved only in the presence of people's approvals and disapprovals. Rosenberg (1965) defined evaluation apprehension as "an active, anxiety-toned concern that he (the subject) wins a positive evaluation from the experimenter, or at least that he provides no grounds for a negative one" (p. 29). He (1965) stated that evaluation apprehension can affect subjects' behavior in psychological experiments and can lead to invalid casual inference. These are some of the statements of learners who are evaluation apprehensives:

> When I hand in a composition, I know I am going to do poorly.
>
> I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly.
>
> I am nervous about writing.
>
> I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.

Students generally keep having challenges in writing because of their writing experiences about writing evaluation. Students could regard the evaluation made by their teachers as a confirmation of their self judgment of deficiency in foreign language and they think that writing is a way of exposing this deficiency. So they avoid writing and taking risks in writing.

Fear of negative evaluation is broader than test anxiety in terms of taking place in a social evaluative situation in the same way of speaking in foreign language class. Horwitz K., Horwitz B., and Cope (1986) claim that even if communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation supplies conceptual blocks for foreign language anxiety, foreign language anxiety is something more than the combination of these fears.

2.4. Language Learning Anxiety

Foreign language anxiety is a different form of anxiety occurred in language learning. It is the situation in which learners become nervous when they expose to language learning and this type of anxiety causes distinct negative influences of language learners. Foreign language anxiety has been recognized as one of the most

important affective reactions of language learners and definitions of foreign language anxiety vary researcher by researcher.

As studies to assess the relationship between anxiety and language learning are unlimited, foreign language anxiety has been defined in various ways and all researches have inconsistent results. Horwitz K., Horwitz B., and Cope (1986) define foreign language anxiety as "a distinct complex of self perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (p128). It is possible to provide another definition made by MacIntyre and Gardner (1994b) that language anxiety is "the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with foreign language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning" (p. 284).

Over the past four decades, a large body of research has been devoted to anxiety in foreign language learning. However, there were some disagreements among studies. Whereas some studies show that there is a relationship between anxiety and foreign language learning, other studies can not find relationship. With the developments of new measurements and theories, it can be concluded that foreign language anxiety is a predictor of foreign language achievement. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) is one of these developments.

The FLCAS was developed by Horwitz (1986) and is used to measure language anxiety in a standardized way. It has 33 statements. Studies carried out with FLCAS show a consistent negative correlation between specific measures of anxiety and language achievement. By using the FLCAS, Horwitz (1986) found that many subjects experienced a fair amount of anxiety in their foreign language classroom.

Negative experiences about language achievement, cognitive processes, and communicative processes can be attributable to foreign language anxiety. FLA decreases students' overall proficiency, success and their capability to encode messages. Beliefs about language learning may be a source of foreign language anxiety.

Three approaches of language anxiety can be identified as: trait anxiety and state anxiety and situation specific anxiety perspectives. State anxiety is described as "a

multimodal emotional state characterized by subjective, consciously perceived feelings of tension and apprehension accompanied by heightened autonomic nervous system activity" (Cheng, 1998, p. 19). State anxiety is concerned with an anxiety- provoking situation and generally many learners experience it when they come across with an unfamiliar or difficult learning task such as writing an essay.

Spielberger, (1983) defines trait anxiety as "relatively stable individual differences in anxiety-proneness, that is, differences between people in the tendency to perceive stressful situations as dangerous or threatening and to respond to such situations with elevations in the intensity of their state anxiety reactions" (cited in Tóth, 2010, p. 6). Trait anxiety has several effects on language acquisition such as impairing cognitive functioning, interfering with memory, and causing avoidance behaviors. From this point of view, anxiety is a general personality trait which is related to many situations. The measurement used for state anxiety was developed in 1970 by Spielberger and named as State- Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) and Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS) developed in 1953 by Spielberger is used for trait anxiety. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) can also be used for trait anxiety.

Situation Specific Anxiety can be defined as anxiety experienced in a well defined situation and considered as trait anxiety. According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a), this theory examines the specific forms of anxiety that occur consistently over time within a given situation. Situation specific anxiety is related to behavior in the critical situations. The French Class Anxiety Scale developed by Gardner and Smythe (1975), English Use Anxiety developed by Gardner, Clement and Smythe (1979), English Test Anxiety developed by Gardner, Clement and Smythe and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, 1986) can be used to measure situation-specific anxiety. Situation- specific anxiety approach makes it possible to assess the orthogonal types of anxiety and to achieve better understanding of anxiety.

Before the mid 1980's, these situation-specific anxiety scales helped to find the effects of anxiety on language learning. However, Horwitz (1986) firstly identified second language learning anxiety as "a distinct construct" (p. 31). While language apprehension is a construct which is differentiated from other types of anxiety, it can be

related more to classroom participation, risk taking, communicative content, interaction with speakers of the target language, and course grades.

Foreign language anxiety can be encouraging when it assists second language learner or debilitating when it creates negative effects on learner. The causes of language anxiety among adult learners consist of psychological factors such as fear of negative evaluation, concern about receiving good grades on writing tasks, emotions of shame and being inadequate in foreign language. Rahilly (2004) suggests:

> For some adult ESL learners, language anxiety can easily develop into a more severe writing anxiety, which, in turn, can have detrimental or paralyzing effects on their academic English writing acquisition. This language anxiety that adults ESL learners often feel may result from of a combination of emotions they may have when they are learning difficult or unfamiliar tasks (p. 45).

2.5. Writing Apprehension

Writing apprehension is a term which was first coined and defined by Daly and Miller (1975). For years, a great number of studies have been carried out. So it can be received as many definitions as the number of studies attained. Daly (1978) defines the term as "a situation and subject-specific individual difference concerned with people's general tendencies to approach or avoid writing" (p. 10). According to their findings, low apprehensive students perform better on tests of writing skills than highly apprehensive.

Definitions vary by researchers concerned with at least one aspect of writing apprehension and Bloom (1985) makes a clear definition of writing apprehension as "a label for one or a combination of feelings, beliefs, or behaviors that interfere with a person's ability to start, work on, or finish a given writing task that he or she is intellectually capable of doing" (p. 121). Also McAndrew (1986) defines writing apprehension as "an individual difference associated with an increase in anxiety when one faced with situations requiring writing. A certain amount of creative tension is

present and necessary in all writers, but for some the situation brings on destructive amounts of tension" (cited in Grinnel, 1993, p. 26).

Writing apprehension with which students must be able to cope is one of the most comprehensive types of affective factors and it also can be termed writing anxiety and writing block. Rose (1984) explains writer's block as "an inability to begin or continue writing for reasons other than a lack of skill or commitment" (p. 3). Itzel (2004)assumes writer's block means a desire to write but failing to do so and could occur both at the beginning of writing process and during the writing. Itzel (2004) also suggests:

> Writer's block may be specific to a particular writing task. Those who suffer from writer's block may only experience it when writing in a particular genre or using a particular strategy of the Composing Process. For instance a writer may suffer from WB when attempting to write an analytical article for publication, when composing a poem, the writing may easily flow (p. 19).

There is no considerable difference between writing anxiety and writing apprehension while it seems clear that writing anxiety/ apprehension and writer's block are attributed to different theoretical orientations. Thompson (1980) defines writing anxiety as" a fear of the writing process that outweighs the projected gain from the ability to write" (p. 121).

For the past three decades, a great body of research devoted to investigate how and to what degree writing apprehension affects students' writing process by many researchers show that high levels of apprehension prevent students from writing successfully. Students with high level of apprehension avoid both writing itself and instruction in writing and they possibly feel anxious when they are forced to write since regarding writing as difficult and challenging.

Some researchers examined what impact different levels of apprehension have on writing and it is suggested that writing apprehension occurs at different levels in all students and performance of students and quality of written products depend on

students' apprehension level. If it is at a reasonable level, apprehension may create positive effects on students' writing while if students have high levels of apprehension, they may have more difficulty with writing. Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) argue what impacts writing apprehension has on writing performance and they state high apprehensive students score lower on measures of writing related skills, tests of reading competency, general verbal ability.

According to Daly and Miller (1975) students with high levels of apprehension feel less contented with their writing- oriented classes and they show less willingness and interest to enroll in advanced writing courses. Given this, it is inevitable that their preferences of academic majors and careers could be affected negatively by their negative perceptions about writing.

It can be clearly seen that level of apprehension is a significant factor in student success. When focused on the effects of writing apprehension, highly apprehensive students' essays would be less syntactically fluent and significantly shorter than essays of students with low apprehension. According to Book (1976), highly apprehensive students tend to use fewer words and convey less information in writing process than students with low apprehension. Daly (1978) asserts high levels of apprehension lead to encode less intense message and use neutral and flat words. Writers with high apprehension are incapable of developing new ideas, put less information into each communicative unit and use a more restrictive range of syntactic constructions.

Students' attitudes toward writing and writing classes are viewed as significant anticipations of writing abilities. According to Daly, Miller and Witte (1981), attitudes have a considerable role on writing. Learners who are highly apprehensive feel themselves completely inadequate and ineffective whenever they attempt to write. In addition, they tend to lose self-confidence and respect they expect to gain from other students and instructors. Those who lack confidence and respect decrease the amount of writing practice they get and this situation results in increase of their level of apprehension and makes writing more punishing and threatening. Through the findings of Daly and his colleagues in 1981, Reeves made a summary of attitudes that reflect students' writing apprehension as follows:

1. Their self-concept is often lower and they may lack self-confidence.
2. They report low success in prior experiences with school related writing.
3. They have received negative teacher responses to prior writing attempts.
4. They are more apprehensive when writing personal narratives in which they must express personal feelings and experiences.
5. They exhibit less apprehension when writing argumentative persuasive essays in which they are told not to inject personal feelings and not to use the first-person point of view (p. 39).

When the presence of negative attitudes is observed in the writing classes, teachers play a key role in taking necessary precautions to improve students' attitudes. By considering the probability that a permanent negative attitude could obstruct writing progress, Popovich and Masse (2005) think as follows:

The more writing instructors can learn about students' individual attitudes toward writing, especially at the outset of the course, the more opportunities the instructor may have to address anxiety issues and implement personalized strategies that could help students gain much needed confidence in their writing abilities (p. 339).

Writing transfers an intended meaning to the audience and it is necessary that the writer communicates to an audience within a context of a language. So writer should improve linguistic and cultural protocols, which create clarity and consciousness in the encoded message. Writing apprehension, therefore, has been the subject of investigation of correct forms of language for written discourse. Writers also should use the language of a specific community as writing is a communicative attempt that takes place within social context.

Beliefs about having successful performance are other determining factors of student behavior. Students considering writing as a rewarding activity have an

inclination to avoid receiving help, which makes them more apprehensives. Cognitive researchers have investigated that there is a relationship between individual beliefs and expectations and their experiences of apprehension. Most of the studies reveal that highly apprehensive students have lower levels of expectations of success in writing, less belief in their writing abilities and less improvement in writing skills. Reeves (1996) categorizes the behaviors of anxious students:

1. They tend to select careers which they perceive to require little or no writing.
2. They tend to avoid courses and majors which require writing on a daily basis.
3. They write very little out of class.
4. They lack role models for writing at home, in school, and in the society at large.
5. They score lower on tests of verbal ability (SAT), reading comprehension, and standardized tests of writing ability used for college placement.
6. They do not necessarily lack motivation (pp 38-39).

The importance of writing skills has been the subject of an increasing body of research in writing apprehension. Daly (1978) concludes that low-apprehension students tend to have higher writing skills than high-apprehension students. In addition highly apprehensives perform less successfully than low apprehensives in writing skill tests. Flower and Hayes (1981) examine cognitive processes and thinking skills in writing to compare writing strategies of good and poor writers. According to cognitive learning theory, poor writers can not give themselves instructions about how to perform writing process and do not have conscious control over their own processes.

Goals also act as a determining factor with regards to the differences between poor and good writers. For example, poor writers have more abstract and top level goals which are hard to work with such as "appealing to the audience". However, they can choose more operational goals which will facilitate composing process. Another point which must be focused on is the devotion of poor writers to the perfectionism. This

situation discourages them to carry out more important tasks such as content and organization and message quality.

Students could concentrate more on grammar, spelling, sentence structure or other mechanical tasks than on organization and content. In contrast, low apprehensive students can transfer basic writing skills and knowledge about writing into long-term memory and when writing is required, they can automatically use their knowledge in the long term memory and execute more significant tasks such as content and organization, which let them reach more developmental stage. Students should attempt to write more to improve their writing skills. Reeves (1997) thinks more practice would be helpful to cope with apprehension and makes a good suggestion:

> As apprehensive writers have generally done very little writing and that has been judged unsatisfactory by prior teachers, a good way to begin is with writing in class every day, creating a non-threatening, practice-like atmosphere where traditional lecturing and grading take a back seat (p. 39).

As writing apprehension not only affects writing skills but also majors and careers students choose, researchers are also prone to investigate the impact of writing apprehension on choosing majors and careers. Daly, Faigley and Witte (1981) argue *"Highly apprehensive individuals prefer and choose occupations and academic majors believed not to require much writing. In contrast, low apprehensives like and select jobs and academic concentrations they judge to demand comparatively more writing "* (p. 16).

For instance, Hanna (2009) notes a major apprehensive student chooses accounting as little writing is required. So instructors and practitioners express dissatisfaction with college students' writing skills and accounting majors seem to have a higher apprehension in comparison with students who choose majors in other fields. A study made by Popovich and Masse (2005) shows that highly apprehensive students choose broadcast journalism as it is expected that they would only speak not write their material and they states: "Writing apprehension among students in a media writing

course may result in fear, frustration, and ongoing anxiety about the skills required in chosen careers " (p. 339).

Hanna (2009) states the impact of writing apprehension is broader than previous studies have found because writing apprehension is not only seen in students of English but also in many fields of study, in different disciplines at all ages and in all geographic areas. Business students and work force members of business community and communication majors are among the groups which are affected by writing apprehension. They could suffer from high levels of anxiety and struggle with writing.

Book (1976) associates communication apprehension with writing apprehension in terms of structure, language use and amount of information conveyed. He argues certain speech communication behaviors displayed by apprehensive people may be indications of written communication. Communication apprehension points out one's anxious feelings about communication. Oral and written messages are influenced by the same grammatical constraints of the language, though structural elements of both processes are not similar. Book (1976) explains:

> Since anxious people have less confidence in their opinions and judgments, they are likely to protect themselves by withdrawing from or avoiding threatening communication situations. On the other hand, confident speakers are likely to initiate communication, and to attempt, to persuade or influence others (p. 5).

Punishment and ignorance result in increased communication apprehension of students, that is, prior conditioning which occurs in elementary and undergraduate years seems to influence communication apprehension and similarly negative experiences may cause avoidance of writing tasks.

Feedback has been investigated by many researchers because it is regarded as an effective way to improve writing in all ages. While some students use teacher feedback to revise their first drafts, others may refuse to use teacher comments. It is crucial to establish the difference between constructive and destructive comments and supply more related and helpful feedback to students. Wiltse (2002) ascertains:

Constructive criticism can increase some students' self efficacy beliefs in their ability to write and motivate them to work harder and improve their writing. However, the same comments that were intended to be constructive can cause other students to dislike writing and to give up trying to improve subsequent drafts (p. 126).

Negative feedback may lead to writing apprehension and low self efficacy beliefs. Faigley, Daly and Witte (1981) assert, with regards to the feedback, writing apprehension is a construct related to a person's tendencies to approach or avoid situations requiring writing conducted by some amount of evaluation. As a result, especially poor writers may attach considerable importance more on grammar, spelling, and sentence structure than content of composition.

It should not be missed the point of what students' reactions are to teacher feedback. They may think they become overwhelmed with teachers' feedback or they may be bewildered and misunderstand the comments on their papers because they are written in terminology that teachers know but not students. Vague and nonspecific comments, partially stemming from the fact that teachers are not trained enough about how to give feedback to students' papers, do not help writers. This causes students ignore those comments and do not use in their next drafts. In this case, teachers must give relevant and more clear feedback and use appropriate teaching methods which require interaction between teachers and students, improve students' self efficacy beliefs and writing abilities and provide positive writing experiences for students.

Wiltse (2002) examines categories of teacher comments and divides them into global and local feedback. Global feedback is a comment upon a written composition's content and local feedback is defined as comments on mechanical writing issues. Hanna (2009) also discusses some specific aspects of teacher comments such as tone, placement, appearance and completeness and how they affect writing process as instructor comments seem to be responsible for existence of apprehension and poor writing. These areas of comments could influence student writing apprehension levels.

Placement has a significant importance in students' perception of comment. For example, end comment may lessen the effectiveness of comments while marginal

comments requires further information and students generally make changes which are requested through marginal comments. As teachers have more space at the end of the paper, end comments are longer than marginal comments. Studies have also focused on comment appearance concerning the impacts of comments on students Color, handwriting styles, and legibility can be included in comment appearance. Hanna (2009) states, while not strong, red pen or pencil is found to cause students to cultivate negative attitude so they suggest avoiding the use of red pen or pencils while giving feedback to students' papers.

As students may perceive comments more differently than intended by teachers, tone is one of the most important aspects of comment, which teacher should be careful. Comment tone can vary from positive and encouraging to negative and hostile. Hanna (2009) exemplifies:

> A comment with a positive tone would be, "Good work, " while an encouraging tone might be perceived in a comment that pointed toward future accomplishment, or recognition of improvement, such as, "Good start, keep working. " A comment that might be perceived as having an impartial tone would be one that points out an error or makes a suggestion without any emotional content in particular, for example, "You need a comma here (p. 45).

Hanna (2009) gives examples of negative, hostile and resigned tones of comments. Comments with a negative tone such as "Sloppy, careless work" or a hostile tone "You really do not belong in this program" may discourage students from revising their drafts. Students demand responses which make them encourage to write and do not neglect their efforts. Bardine (1999) focuses on teachers' role while responding to students' writing not just as a teacher, but as a reader and this requires positive and instructional tone with a concentration on content.

The last aspect of comment handled by Hanna is completeness of comments. Effective and complete comments and the actual length of the comments are better perceived by students but they may not fully understand symbols, abbreviations, and one word responses so instructors must avoid the use of them and adjust the length of

comments they make because long paragraphs necessitate long time both for teachers to respond to all students' papers and for students to read and use them. Markings such as arrows, underlining, circles, parentheses, and slashes which might not reflect teachers' real intents should not be used during feedback process. To sum up, instructors' comments need to be clear, comprehensive and specific.

Teacher comments may cause students to develop writing apprehension if they appear to be an unkind analysis of students' writing effort. In contrast, when students regard comments as advice or suggestions, they try to improve their writing performance. Hanna correlates teacher comment with students' writing apprehension as follow:

> If the reported impact of writing apprehension on writing success is valid, and if it can be linked to teacher comments, then writing apprehension is very much the instructor's problem, since students who are highly apprehensive clearly do not perform as well as those who are not (p. 55).

Crumbo (1998) studies the effect of writing apprehension on teachers' evaluations and finds out teachers evaluate students with low apprehension more positively than highly apprehensive students so this leads to an increase of self efficacy beliefs and writing performance of students who receive positive writing evaluation while the opposite is true for highly apprehensive students receiving negative writing evaluations. Daly (1979) states writing apprehension has an effect on teachers' perceptions, and therefore their judgments, of students.

Crumbo (1998) implies a direct connection between teacher feedback and students' self esteem and suggests instructors should take demands of writing into account and communicate with students to help students fulfill writing tasks. It is critically important to reward and encourage students as students consider them as the most influential critics.

Responding to student and its impacts on writers are important topics for foreign language writing. Students view the feedback from their teachers and peers as a

significant component in their writing development. Since the past decade, the effects of teacher feedback on writing process and apprehension have been widely examined and researchers have taken into account of students' needs, desires and abilities concerned to feedback. They point teacher feedback should be clear and concrete to foreign language writers and teacher need to assess students' experiences, knowledge and their expectations as students have different characteristics. Teachers' responses are critically important since these responses are expected to indicate underlying assumptions about the nature and function of writing. Cohen and Calcavanti (1991) assert:

> If effective interactive procedures are in operation, teachers are then able to observe the effects of their feedback through improvement in students' writing, in their attitudes toward writing, and in their language acquisition in general. In turn the students welcome the feedback because of the benefits that they receive from it (p. 176).

Writing apprehension is also related to gender and it would be possible to conclude that males have higher levels of writing apprehension than female writers. Cheng (1998) focuses on two reasons for this notion. Not only females are more capable of doing verbal activities but receive more positive feedback to their writing than males. According to Cheng, females' positive attitudes is another reason for being less anxious than males.

The complexity and intensity of written products of students with high and low apprehension show differences. Daly and Miller (1975) state highly apprehensive learners write shorter essays, make fewer statements, use fewer adverbs and adjectives and they are less skilled in usage of punctuation than low apprehensive writers.

Reeves (1997) summarizes the written products of students as following:

1. They have more difficulty with invention getting ideas of what to write.
2. They produce shorter pieces of writing; i. e., fewer total words per piece.
3. Their ideas are not as well developed.
4. Their writing is judged to be lower quality when holistic scoring is employed, especially males' writing.

5. They score lower on scales of syntactic maturity: T–units are shorter, and there is less right branching (placing of participles to the right of the main clause).

6. They include less information in each clause or T-unit.

7. They have more difficulty with usage and mechanics.

8. They use less variety in sentence patterns (p. 39).

There may be several causes of writing apprehension but Cheng (1998) maintains the complexity and variability of human being is an obstructive factor in proposing an approach about development of writing apprehension. Despite this factor, some basic causes of writing anxiety, including negative evaluation, perfectionism, early experience, self exposure can be examined by writing apprehension researchers. Procrastination, inability to organize materials, impatience at the editing and proofreading stages are suggested causes by researchers.

It is required to determine causes of writing apprehension before treatment begins. Smith (1984) argues negative evaluation causes students to think that they are not good writers and their chances for a successful writing process reduce. Another consideration regarded as a reason for writing apprehension is compulsory writing. Compulsory writing as a cause of writing apprehension was found by Powers, Cook and Meyer (1979) and they investigated students in basic college level writing course and students who were in compensatory section showed an increase in the level of writing apprehension. If students are forced to write they experience an increased anxiety. As soon as possible causes of writing apprehension are found, teachers should help students view writing as process, time-management and organizational skills.

Writing apprehension could be significantly decreased when necessary measures are taken in time. Students generally have preconceived notions that they feel the lack of writing ability. As they think they are weak writers, high levels of anxiety occur due to this preconceived notion. In such a detrimental situation, it is crucial to create and maintain an environment that reinforces students to enhance their performance and accept whatever they do at first without trying to find errors. So they don't have negative attitudes and experiences toward their own writing.

Smith (1984) argues the first step for reducing writing apprehension is to introduce students to the writing process. Teachers should design the courses to teach both planning strategies for beginning their work and the revision process. According to this approach, they first write their draft and then, their errors are corrected at the revision stage. If students do not know this way of writing, they try to write perfectly in their first attempt as they don't realize even the best writer can't write without several drafts.

Thompson (1979) suggests the usage of symbols, patterns and sentences to reduce writing apprehension and the relation between writing and thinking processes and the conventional order in developing the writers' intended messages should be taught to students. Smith (1984) stresses the importance of teachers addressing themselves and a well designed curriculum used for all students because low apprehensive students may perform better than highly apprehensives and they tend to be more willing to instruction and Smith (1984) explains reasons why a curriculum should not be completely devoted to the decline of writing apprehension with the following statements:

> First some apprehension is necessary if a writer is to take the care that produces an acceptable product. Second, not all students suffer from apprehension. Activities that are designed to reduce or prevent the problem, then, should also benefit students who lack writing anxiety. In the best possible world, activities that reduce apprehension would be pedagogically sound for other reason, allowing teachers to reduce anxiety and develop skills at the same time (p. 13).

Matthews (2001) also discusses that addressing the problem by the instructor is essential to reduce anxiety. It is required to place students in a better position to meet the standards and although it is a fact that writing apprehension prevents students from writing, a little apprehension may not be such a bad thing. Matthews (2001) concerns with exercises and classroom practices carried out to make students perceive that writing is not a threatening process and to create a relaxed atmosphere in the writing classroom. He suggests The Picnic Basket Activity, The Class Essay, The writing Notebook and the Homeless Journal can be used in reducing writing apprehension.

The Picnic Basket Activity includes fifty wrapped items which are described by students in detail without naming them in class and by using this activity; it is aimed to reduce apprehension by giving a chance students to enjoy while learning writing. The activity supplies some utilities such as speaking before an audience, using details, thinking creatively and coping with stress. Since it is a prewriting activity, it gives student practice to enjoy and describe an item without fear of evaluation.

The Class Essay is another activity developed by Matthews (2001). In this activity, students are divided into group and expected to choose one of the topics. Each group takes responsibility for performing a part of the essay so they share their ideas with the other groups. The Class Essay requires not only to work in groups but to collaborate and this makes the process more enjoyable than writing themselves. Shrewsbury (1995) concludes:

> Collaborative learning is structured activities or experiences in which students work with each other and / or a teacher to discover, explore, analyze, synthesize, debate, question etc. to solve a problem, participate in a writing process, arrive at a mutual understanding of a concept, or develop social and intellectual skills for the purpose of learning (p. 14).

Shrewsbury (1995) asserts collaborative learning supplies more concentration on writing than other skills and teachers devote themselves to student centered classroom. Wynn (1999) articulates collaborative writing is a process in which students receive support from their peer while constructing written products and to do this, they use collaborative writing approaches such peer editing, peer tutoring, and co-authoring as.

Collaborative learning facilitates students to be more involved in writing tasks, to develop confidence and writing skills. Consequently, this approach makes it possible to develop ability to produce ideas, to listen, reply to their peers and to agree or disagree with them, and improves students' communicative skills. Matthews (2001) explains benefits of collaborative learning as follows:

> For the apprehensive writer, it may even mean increased confidence since collaboration provides an opportunity to discuss writing and problem solve with other students. By talking with their peers, students

often learn that their writing is comparable to that of their classmates, not poorer (p. 59).

The Writing Notebook allowing students to monitor their improvement in writing is a collection of writing assignments, prewriting and proofreading records, grammar exercises and free writing. Students maintain a notebook to write their first drafts, to engage actively in the writing process and to reduce writing apprehension by the fact that their first draft does not need to be the final one. Students can also keep journals and portfolios to have a sense of writing for a real audience.

Matthews (2001) also suggests homeless journal, computer assisted composition instruction, a detailed syllabus, directed prewriting, conferences, and visible writing are other activities which can be used to create an unthreatening environment, to reduce writing apprehension in the writing classroom, and to prompt students to write better. Matthews (2001) concludes with an example:

Even when students may do poorly in the first essay, they know that they will have the opportunity to revise, or if they are having difficulty getting started, they know that through directed free writing or invisible writing, they do not have to stare at a blank page or a blank screen (p. 97).

Smith (1984) believes that students' writing apprehension can be minimized by planning instruction and suggests three sample lessons; first lesson requires teaching writing style, creative writing is taught in the foreign lesson by using fables, and third needs introducing expository writing. Hanna (2009) makes suggestions with regards to the teacher comment:

As teachers at all levels learn to direct their comments, not to individual papers, but to student colleagues who are viewed as apprentice academics, these teachers can begin to mesh their written comments with their classroom instruction, bringing both to their optimal effectiveness. Teachers need to work to develop a partnership with their students, to build trust and communication so that teacher comments, in whatever form or color, work to enhance the work done in the classroom (p. 128).

Campbell (1994) suggests meditation to decrease writing apprehension as it gives apprehensive students an alternative physical sensation while composing. It is possible to assess practice in meditation as beneficial as other study techniques for beginning college students since it is included in a spiritual context. Meditation provides a practical technique to relax physically and by meditating, apprehensive writers both find the physical location of their fear of writing and release it.

Lew (2001) represents the ways of leading to improvement in writing. She believes students should increase the number of writing assignments and teachers may assist them by providing regularly scheduled in-class writing time. Instructors also give students anxiety lowering exercises before writing an essay. They can present different types of treatments to reduce apprehension such as brainstorming, journal writing cubing, and give a chance to students to select one of which may help them to write skillfully.

In conclusion, writing is a way of communication and people can easily communicate a lot of messages to the audience using writing. Due to the vital importance of communication in modern world, writing is no doubt required much in addition to the technological advances such as mail. So, foreign language researchers should focus on writing development more and discover more effective ways to improve and foster writing.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

This study was carried out mainly to explore the basic dimensions of foreign language writing apprehension, and to investigate the relationship between this construct and writing achievement.

Writing apprehension is a prevalent problem among undergraduate English foreign language learners, and researchers have widely examined this problem, acknowledged its existence, defined characteristics, and developed strategies that could be helpful to overcome this problem. It is aimed in this study to define and describe writing apprehension as experienced by undergraduate students and to compare the ways in which students with low levels of apprehension approach writing with the ways highly apprehensive learners approach the same task.

Lester, Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981) assert that writing apprehension "is a tendency to experience high degrees of anxiety when asked to write resulting in an approach-avoidance conflictive state which manifests itself in one's behaviors, attitudes, and written product" (cited in Reeves, 1997, p. 38). These facets can be seen among the undergraduate EFL students. This study intended to develop more understanding of students' behaviors, attitudes, and written products so as to identify the prevalence of writing apprehension and to determine the ways that writing apprehension affects students' success.

This chapter describes methodology, the participants, instrumentation and procedure, data gathering process and data collection process.

3.1. Research Design

In this research, a study was carried out regarding writing apprehension of students in foreign language. This research design comprised a quantitative, correlational study. Quantitative study gives opportunity researchers to generalize a finding to a population and to investigate relationships between independent and dependent variables. Creswell (2005) defines quantitative research as "a type of educational research in which the researcher decides what to study, asks specific, narrow questions, collects numeric (numbered) data from participants, analyzes these numbers using statistics, and conducts the inquiry in an unbiased, objective manner" (p.39).

Quantitative research began to gain importance in the late 19th century and it was used for educational inquiry during 20th century. Quantitative research today has its origin of its beginning in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries. Although this type of research was initially used for physical sciences, it was then aimed to assess and measure students' abilities, to gather scores in educational inquiry, to carry out psychological experiments and surveys.

Creswell (2005) alludes to three trends of quantitative research in its developmental history. These are statistical procedures, test and measurements practices and research designs. Statistical procedures focus on the ideas of correlating and relating two or more ideas. Based on this trend, common statistics still used today examines the relationship among numerous variables such as cause-effect or stimulus response. Tests and measurement practices mainly use standardized tests for children in school and the last trend is research designs developed to conduct educational experiments. This type of research involves multiple groups and multiple tests.

Creswell (2005) summarized the characteristics of quantitative research as following:

- an emphasis on collecting and analyzing information in the form of numbers
- an emphasis on collecting scores that measure distinct attributes of individuals and organization

- an emphasis on the procedures of comparing groups or relating factors about individuals or groups in experiments, correlational studies, and surveys (p. 41).

The independent variables in this study were students' demographic data such as gender, age, and class. The dependent variables were writing apprehension and writing performance of EFL learners. The study examined the correlation between students' demographic data (gender, class, age) and writing apprehension and writing performance.

3.2. Participants

Participants of the study were 223 undergraduate students studying at the Department of English Language Teaching at Atatürk University. Undergraduate English foreign language students were chosen because the participants' achievement and emotional experiences in English writing are the main concerns of this study. There were 172 female and 51 male students as participants of questionnaire.

The subjects ranged from age 18 to 21. All of them studied English in primary and secondary school as a compulsory lesson before studying English at university. They were all native speakers of Turkish.

Table 3.1.

General profiles of participants

Class	Female	Male	Total
Prep	35	12	47
1	63	25	88
2	44	6	50
3	23	2	25
4	7	6	13

As seen from the table, most of the participants attend the first class (39. 46) and 5. 8 percent of the participants attend fourth class. 77. 1 percent of the total participants are female while 22. 8 percent of the them are male.

3.3. Instrument

In this study, The Daly Miller Writing Apprehension Test was conducted to estimate students' incoming level of apprehension. Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) is the best-known questionnaire and is widely used to measure writing apprehension. Daly and Miller (1975) did not prefer using classroom observations as they might not have been correct and they developed WAT as a standardized instrument. Writing Apprehension Test is also known as Daly-Miller Scale or Daly- Miller Test.

Daly and Miller originally administered sixty-three items questionnaire to 164 undergraduate composition and communication students at West Virginia University during the spring of 1974. At the end of the study, they selected twenty-six items, which accounted for 46 percent of the total variance. The current test contains twenty-six items in which answers were recorded on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, to ask participants to rate their experiences in such statements as "Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience." or "I avoid writing.".

There are thirteen items with positive polarity and thirteen items with negative polarity. The questionnaire constitutes a single score by adding all point values for positive statements and negative statements. In the original test, high scores mean that students do not have a high level of apprehension and do not avoid writing. A low score, however, shows that students have a high level of apprehension.

According to Daly and Miller (1975), WAT identifies stress apprehension which is fear of writing, evaluation apprehension, fear of having writing read and judged by others, and product apprehension, fear of writing a standard product. Writing Apprehension Test associates writing apprehension to writing performance, quality of writing gender differences, willingness to write, expectations about writing process and performance of standardized measurements and tests.

WAT was chosen in this study because a great body of research indicates it is a valid and reliable questionnaire of writing apprehension and it can be easily executed and scored. It was not translated into Turkish so as not to reduce its validity and reliability.

3.4. Procedure

The study took place at the beginning of the fall semester of 2009-2010 academic year. It was aimed to measure students' levels of writing apprehension. Writing Apprehension Test was carried out in the study and the questionnaire was administered to 223 students, 172 female, 51 male during class time in the classroom. The participants were explained the aim of the study and asked for their assistance with the research. We asked them to write down their age, gender and class to correlate writing apprehension with these independent variables.

They completed Writing Apprehension Test in a very short time and they were thanked for their time and participation and tests were collected. The use of Daly-Miller Scale gave opportunity to determine the prevalence of writing apprehension in English Foreign Language classrooms.

3.5. Analysis of the Data

In this study, 5 different statistical analyses have been employed in analyzing the data collected. These analyses are provided below. These analyses have been performed on the computer with the "SPSS for Windows 16. 00" software. Level of significance has been assumed as $p<0.05$.

1. Arithmetic average
2. Standard deviation
3. Student t test
4. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
5. LSD Post Hoc test

The calculation of integral lengths for the questionnaires applied is detailed below.

Calculating the interval lengths of the questionnaires:

Number of options =5
Number of intervals = 5-1 = 4
Interval coefficient = 4: 5=0, 80

For positive items (2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24), the evaluation is as follows:

Items between 1. 00 – 1. 80: **1** …"Strongly agree"
Items between 1. 81 – 2. 60: **2** …" Agree"
Items between 2. 61 – 3. 40: **3** …"Uncertain"
Items between 3. 41 – 4. 20: **4** …" Disagree"
Items between 4. 21 – 5. 00: **5** …" Strongly disagree".

For negative items (1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26), the evaluation is as follows:

Items between 1. 00 – 1. 80: **1** …" Strongly disagree"
Items between 1. 81 – 2. 60: **2** …" Disagree"
Items between 2. 61 – 3. 40: **3** …" Uncertain"
Items between 3. 41 – 4. 20: **4** …" Agree"
Items between 4. 21 – 5. 00: **5** …" Strongly agree"

<div align="center">

CHAPTER FOUR

</div>

4. RESULTS

In this section, findings derived from the statistical analyses of the data together with discussion on these findings are provided in sequence according to the sub problems of the study.

4.1. Findings for Students' Ideas on Writing & Discussion

The first sub-problem of the study is "What are university-level EFL students' ideas on writing?"

To identify students' ideas on writing, the mean and standard deviation of the points marked by the students in the questionnaire have been calculated and provided in

Table 4.1.
Distribution of students' ideas on writing

ITEMS	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Mean
1. I avoid writing*	3,57	1,08	Agree
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	2,57	,99	Agree
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	2,75	1,04	Uncertain
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	3,17	1,14	Uncertain
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience.*	3,55	1,10	Agree
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	2,68	1,02	Uncertain
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.*	2,95	1,15	Uncertain
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.*	4,12	,95	Agree
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	3,29	1,26	Uncertain

Tablo 4.1 Continues

ITEMS	$\overline{X}$	S. D.	Mean
10. I like to write my ideas down.	2,38	1,06	Agree
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	2,52	1,09	Agree
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	2,81	1,16	Uncertain
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	3,31	1,13	Uncertain
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	2,99	,81	Uncertain
15. I enjoy writing.	2,51	1,13	Agree
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	3,43	1,05	Agree
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	2,68	1,13	Uncertain
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them.*	3,34	1,07	Uncertain
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper..	2,39	1,02	Agree
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	2,62	1,08	Uncertain
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	3,14	1,13	Uncertain
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly.*	3,39	1,04	Uncertain
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	3,09	1,05	Uncertain
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	3,18	1,03	Uncertain
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.*	3,19	1,12	Uncertain
26. I'm no good at writing.*	3,35	1,15	Uncertain
MEAN	3,04	2,62	Uncertain

*These are negative statements and they are reversely scored.

Scores between 2. 61 and 3. 40 display that students are not sure to what extent they avoid or approach writing. According to the table, it was noted that writing apprehension mean score for all students is 3.04 which is well in the "not significantly apprehensive" range and the results show that all students are moderately apprehensive in writing. They have neither high nor low apprehension while writing.

Table 4.1 reveals that the following items of the questionnaire about students' ideas on writing have been marked as *"I agree"*:

"1. I avoid writing",

"2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated",

"8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time."

"10. I like to write my ideas down."

"11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing."

"15. I enjoy writing."

"16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly."

"19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper".

Table 4.1 also reveals that the following items of the questionnaire about student's ideas on writing have been marked as *"I am uncertain"*:

"3. I look forward to writing down my ideas."

"4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated."

"6.Handing in a composition makes me feel good."

"7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition."

"9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication."

"12. I like to have my friends read what I have written."

"13. I'm nervous about writing."

"14. People seem to enjoy what I write."

"17. Writing is a lot of fun."

"18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them."

"20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience."

"21 I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course."

"22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly."

"23. It's easy for me to write good compositions."

"24. I don't think I write as well as most people."

"25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated."

"26. I am no good at writing".

4.2. Findings and Discussion Related to Student's Ideas on Writing in Terms of Gender

The second sub-problem of the study is "Is there a significant difference in terms of gender among apprehensive students?"

To identify whether there is any variation by gender in students' writing apprehension, the t test has been applied to the points marked by students in the questionnaire, and findings are provided in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2.
Variance in writing apprehension means in terms of gender

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
MEAN	female	172	3,06	,252	,019
	male	51	2,94	,272	,038

* Variance is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.2. shows that female's writing apprehension mean was 3.06 while males' apprehension was 2.94. Results show that females are more apprehensive than males.Students' gender were not found to have a highly significant relationship with writing apprehension but there is a variance between males and females which is significant at the 0.05 level. (p=0.04).According to these results, students' gender is not primarily influential on their writing performance and there is not too much difference between males and females' apprehension levels.

Tablo 4.3.
T test related to difference among students' writing apprehension in terms of gender

Items	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	F	172	3,40	1,29	**2,305**	**,022**
	M	51	2,94	1,08		
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	F	172	2,77	1,11	**2,351**	**,020**
	M	51	2,35	1,15		

With regard to variation of students' writing apprehension in terms of gender, the t values have been found significant at the p<0.05 level of significance only for the items "9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and

publication. ", and "17. Writing is a lot of fun. ", and all t values for answers to other items of the questionnaire have been found insignificant at the p>0.05 level of significance. This finding demonstrates that, the answers given by students for the items "9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication. " and "17. Writing is a lot of fun. " show variation by gender in students' writing apprehension, and the answers to the other items of the questionnaire are similar.

Table reveals that the mean of female students responding to the item "9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication. " is 3, 40 whereas it is 2,94 for male students. It can be suggested that compared to male students, female students are more inclined to send their essays to magazines for review and publication.

The table further shows that the mean of female students responding to the item "17. Writing is a lot of fun. " is 2.77; whereas it is 2,35 for male students. Therefore, it is possible to advocate that female students find it more entertaining to write compared to male students.

As can be seen from the table, concerning the mean of the answers provided by female and male students, to the items "1. I avoid writing. ", "8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. ", "16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. ", "22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. " students responded "I agree. ". This finding shows that both females and males are apprehensive in writing. When they write, they do not believe they can write skillfully and they consider writing as a waste of time.

Having examined the mean of answers provided by female and male students to the items "4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. ", "7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. ", "13. I'm nervous about writing. ", "18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. ", "21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. ", "25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. " and "26. I'm no good at writing. ", they responded "uncertain" and this shows that not only female but male students are not sure about organization of writing process and evaluation. Table concerning T test related to difference among students' writing apprehension in terms of gender is presented in Appendix 3.

4.3. Findings and Discussion Concerning Student's Ideas on Writing, in Terms of Grade

1. The third sub-problem of the study is "Is there any difference between the students' apprehension level, which are at different grades, in writing?"

To identify whether there is any difference between students' apprehension level, which are at different grades, in writing, One-Way Analysis of Variance has been applied to the points marked by the students in the questionnaire whereby mean, standard deviations and results of the variance analysis are provided in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4.
Variance in writing apprehension means in terms of grade

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Prep	47	2,99	,23047	,03362	2,9291	3,0644	2,42	3,54
First	88	3,00	,24600	,02622	2,9536	3,0578	2,35	3,38
Second	50	3,04	,24905	,03522	2,9715	3,1131	2,35	3,85
Third	25	3,26	,21983	,04397	3,1785	3,3600	2,85	3,73
Forth	13	2,91	,36093	,10010	2,6931	3,1294	2,15	3,50
Total	223	3,03	,26156	,01752	3,0015	3,0706	2,15	3,85

** Variance is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It can be deduced from the table that students' apprehension is affected by grade. As students pass higher grades, their apprehension levels increase. Forth grade students only showed decline in their apprehension level. Students' total mean is 3.03 and this shows that they have moderate levels of apprehension in terms of their grades. There is a significant difference among students from different grades at the level of 0.01 (p=0.00). Table of mean and standard deviation data on students' apprehension in terms of their grades is presented in Appendix 2 and table of One-Way Analysis of Variance of all items can be seen in Appendix 4.

To identify what grade of students accounts for this difference, the LSD Post Hoc test has been applied whereby the results are provided in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5.
Findings for the LSD Post Hoc test in terms of grade

Dependent Variable	(I) grade	(J) grade	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	Prep	1,00	,53554 (*)	,17307	,002
		2,00	,19872	,19462	,308
		3,00	,97872 (*)	,23713	,000
		4,00	,67103 (*)	,30019	,026
	1,00	prep	-,53554 (*)	,17307	,002
		2,00	-,33682 (*)	,16965	,048
		3,00	,44318 (*)	,21710	,042
		4,00	,13549	,28463	,635
	2,00	prep	-,19872	,19462	,308
		1,00	,33682 (*)	,16965	,048
		3,00	,78000 (*)	,23464	,001
		4,00	,47231	,29823	,115
	3,00	prep	-,97872 (*)	,23713	,000
		1,00	-,44318 (*)	,21710	,042
		2,00	-,78000 (*)	,23464	,001
		4,00	-,30769	,32756	,349
	4,00	prep	-,67103 (*)	,30019	,026
		1,00	-,13549	,28463	,635
		2,00	-,47231	,29823	,115
		3,00	,30769	,32756	,349
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.	Prep	1,00	-,43738 (*)	,19877	,029
		2,00	,13489	,22353	,547
		3,00	-,96511 (*)	,27235	,000
		4,00	-,00818	,34477	,981
	1,00	prep	,43738 (*)	,19877	,029
		2,00	,57227 (*)	,19485	,004
		3,00	-,52773 (*)	,24935	,035
		4,00	,42920	,32691	,191
	2,00	prep	-,13489	,22353	,547
		1,00	-,57227 (*)	,19485	,004
		3,00	-1,10000 (*)	,26950	,000
		4,00	-,14308	,34252	,677
	3,00	prep	,96511 (*)	,27235	,000
		1,00	,52773 (*)	,24935	,035
		2,00	1,10000 (*)	,26950	,000
		4,00	,95692 (*)	,37621	,012

Tablo 4.5 Continues

Dependent Variable	(I) grade	(J) grade	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	4,00	prep	,00818	,34477	,981
		1,00	-,42920	,32691	,191
		2,00	,14308	,34252	,677
		3,00	-,95692 (*)	,37621	,012
13. I'm nervous about writing.	Prep	1,00	-,25314	,20091	,209
		2,00	,31277	,22593	,168
		3,00	-,54723 (*)	,27528	,048
		4,00	-,09493	,34849	,786
	1,00	prep	,25314	,20091	,209
		2,00	,56591 (*)	,19694	,004
		3,00	-,29409	,25203	,245
		4,00	,15822	,33043	,633
	2,00	prep	-,31277	,22593	,168
		1,00	-,56591 (*)	,19694	,004
		3,00	-,86000 (*)	,27240	,002
		4,00	-,40769	,34621	,240
	3,00	prep	,54723 (*)	,27528	,048
		1,00	,29409	,25203	,245
		2,00	,86000 (*)	,27240	,002
		4,00	,45231	,38026	,236
	4,00	prep	,09493	,34849	,786
		1,00	-,15822	,33043	,633
		2,00	,40769	,34621	,240
		3,00	-,45231	,38026	,236
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	Prep	1,00	,53651 (*)	,14294	,000
		2,00	,19787	,16074	,220
		3,00	,21787	,19585	,267
		4,00	,52864 (*)	,24794	,034
	1,00	prep	-,53651 (*)	,14294	,000
		2,00	-,33864 (*)	,14012	,016
		3,00	-,31864	,17931	,077
		4,00	-,00787	,23509	,973
	2,00	prep	-,19787	,16074	,220
		1,00	,33864 (*)	,14012	,016
		3,00	,02000	,19380	,918
		4,00	,33077	,24632	,181
	3,00	prep	-,21787	,19585	,267
		1,00	,31864	,17931	,077
		2,00	-,02000	,19380	,918
		4,00	,31077	,27054	,252

Tablo 4.5 Continues

Dependent Variable	(I) grade	(J) grade	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	4,00	prep	-,52864 (*)	,24794	,034
		1,00	,00787	,23509	,973
		2,00	-,33077	,24632	,181
		3,00	-,31077	,27054	,252
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	Prep	1,00	-,01209	,20203	,952
		2,00	-,56936 (*)	,22719	,013
		3,00	-,28936	,27682	,297
		4,00	-,02782	,35043	,937
	1,00	prep	,01209	,20203	,952
		2,00	-,55727 (*)	,19804	,005
		3,00	-,27727	,25344	,275
		4,00	-,01573	,33227	,962
	2,00	prep	,56936 (*)	,22719	,013
		1,00	,55727 (*)	,19804	,005
		3,00	,28000	,27392	,308
		4,00	,54154	,34814	,121
	3,00	prep	,28936	,27682	,297
		1,00	,27727	,25344	,275
		2,00	-,28000	,27392	,308
		4,00	,26154	,38238	,495
	4,00	prep	,02782	,35043	,937
		1,00	,01573	,33227	,962
		2,00	-,54154	,34814	,121
		3,00	-,26154	,38238	,495
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	Prep	1,00	,18956	,19151	,323
		2,00	-,30681	,21536	,156
		3,00	-,56681 (*)	,26240	,032
		4,00	-,21604	,33217	,516
	1,00	prep	-,18956	,19151	,323
		2,00	-,49636 (*)	,18773	,009
		3,00	-,75636 (*)	,24024	,002
		4,00	-,40559	,31496	,199
	2,00	prep	,30681	,21536	,156
		1,00	,49636 (*)	,18773	,009
		3,00	-,26000	,25965	,318
		4,00	,09077	,33001	,784
	3,00	prep	,56681 (*)	,26240	,032
		1,00	,75636 (*)	,24024	,002
		2,00	,26000	,25965	,318
		4,00	,35077	,36246	,334
	4,00	prep	,21604	,33217	,516
		1,00	,40559	,31496	,199
		2,00	-,09077	,33001	,784

Tablo 4.5 Continues

Dependent Variable	(I) grade	(J) grade	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
		3,00	-,35077	,36246	,334

* The mean difference is significant at the. 05 level.

It is seen that students of the preparatory class provided more positive answers for the item "2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated. " than the 1st, 3rd and 4th-grade students did; 1st and 2nd-grade students provided more positive answers than the 3rd-grade students did; and 1st-grade students provided more negative answers than the 3rd-grade students did.

As for the item "4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. ", students of the preparatory class feel less fear than the 3rd and 4th-grade students do; 1st-grade students feel more fear than the 2nd-grade students do and less fear than the 3rd-grade students do; 2nd-grade students feel less fear than the 3rd-grade students do; and 3rd-grade students feel more fear than the 4th-grade students do.

Based upon the answers for the item "13. I'm nervous about writing. ", the preparatory-grade and 2nd-grade students develop less concern than the 3rd-grade students do. First-grade students develop less concern than the 2nd-grade students do. Also preparatory-grade students show more agreement with the item "14. People seem to enjoy what I write. " than the 1st and 4th-grade students do, and 1st-grade students show less agreement with this item than the 2nd-grade students do.

When focused on the item "17. Writing is a lot of fun. " 2nd grade students find it more entertaining than the 1st-grade students and preparatory-grade students do. Also, answers given to the item "20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience. " show that preparatory and 1st-grade students like discussing less than the 2nd and 3rd-grade students do.

4.4. Findings and Discussion for Students' Ideas on Writing, in Terms of Age

The fourth sub-problem of the study is "Is there any difference between students' apprehension level, which are at different age groups, in writing?"

One-Way Analysis of Variance has been applied to the points marked by the students in the questionnaire whereby mean and standard deviations are provided in Table 4.6, and one way analysis of the variance is provided in Table 4.7, in order to determine whether there is any difference between students' apprehension level, which are at different age groups, in writing.

Table 4.6.
Variance in writing apprehension means in terms of age

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
18,00	17	2,96	,25801	,06258	2,8289	3,0942	2,65	3,46
19,00	37	3,03	,22417	,03685	2,9627	3,1122	2,35	3,38
20,00	69	2,98	,25018	,03012	2,9221	3,0423	2,42	3,35
21,00	50	3,13	,25633	,03625	3,0610	3,2067	2,35	3,85
22,00	30	3,04	,21514	,03928	2,9671	3,1278	2,69	3,50
23,00	12	2,96	,37109	,10712	2,7258	3,1973	2,15	3,50
24,00	8	3,11	,39515	,13971	2,7802	3,4409	2,50	3,73
Total	223	3,03	,26156	,01752	3,0015	3,0706	2,15	3,85

* Variance is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.6. shows that students' apprehension level increases or decreases according to their ages. For example, mean of students who are at age of 18 is 2.96 whereas it is 3.03 at age of 19.All students' apprehension mean in terms of their ages is 3.03 and V-variance has been found significant at the 0.05 level ($p<0.05$) among students from different ages. Table showing all items' mean and standard deviation data on students'apprehension in terms of their ages can be received in Appendix 5.

Tablo 4.7.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) related to the difference among students'
apprehension level in terms of their ages

ITEMS		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
10. I like to write my ideas down.	Between Groups	16,495	5	3,299	**3,058**	**,011**
	Within Groups	234,106	217	1,079		
	Total	250,601	222			
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	Between Groups	12,159	5	2,432	**2,263**	**,049**
	Within Groups	233,222	217	1,075		
	Total	245,381	222			

According to the result of the One-Way Variance Analysis on the difference between the students' apprehension, which are at different age groups, in writing, F values for the items "10 I like to write my ideas down. ", and "23. It's easy for me to write good compositions. " are significant at a level of $p < 0.05$ whereas all other F values for other items which are shown in appendix 6 are insignificant at a level of $p > 0.05$. Results of all items are presented in Appendix 6.

This finding demonstrates that there is difference between students' apprehension level, which are at different age groups, in writing in respect of the items "10. I like writing out my ideas" and "23. Good essay writing is easy for me". To identify what grade of students accounts for this difference, the LSD Post Hoc test has been applied whereby the results are provided in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8.
Findings for the LSD Post Hoc test in terms of age

Dependent Variable	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
10. I like to write my ideas down.	18,00	19,00	,17170	,30433	,573
		20,00	-,25916	,28124	,358
		21,00	-,66235 (*)	,29161	,024
		22,00	-,34902	,31531	,270
		23,00	-,18235	,34264	,595
	19,00	18,00	-,17170	,30433	,573
		20,00	-,43087 (*)	,21164	,043
		21,00	-,83405 (*)	,22524	,000
		22,00	-,52072 (*)	,25518	,043
		23,00	-,35405	,28827	,221
	20,00	18,00	,25916	,28124	,358
		19,00	,43087 (*)	,21164	,043
		21,00	-,40319 (*)	,19290	,038
		22,00	-,08986	,22715	,693
		23,00	,07681	,26377	,771
	21,00	18,00	,66235 (*)	,29161	,024
		19,00	,83405 (*)	,22524	,000
		20,00	,40319 (*)	,19290	,038
		22,00	,31333	,23987	,193
		23,00	,48000	,27481	,082
	22,00	18,00	,34902	,31531	,270
		19,00	,52072 (*)	,25518	,043
		20,00	,08986	,22715	,693
		21,00	-,31333	,23987	,193
		23,00	,16667	,29984	,579
	23,00	18,00	,18235	,34264	,595
		19,00	,35405	,28827	,221
		20,00	-,07681	,26377	,771
		21,00	-,48000	,27481	,082
		22,00	-,16667	,29984	,579
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	18,00	19,00	,42448	,30376	,164
		20,00	,04689	,28071	,867
		21,00	-,12471	,29106	,669
		22,00	,30196	,31472	,338
		23,00	,58529	,34199	,088
	19,00	18,00	-,42448	,30376	,164
		20,00	-,37759	,21124	,075
		21,00	-,54919 (*)	,22482	,015
		22,00	-,12252	,25470	,631

Tablo 4.8 Continues

Dependent Variable	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
		23,00	,16081	,28772	,577
	20,00	18,00	-,04689	,28071	,867
		19,00	,37759	,21124	,075
		21,00	-,17159	,19254	,374
		22,00	,25507	,22672	,262
		23,00	,53841 (*)	,26328	,042
	21,00	18,00	,12471	,29106	,669
		19,00	,54919 (*)	,22482	,015
		20,00	,17159	,19254	,374
		22,00	,42667	,23942	,076
		23,00	,71000 (*)	,27429	,010
	22,00	18,00	-,30196	,31472	,338
		19,00	,12252	,25470	,631
		20,00	-,25507	,22672	,262
		21,00	-,42667	,23942	,076
		23,00	,28333	,29927	,345
	23,00	18,00	-,58529	,34199	,088
		19,00	-,16081	,28772	,577
		20,00	-,53841 (*)	,26328	,042
		21,00	-,71000 (*)	,27429	,010
		22,00	-,28333	,29927	,345

* The mean difference is significant at the. 05 level.

As seen from the table, it is clear the 18-year age group likes writing less than the 21-year age group does; and the 19-year age group likes writing less than the 20,21 and 22-year age groups do when the item "10. I like to write my ideas down. " is examined. Also, results of the item "23. It's easy for me to write good compositions. " reveal that the 23-year age seems more positive than the 20-year age group does; and the 21-year age group seems more positive than the 19 and 23-year age groups do.

In sum, Turkish students at university level, in their context, appears to be apprehensive during writing though they desire to achieve and improve acceptable writing. Further, results can imply that undergraduate students are not adequately aware of writing process due to certain reasons such as pedagogical reasons and their preconceptions against writing. In fact, study has underlined that writing is not an inborn talent which either exists or does not exist in a learner's capacity, it can be

learned, achieved and improved. At this point, the phenomenon needs to be well understood, teachers, program designers and textbook writers should be cautious about students' feelings, opinions and individuality.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Conclusion

Previous studies show that writing apprehension has an influence on students' writing performance and composition is affected by students' gender, age and other issues and this chapter provides conclusions for the study about the connection among gender, age, class and writing apprehension and writing performance. The effect of apprehension on writing performance was also concluded.

Writing possesses applications that must be often supplied and this situation makes students avoid writing situations during their lifetime. Apprehensive students usually regard writing as tedious and displeasing and choose professions that will not force them to write. It is a complex matter that is worth studying more than some people think, it is not a simple problem that can not be solved easily.

The aim of this study was to determine problems related to writing and to provide evidence that these problems can contribute a source of apprehension and this type of apprehension causes learners to avoid writing and situations that require use of writing. Learners with apprehension do not write much, which leads to a decline in their writing abilities.

According to the results of this study, students who completed questionnaire have some forms of apprehension but their apprehension level is not very high or low.Though gender does not have too many impacts on writing apprehension, their grades causes apprehension in writing. Last variable "age" has also significant difference and is effective in increasing or decreasing of apprehension.

Some researchers like Shami (1999) focus on problems leading to writing anxiety and, interviews made by Shami (1999) show that problems experienced by adults in their childhood and adolescence affect their ability and desire to write, to enter

professions requiring writing, and prevent them from simple writing tasks. Causes of writing apprehension may range from students' personality, environment at home, and early experiences to other details of school background. If these causes are investigated correctly, it is possible to avoid increasing writing apprehension levels, and to help students develop a partnership with their peers and teachers. He (1999) concludes about students' difficulties on writing:

> Based on the results of the interviews, the major conclusion is that the people who participated in both types of interviews have major problems associated with writing. They have difficulty in all phases of writing from conceptualization to providing a finished document. Their writing anxiety ranges from simple friendly letters to essays (p.68).

In Shami's survey, when students were asked "What events, situations, and people are connected with your writing anxiety?" they indicated situation of having to write, teachers' feedback papers filled with red ink, parents' negative thoughts about their paper, friends who disturb them while writing and testing situations especially ones long and difficult make them nervous and anxious about writing.

Disuse of outlines and plans before beginning to write, difficulties to get started to write, the lack of ideas concerning imagination, choice of writing topics, and inadequate experiences to develop ideas may cause poor writing. Rahilly (2004) investigates the reasons of students' anxious and fearful feelings in academic writing and states when students have lack of confidence about their writing abilities, lack of positive experiences, lack of knowledge about necessities of writing process, fear of negative evaluation or feel embarrassed because peers or teachers view themselves as unskilled, and they have high levels of apprehension while writing.

It should be implied to teachers' effects on student writing problems in order to reduce writing apprehension. Some teachers' attitudes such as spending little time to teach writing, humiliating comments about their writing, inadequate energy to examine teaching styles to use in writing classes are some of the factors in students' writing apprehension. To decrease teachers' negative effects on students' performance, Shami (1999) suggests that teachers need to know students' cultural backgrounds, and sentence structure differences between native and foreign languages. They should spend more

time and energy in teaching writing and avoid negative comments on students' writing. Since each student is different from one another, their learning styles show differences and teachers should focus on different learning styles which promote students' abilities to write well. Armendaris (2009) claims all approaches work but not always and they should be adapted to each student, classroom or ethnic group and should be changed every semester since new students produce their own expectations, purposes, capacity and feelings. Learning styles including ideas on dialogue, participation and liberation may work well. Hamp-Lyons (1991) states in this issue:

> As adult ESL students in academic writing classes come from a wide diversity of educational, linguistic and ethno-cultural backgrounds, it is expected that they will bring to an academic English writing class different experiences, skills and exposure to literacy and writing in both their native languages and in English (cited in Rahilly, 1994, p.273).

Participants of Rahilly's study assert that they feel anxious when they encounter with unfamiliar writing tasks or are tested difficult, competitive and intensely timed writing situations. This nervousness causes them to experience writing block. Writer's block is observed in participants who are unconfident and apprehensive with the allocated writing task. Poff (2004) associates writer's block with writing apprehension according to the model hypothesized for Predictors of Literacy and explains item 5 "Writer's block may be partly the result of writing apprehension":

> A writer, who experiences negative symptoms with respect to writing (WA), may suffer so intensely as to possibly paralyze the writer from writing altogether (WB). In this situation, the writer may be unable to initiate writing altogether or may be unable to continue using CP strategies for any writing already begun (pp 11-12).

Training and educational experiences can be regarded as the origin of these problems. Students are also influenced by their parents' poor expectations, and lack of teacher support. Shami (1999) points mechanical and psychological problems which arise with parents' behaviors referring that they do not expect their children can write well. These beliefs discourage children from improving their writing skills. Mechanics such as spelling and grammar are not considered as important as content by some

teachers using journal writing as a way of contributing to students' writing skills. However, students should be taught how to organize their thoughts into logical sentences and paragraphs.

Writers' knowledge and experiences form basis of their writing best. Reading about diverse topics increases their experiences and being exposed to writing as much as possible let students realize how writing skills vary from the writer to purpose of writing.

Gender plays a part in writing apprehension as an independent variable. Studies carried out by Rahilly (2004) demonstrate women feel more anxious and worried about writing than men who do not explain their feelings deeply and focus on more their performances and other people's views about their writing. This distinction can be made due to the fact that women have a more open proneness to tell about their feelings and they are more apprehensive than men are.

Most research activities carried on the correlation between gender and writing self-efficacy beliefs show that girls have stronger confidence in writing than boys and as they grow up, differences may arise like the situation of girls' having a decline in their perception of competence when they move to high school. Pajares (2003) states girls have high grades in writing performance tasks and are interpreted as better writers by teachers, but this situation changes when they cannot show relevant strong confidence in writing capabilities as much as boys.

It is probably true that girls perform better than boys but they have the same levels of writing self-efficacy. Also girls regard themselves as learners write better than boys in the classes. Pajares (2003) points out stereotyped beliefs about gender students have are more dominant on students than gender and "students' gender role stereotypes are partly responsible for differences in course and career selection, confidence beliefs, and perceived value of tasks and activities" (p.150).

Rahilly (2004) also explains the conclusions about the effects of participants' first language attitude toward writing on English writing and concludes that students with positive attitudes toward writing in their native language are more positive about learning to write in English while students with negative feelings about writing in native

language have poor attitudes in English writing. She (2004) exemplifies this situation with Krashen's (1982) *Affective Filter Hypothesis* which expresses if students have a high emotional filter or negative attitude toward native culture and language, they seem likely to learn foreign language more unwillingly than those that have a more positive attitude about native language.

Self efficacy beliefs and motivation playing a great role in learning to write were discussed in Rahilly's study as affective findings. It can be implied that students highly motivated believe that they can easily achieve their educational goal by learning to write and they are more successful in writing than students with low motivation. Producing good writing papers make it possible to increase students' motivation and connect their academic English writing to real world utilizations. Self efficacy defined as "the belief that a students can successfully learn a new task" (Rahilly, 2004) reveals that experience and success in writing raise levels of self confidence as much as feelings about being successful and receiving high marks in writing classes.

Variety in type and intensity of writing assignments as well as feelings and attitudes about foreign language writing constitutes students' affective concerns which give the opportunity to recognize how the writers overcome the difficulties of writing in a competitive and demanding learning environment. As a result, affective factors such as students' feelings, attitudes and motivation facilitate to see how they affect students' success and failure in writing process.

Garrison (1998) states that highly and moderately apprehensive learners are more influenced by personal factors than those with low level of apprehension. Many personal factors such as getting married, illness or death of a family member, job related fears, and difficulties with technology have a great impact on the progress of students' writing apprehension levels. Garrison (1998) points the findings concerning communication and support factors by means of participants of the study that students with high apprehension show greater lack of communication and support

This study was carried out to validate a measurement for Turkish students of English and the following research questions were examined using Writing Apprehension Test.

1. What are the beliefs and practices of EFL students' about writing at university level?

2. Is there a significant difference in terms of gender among apprehensive students?

3. Is there a significant difference in terms of age among apprehensive students?

4. Is there a significant difference in terms of grade among apprehensive students?

It is expected that this scale can recognize whether students are in danger of writing poorly. By developing and conducting a treatment to decrease students' apprehension, it would seem to help students overcome writing difficulties. The instrument will help us measure the effects of writing apprehension on writing performance.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications

For many years, studies show that writing apprehension of EFL students negatively correlates with writing performance and students with low apprehension write more quality compositions than students with high apprehension. When these findings are regarded as difficulties preventing students from writing effectively, ways of reducing student writing apprehension should be focused on.

Improving writing skills of students is a way to overcome writing challenges. Teachers play a part in providing a teaching process to decrease student apprehension. First of all, they should create and maintain a positive environment encouraging students to participate in writing classes and offer helpful strategies including communicative writing tasks to reduce fears and build confidence. Hassan (2001) suggests teachers must change the context of foreign language learning and observe the students to determine the reasons of student apprehension.

Hassan (2001) offers "Writing labs" to create an ideal setting to contribute students to regain confidence in writing. These labs are beneficial as they give students opportunity to make peer tutoring which is less threatening than working with regular

class instructors. It is also possible in "Writing labs" to use timed writing and revision activities.

Reeves (1997) advocates the benefits of some certain techniques used in the learner-centered classrooms. Writing more is one of them, in this technique, it needs explaining to students that writing requires more practice to give students chance of expressing themselves freely. Students can write in forms of journals, memos, poems and letters. It is considerably important to respond students' writing. Teachers should not be judgmental toward students and it should be shifted focus from teacher evaluation to peer or self evaluation which will give students feelings of security and confidence. In this issue, Reeves (1997) emphasizes discouraging appropriation of authority to help students be their own authority, take ownership of their writing, write about their experiences and find meaning.

Since past experiences have an effect on writing, talking about feelings and past experiences is suggested by Reeves (1997) as a pre-writing activity. Contextualizing and customizing, finding patterns in students' error, conference during drafting stages, collaborating students for evaluation criteria and coach peers for effective response, monitoring attitudes, varying writing modes, encouraging positive self talk are activities recommended by Reeves (1997) to reduce writing apprehension.

Hassan (2001) suggests some techniques to reduce writing apprehension such as "using the word processor which may help in students' effort to write and to improve their self-images as writers" or "gradually increasing students' writing activities such as journal writing". As evaluation plays a crucial part in writing process, teachers should assess students' writing in a constructive way in order to encourage students to ask when they have difficulties. Students should be directed toward revision of logical patterns or meaning of writing not grammar correction which may be harmful for students' development in writing.

Hassan (2001) also emphasizes ways of teaching writing such as using of peer review which creates a friendlier environment and feelings of equality between the writer and the reader and makes students feel more secure. To lower apprehension level of students peer group workshops are also recommended as a helpful way as well as

telling about the writing process and making students aware that writing is learnt step by step.

Since the influence of self-efficacy beliefs on writing is undeniable, teachers have responsibilities to develop students' confidence and competence. Adults can shape young students' behaviors by activities improving self-assurance or self- beliefs. Because young children need others' judgments in order to constitute their own confidence. Here, teachers' writing tasks and activities which support and encourage students to develop a sense of confidence and competence gain importance. It may be useful that teachers take into consideration students' perceptions of competence gauging motivation and academic choices as well as their actual competence.

In reducing writing apprehension, two of the significant things are teacher feedback and the strategies that develop students' papers. How teachers respond to student writing and what impacts teacher response have on revision have really attracted researchers' attention. The findings of the studies carried out to investigate this matter have contributed much to writing literature.

Ferris (1997) supports that if students are interested in teacher response, this will help them to make revisions and improve their writing. On the other hand, the fact that students pay no attention to feedback given by teachers leads to no changes. She (1997) also concludes that specific and long comments result in more positive changes. At this point, teachers must teach students to revise their drafts according to feedbacks and take into account teachers' comments even if teachers' commenting style is not suitable for them.

To choose correct techniques to give feedback, teachers can utilize techniques classified by Ferris. These techniques are peer response groups, teacher-student conferences, audiotaped commentary, reformulation, and computer-based commentary. (p. 315). Handwritten commentary is another method that can be used to respond. Teachers must take care in choosing their strategies and make students understand their strategies by explaining them how to respond their writing.

Considering what precautions should be taken to reduce writing apprehension, teachers are primarily responsible for making students write well. Firstly they should major on the quality of writing classes. Generally students find writing boring and punishing, which results in writing apprehension. To prevent students from having negative attitudes toward writing classes, teachers should provide enjoyable writing activities related to writing topics and they can use other language skills such as listening, and reading.

Not just writing courses, but all lessons are supposed to be taught in an integrated way as well. All four skills are to be utilized. What is more, writing courses should be given in a three- phase approach including presentation, practice and production. In presentation, students should be informed about writing topic, the aim and the importance of the task by teachers.

If students do not know what to do or how to begin to write, it will be the waste of time for unskilled writers. So, prewriting stage is worth spending time in class. Students then are prepared to the writing class with some activities. Teachers should bring a variety of strategies for presentation stage to encourage students to find out what strategies are the best for them. Brainstorming, warm up activities, reading or listening passages relevant to writing task, freewriting or listing can be used to get started. By doing this, students will be familiar to the writing issue and they will probably find writing entertaining. Tasks for pair or group work give them more opportunities to get started.

Second stage, in which activities about practicing learning task are used, helps them use correct forms or patterns of language, learn a variety of words or grammar rules and master the meaning conveyed. In this phase, teachers can use such activities as filling gaps, answering questions according to a reading passage concerned with writing subject, and rewriting a sentence given. The last stage gives students opportunity to produce new things based on their experiences about the topic. Since students are exposed to similar structures in the previous stages, they should be able to write easily and skillfully.

Teachers can utilize different sources concerned with writing instead of using only textbooks chosen for writing classes. They should adopt different materials so as to persuade students to broaden their minds, and discover new things and prevent them from considering writing as a tedious skill.

It would seem to be helpful to take into consideration textbooks used in writing classes for an efficient and productive writing process.Many textbooks are not well-designed in terms of subjects chosen to be taught to students, their grammatical or discourse level and so on. They are so demanding that students are expected to do many things in a short time and do not include all necessary writing skills required for a good and competent writer. So, it can be suggested that textbooks used in writing classes, must meet students' demands and contain all necessary topics.

Writing topics should be functional, that is textbooks should provide real life writing contexts. For instance, students are supposed to know how to write a postcard, a personal or formal letter, and a book review and how to complete hotel, post office and bank forms. The tasks based on real- life situations or texts give students confidence in any situations and help them develop the skills required to write confidently in any situation. Finally, textbooks should be student-centered which seems to be one of the most important considerations in writing. Activities or tasks in the book must make it possible that students will perform in each part. They can do the activities themselves, in pairs or in groups.

Writing curriculum is one of the most important components in language learning. So it should be established by considering students' needs, experiences, demands and their skill levels. The curriculum must be student-centered and well designed in order to help teachers perform effectively in the classroom. It also should include approaches one of which teachers can choose for their students and writing activities or tasks suitable for learners. These tasks must be completed in time and must improve students' understanding of content and skills.

To sum up, writing a text skillfully or teaching students to become good writers is a complex issue that needs to be controlled and shaped for a certain audience or purpose. Since writing can be regarded as the most difficult skill to accomplish of all,

students should spend more time for writing than other skills to attain a success in writing. Given that writing is a challenging process, it is inevitable that teachers play a big role in developing students' writing skills, controlling writing classes and supplying strategies and tools for them.

5.3. Further Research

There are many opportunities for further research relevant writing apprehension of EFL students. This study was carried out to investigate EFL students' apprehension level. However, it is not possible to compare these students' apprehension levels and apprehension of students from other majors. Additional investigations should be conducted to examine students' writing apprehension from other majors to be able to explore similarities and differences of EFL undergraduate students and students who choose different majors.

This study showed that we know very little about writing apprehension. Many studies use Daly- Miller test to understand the causes and effects of apprehension on writing. However, this may not be enough to determine the correlation between apprehension and affective factors. Based on the findings of this study, it can be stated that there is a need for further study related to the affective issues which influence EFL students and their writing performance. So, further research should conduct to investigate students' attitudes, feelings and motivation in order to define the relationship between writing apprehesion and affective factors.

In this study, quantitative research was conducted due to time constraints. Subsequent investigations should include qualitative research as well as quantitative research in order to obtain more detailed data. Also, qualitative research gives opportunity to find out variables which are not known and need to be learned from participants.

REFERENCES

Armendaris, F. (2009). *Writing anxiety among english as a second language studetns enrolled in academic english writing classes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, California.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freedmand & Co.

Bardine, B. (1999). Students' perceptions of written teacher comments: What do they say about how we respond to them?. *High SchoolJournal, 82* (4), 239.

Bardine, B. A., Bardine, M. S., & Deegan, E. F. (2000). Beyond the red pen: Clarifying

our role in the response process. *The English Journal, 90* (1), 94–101.

Beane, J., Lipka, R. P., & Ludewig, J. W. (1980). Synthesis of research on self concept. *Educational Leadership, 38* (1), 84-89.

Bloom, L. (1985). Anxious writers in context: Graduate school and beyond. In M. Rose (Eds.), *When a writer can't write* (pp. 119–133). New York: Guilford Press.

Book, V. (1976). Some effects of apprehension on writing performance. *Annual Meeting of the American Business Communication Association,* San Diego, 1–24.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Campbell, J. (1994). Writing to heal: Using meditation in the writing process. *College Composition and Communication*, *45* (2), 246-251.

Cheng, Y. S. (1998). *Examinations of two anxiety constructs: Second language class anxiety and second language writing anxiety*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

Cohen, A. D., &, Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom,* (pp. 155–177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cottrell, N. B. (1972). Social facilitation. In C. McClintock (Ed.), *Experimental social psychology*, (pp. 185-236). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Planning, conducting and evaluating Quantitative and qualitative research.* Lincoln, Educational research, University of Nebraska.

Crumbo, G. B. (1998). *Writing apprehension and the effects of "I think I can, I think I can",* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Spalding University, Louisville.

Çubukçu, F. (2007). Foreign language anxiety. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies (I) LS), 1* (2), 133-142.

Daly, J. A. & Miller, M. D. (1975). Further studies on writing apprehension: SAT scores, success expectation, willingness to take advanced courses and sex Differences. *Research in the Teaching of English, 9* (3), 249–253.

Daly, J. A. & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *9* (3), 242-249.

Daly, J. A. (1978). Writing apprehension and writing competency. *Journal of Educational Research, 72* (1), 10–14.

Daly, J. A., Faigley, L., & Witte, S. P. (1981). The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence. *Journal of Educational Research, 75* (1),16-21.

Dornyei, Z. (2002). *Teaching and research motivation*. Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Dulay, H., Burt M., & Krashen S. D. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly, 31* (2),315–339.

Ferris, D. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition: The Role of Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA*, *32* (2), 181-201.

Fitzgerald, J., & Markham, L. R. (1987). Teaching children about revision in writing *Cognition and Instruction*, *4* (1), 3-24.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32* (4), 365-387.

Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). Issues in E. A. P.: A preliminary perspective. In J. Flowerdew, & M. Peacock, (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp.8-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, *13*, 266–272.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gay, P. (1983). *How attitude interferes with the performance of unskilled college freshman writers.* (Contract No. NIE-G-81-0102). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. Kroll, B., *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*, (Edt). Cambridge University Press, New York, 2003.

Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). *Second language acquisition: A social psychological approach.* Research Bulletin, 332. London, Canada: University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Clement, R. (1979). Intensive second language study in a bicultural milieu. An investigation of attitude, motivation and language proficiency. *Language Learning, 29*,305–320.

Garrison, L. G. (1998). *The association between writing apprehension and writing productivity at the doctoral level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University. Minneapolis.

Grinnell, C. K. (2003). *The effect of a writing center on developmental studetns writing apprehension and writing performance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Grambling State University. Grambling.

Hanna, K. J. (2009). *Student perceptions of teacher comments: Relationships between specific aspects of teacher comments and writing apprehension*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. E. (1995). *The Literacy Dictionary: The Vocabulary of Reading and Writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Hassan B. A. (2001). The relationship of writing apprehension and self esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL University students. *ERIC Document,* ED 459671.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S.(1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp3-30). Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heuring, D. L. (1985), *The revision strategies of skilled and unskilled ESL writers: Five case studies*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Hawaii, Manoa.

Horwitz, E. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 559–564.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70* (2),125–132.

Kaplan, R. B. (1967) Contrastive rhetoric and the teaching of composition. *TESOL Quarterly, 1* (4),10–16.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Writing: research, theory and applications*. New York: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: ıssues and implication*. London: Longman.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching an ESL/EFL writing course. In M. C. Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 219-232). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Kroll, B. (2003). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*, (Edt). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kunt, N. (1997). *Anxiety and beliefs about lanuguage learning: a study of turkish – speaking university studetns learning english in North cyprus.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Lew, S. E. (2001). *Writing apprehension in ESL*, Unpublished master's thesis. California State University, California.

Masgoret, A. M., & Gardner, R. C. (2003). Attitudes, motivation an second language learning: A meta-Analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and Associates. *Language Learning, 53* (1), 123–163.

McCarthy, P., Meier, S., & Rinderer, R, (1985). Self-efficacy and writing: A different view of self-evaluation. *College Composition and Communication, 36 (4),* 465–471.

MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning. 44* (2), 283-305.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: *A review of the literature. Language Learning, 41(1),* 85–117.

Matthews, D. A. H. (2001). *In our voices: A pedagogical approach to reducing writing apprehension.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Georgia State University, Atlanta.

McLeod, S. (1987). Some thoughts about feelings: The affective domain and the writing process. *College Composition and Communication, 38* (4),426–435.

Miller, A. M. (2009). Basic writers using clickers: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Akron, Akron.

Oh, M-J. T. (1996). *Beliefs about language learning and foreign language anxiety: A study of American university students learning Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Owens, R. J. (1970). Teaching English composition. *RELC Journal,* I: *1,*125–126.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66* (4), 543-578.

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy Beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: Areview of literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *19*, 139–158.

Pajares, F. (2007). Empirical properties of a scale to assess writing self-efficacy in

school contexts measurement and evaluation in counseling and development. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 39,*239–249.

Pajares, F., & Johnson, M. J. (1993). Confidence and competence in writing: The role of writing self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 28, 1-26.

Parajes, F., Johnson M. J., & Usher E. L. (2007). Sources of writing self efficacy beliefs

of elementary, middle, and high school students. *Research in the Teaching of English; 42 (1),* 104.

Rosenberg, M. J. (1965). When dissonance fails: On eliminating evaluation apprehension from attitude measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95,*28–42.

Rose, M. (1984). *Writer's block: the cognitive dimension*. Carbondale: Southern

Illinois University Press.

Paulston, C. B. (1972, Mar.). Teaching writing in the ESOL classroom: Techniques of controlled composition. *TESOL Quarterly, 6* (1),33–59.

Perl, S. (1980). Understanding composing. *College Composition and Communication, 31* (4),363–369.

Poff, S. I. (2004). *A Predictor of writer's block and writing apprehension.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, University of Southern California.

Popovich, M. N., & Massé, M. H. (2005). Individual assessment of media writing student attitudes: recasting the mass communication writing appehension measure. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly;* Summer; *82* (2); 339–355.

Powers, W. G., Cook, J. A., & Meyer R. (1979). The effect of compulsory writing on writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13* (3), 225–230.

Rahilly, M. K. (2004). *Affective literacy and cultural influences on the development of English composition skills: Perceptions and experiences of adult ESL studetns in academic ESL writing programs.* Unpublished master's thesis. George Mason University, Fairfax.

Reeves, L. L. (1997, Oct). Minimizing Writing Apprehension in the Learner-Centered Classroom. *The English Journal, 86* (6),38–45.

Sarason, I. G. (1978). The test anxiety scale: Concept and research. In C. D. Spielberger & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Stress and anxiety* (Vol.5, pp. 193-216). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Schnee, A. K. (2010). *Student writing performance: Identifying the effects when combining planning and revising instructional strategies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Shami, A. (1999). *A study of writing aversion and anxiety: A heuristic approach.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Wayne State University, Detroit.

Shrewsbury, M. J. B. (1995). *The effects of collaborative learning on writing quality, writing apprehnesion, and writing attitude of college studetns in a developmental english program.* Unpublished master's thesis. West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: developments, issues and directions in ESL", In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23*)* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silva T., &, Leki I. (2004). Family matters: The influence of applied linguistics and composition studies on second language Writing studies: past, present, and future. *The Modern Language Journal, 88* (1),1–13.

Smith, Michael W. (1984). Reducing Writing Apprehension, *Eric Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills,* 1-47.

Smith, D. C. & Nelson, S. J. (1994). Writing apprehension and test anxiety in technical writing: Extent and variables. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education, 11*,20–29.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(4),378–388.

Spack, R. (1990) Initiating ESL studetns into academic discourse community: How far should we go?, In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Flowerdew, J. & Peacock, M. (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, B. P. (1981). Content and written form: A two-way street. *TESOL Quarterly, 15* (1),5–13.

Thompson, M. (1979). *Writing anxiety and freshman composition.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Conference on English in the Two Year College. Pittsburgh, PA.

Thompson, M. O. (1980). *Classroom techniques for reducing writing anxiety: A study of several cases.* Paper presented at annual conference on College Composition and Communication, Washington D. C.

Thornton, A. (2010). *Teachers' self-perception of their writing and their teaching of writing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Capella University, Minneapolis.

Tóth, Z. (2010). *Foreign language anxiety and the advanced language learner: A study of hungarian students of english as a foreign language.* UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing UK.

Warnock J. (1983). The Writing Process. *Rhetoric Review, 2* (1),4–23.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33* (4), 448-457.

Wiltse, E. M. (2002). Correlates of college students' use of instructors' comments, *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator; 57* (2), 126–138.

Wood, R. &, Bandura, A. (1989, July). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *The Academy of Management Review, 14* (3),361–384.

Young, R. (1978). Paradigmas and problems Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: Points of departure* (pp. 29–47). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly, 10* (1), 67–76.

Zamel, V. (1982). The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly,* 16(2),195–209.

Zamel V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies, *TESOL Quarterly*, *17* (2),165–187.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Writing Apprehension Questionnaire

Department :

Class :

Sex : (F)   (M)

Age :

Writing Apprehension Test measures people's general attitudes to avoid and approach writing. The goal is to find out different levels of writing apprehension in all students, why they become apprehensive while writing and the ways to create a constructive environment to improve their writing abilities. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) uncertain, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree with the statement. All the information will be used for research purposes. Thank you for your cooperation to complete the questionnaire.

ITEMS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I avoid writing.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.	①	②	③	④	⑤

9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10. I like to write my ideas down.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	①	②	③	④	⑤
13. I'm nervous about writing.	①	②	③	④	⑤
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	①	②	③	④	⑤
15. I enjoy writing.	①	②	③	④	⑤
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly.	①	②	③	④	⑤
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	①	②	③	④	⑤
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them.	①	②	③	④	⑤
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	①	②	③	④	⑤
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	①	②	③	④	⑤
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course.	①	②	③	④	⑤
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly.	①	②	③	④	⑤
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	①	②	③	④	⑤
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	①	②	③	④	⑤
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.	①	②	③	④	⑤
26. I'm no good at writing.	①	②	③	④	⑤

Appendix 2: Mean and standard deviation data on students'apprehension in terms of grade

Items	Grade	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I avoid writing. *	prep	47	3,70	1,17797
	1	88	3,59	1,11206
	2	50	3,26	1,02639
	3	25	3,80	,81650
	4	13	3,62	1,12090
	Total	176	3,52	1,05816
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	prep	47	2,98	1,09325
	1	88	2,44	1,01549
	2	50	2,78	,91003
	3	25	2,00	,57735
	4	13	2,31	,75107
	Total	176	2,47	,94354
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	prep	47	2,70	1,10168
	1	88	2,66	,95756
	2	50	3,00	1,12486
	3	25	2,88	,83267
	4	13	2,31	1,25064
	Total	176	2,76	1,02533
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	prep	47	2,91	1,19473
	1	88	3,35	1,11458
	2	50	2,78	1,13011
	3	25	3,88	,83267
	4	13	2,92	,95407
	Total	176	3,23	1,12491
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience. *	prep	47	3,57	1,26396
	1	88	3,63	1,07546
	2	50	3,30	1,09265
	3	25	3,88	,83267
	4	13	3,23	1,01274
	Total	176	3,54	1,05755
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	prep	47	2,57	1,07834
	1	88	2,61	1,08735
	2	50	2,92	,96553
	3	25	2,56	,76811
	4	13	2,77	,92681
	Total	176	2,70	1,00466
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. *	prep	47	2,74	1,20629
	1	88	3,00	1,20344
	2	50	2,82	1,13731
	3	25	3,24	,92556
	4	13	3,31	,94733
	Total	176	3,01	1,13388
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. *	prep	47	4,26	1,01012
	1	88	4,23	,97941
	2	50	3,76	,89351
	3	25	4,20	,76376
	4	13	4,08	,86232
	Total	176	4,08	,93469
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	prep	47	3,23	1,20168
	1	88	3,24	1,25940

Items	Grade	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	2	50	3,20	1,35526
	3	25	3,88	1,16619
	4	13	3,15	1,21423
	Total	176	3,31	1,28244
10. I like to write my ideas down.	prep	47	2,19	1,15417
	1	88	2,27	,99108
	2	50	2,66	1,08063
	3	25	2,64	,90738
	4	13	2,23	1,23517
	Total	176	2,43	1,03422
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	prep	47	2,57	1,31455
	1	88	2,34	1,03819
	2	50	2,88	1,08119
	3	25	2,48	,82260
	4	13	2,31	,94733
	Total	176	2,51	1,03641
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	prep	47	2,74	1,32645
	1	88	2,60	1,07788
	2	50	3,10	1,18235
	3	25	3,16	,98658
	4	13	2,62	1,04391
	Total	176	2,82	1,11494
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	prep	47	3,21	1,15976
	1	88	3,47	1,13410
	2	50	2,90	1,19949
	3	25	3,76	,66332
	4	13	3,31	1,10940
	Total	176	3,34	1,12940
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	prep	47	3,29	,99815
	1	88	2,76	,75801
	2	50	3,10	,73540
	3	25	3,08	,64031
	4	13	2,77	,59914
	Total	176	2,90	,73818
15. I enjoy writing.	prep	47	2,40	1,19163
	1	88	2,43	1,14265
	2	50	2,72	1,16128
	3	25	2,60	1,00000
	4	13	2,38	,86972
	Total	176	2,53	1,11046
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	prep	47	3,21	1,15976
	1	88	3,48	1,03920
	2	50	3,38	,98747
	3	25	3,68	,94516
	4	13	3,62	1,12090
	Total	176	3,49	1,01412
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	prep	47	2,51	1,08091
	1	88	2,52	1,18397
	2	50	3,08	1,06599
	3	25	2,80	1,00000
	4	13	2,54	1,19829
	Total	176	2,72	1,14482
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before	prep	47	3,11	1,25515

Items	Grade	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
I enter them. *	1	88	3,36	1,04146
	2	50	3,28	1,08872
	3	25	3,88	,72572
	4	13	3,23	,83205
	Total	176	3,40	1,01519
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper..	prep	47	2,34	1,14733
	1	88	2,32	1,06723
	2	50	2,54	,99406
	3	25	2,52	,65320
	4	13	2,15	,98710
	Total	176	2,39	,99185
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	prep	47	2,55	1,13843
	1	88	2,36	1,04146
	2	50	2,86	1,06924
	3	25	3,12	,92736
	4	13	2,77	1,09193
	Total	176	2,64	1,07024
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	prep	47	2,87	1,24441
	1	88	3,26	1,19860
	2	50	3,04	1,04900
	3	25	3,52	,71414
	4	13	2,92	,95407
	Total	176	3,21	1,08817
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. *	prep	47	3,23	1,12700
	1	88	3,48	1,09311
	2	50	3,18	1,02400
	3	25	3,80	,57735
	4	13	3,31	,94733
	Total	176	3,43	1,01711
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	prep	47	3,38	1,01195
	1	88	3,03	1,12902
	2	50	3,12	,98229
	3	25	2,84	,85049
	4	13	2,69	1,10940
	Total	176	3,01	1,05015
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	prep	47	3,15	1,16056
	1	88	3,18	1,02324
	2	50	3,12	,96129
	3	25	3,52	,87178
	4	13	2,92	1,18754
	Total	176	3,19	1,00123
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. *	prep	47	3,23	1,16494
	1	88	3,22	1,07691
	2	50	3,04	1,21151
	3	25	3,44	1,04403
	4	13	2,92	1,11516
	Total	176	3,18	1,11494
26. I'm no good at writing. *	prep	47	3,21	1,19667
	1	88	3,33	1,18148
	2	50	3,28	1,21286
	3	25	3,84	,62450
	4	13	3,31	1,18213
	Total	176	3,39	1,13572

Appendix 3: T Test related to difference among students' writing apprehension in terms of gender

Items	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P
1. I avoid writing. *	F	172	3,53	1,06	,682	,496
	M	51	3,65	1,16		
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	F	172	2,63	,99	1,650	,100
	M	51	2,37	,99		
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	F	172	2,79	1,04	1,258	,210
	M	51	2,59	1,04		
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	F	172	3,11	1,15	1,331	,185
	M	51	3,35	1,13		
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience. *	F	172	3,56	1,09	,275	,784
	M	51	3,51	1,12		
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	F	172	2,75	1,01	1,973	,050
	M	51	2,43	1,02		
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. *	F	172	2,97	1,14	,482	,631
	M	51	2,88	1,19		
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. *	F	172	4,12	,94	,158	,874
	M	51	4,09	1,01		
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	F	172	3,40	1,29	**2,305**	**,022**
	M	51	2,94	1,08		
10. I like to write my ideas down.	F	172	2,42	1,06	,966	,335
	M	51	2,25	1,07		
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	F	172	2,59	1,08	1,715	,088
	M	51	2,29	1,14		
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	F	172	2,80	1,19	-,114	,909
	M	51	2,82	1,03		
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	F	172	3,29	1,16	-,311	,756
	M	51	3,35	1,05		

Items	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	P
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	F	172	2,99	,83	,061	,951
	M	51	2,98	,76		
15. I enjoy writing.	F	172	2,57	1,13	1,539	,125
	M	51	2,29	1,08		
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	F	172	3,42	1,07	-,158	,874
	M	51	3,45	,99		
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	F	172	2,77	1,11	**2,351**	**,020**
	M	51	2,35	1,15		
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. *	F	172	3,38	1,07	,947	,345
	M	51	3,22	1,10		
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	F	172	2,41	1,01	,570	,569
	M	51	2,31	1,07		
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	F	172	2,68	1,09	1,445	,150
	M	51	2,43	1,04		
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	F	172	3,17	1,15	,718	,473
	M	51	3,04	1,06		
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. *	F	172	3,37	1,04	-,356	,722
	M	51	3,43	1,06		
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	F	172	3,14	1,01	1,421	,157
	M	51	2,90	1,17		
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	F	172	3,22	1,01	,828	,408
	M	51	3,08	1,13		
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. *	F	172	3,20	1,11	,369	,712
	M	51	3,14	1,18		
26. I'm no good at writing. *	F	172	3,34	1,14	-,161	,872
	M	51	3,37	1,18		

Appendix 4: One-Way Analysis of Variance on the difference among the students'apprehension levels, which are at different grades, in writing

Items		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
1. I avoid writing. *	Between Groups	6,932	4	1,733	1,487	,207
	Within Groups	254,118	218	1,166		
	Total	261,049	222			
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	Between Groups	20,485	4	5,121	**5,581**	**,000**
	Within Groups	200,044	218	,918		
	Total	220,529	222			
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	Between Groups	6,925	4	1,731	1,620	,170
	Within Groups	233,012	218	1,069		
	Total	239,937	222			
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	Between Groups	26,979	4	6,745	**5,572**	**,000**
	Within Groups	263,882	218	1,210		
	Total	290,861	222			
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience. *	Between Groups	7,694	4	1,923	1,603	,175
	Within Groups	261,562	218	1,200		
	Total	269,256	222			
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	Between Groups	4,253	4	1,063	1,023	,396
	Within Groups	226,501	218	1,039		
	Total	230,753	222			
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. *	Between Groups	6,812	4	1,703	1,291	,275
	Within Groups	287,645	218	1,319		
	Total	294,457	222			
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. *	Between Groups	8,535	4	2,134	2,417	,050
	Within Groups	192,434	218	,883		
	Total	200,969	222			
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	Between Groups	9,720	4	2,430	1,537	,193
	Within Groups	344,746	218	1,581		
	Total	354,466	222			
10. I like to write my ideas down	Between Groups	8,582	4	2,146	1,933	,106
	Within Groups	242,019	218	1,110		
	Total	250,601	222			
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	Between Groups	10,063	4	2,516	2,129	,078
	Within Groups	257,551	218	1,181		
	Total	267,614	222			
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	Between Groups	11,756	4	2,939	2,233	,066
	Within Groups	286,953	218	1,316		
	Total	298,709	222			
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	Between Groups	16,051	4	4,013	**3,245**	**,013**
	Within Groups	269,599	218	1,237		
	Total	285,650	222			
14. People seem to enjoy	Between Groups	10,494	4	2,623	**4,191**	**,003**

Items		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
what I write.	Within Groups	136,466	218	,626		
	Total	146,960	222			
15. I enjoy writing.	Between Groups	3,673	4	,918	,720	,579
	Within Groups	278,067	218	1,276		
	Total	281,740	222			
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	Between Groups	4,549	4	1,137	1,032	,391
	Within Groups	240,124	218	1,101		
	Total	244,673	222			
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	Between Groups	12,143	4	3,036	**2,428**	**,049**
	Within Groups	272,610	218	1,251		
	Total	284,753	222			
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. *	Between Groups	10,239	4	2,560	2,270	,063
	Within Groups	245,859	218	1,128		
	Total	256,099	222			
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	Between Groups	2,838	4	,709	,672	,612
	Within Groups	229,996	218	1,055		
	Total	232,834	222			
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	Between Groups	15,410	4	3,853	**3,429**	**,010**
	Within Groups	244,948	218	1,124		
	Total	260,359	222			
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	Between Groups	9,385	4	2,346	1,871	,116
	Within Groups	273,306	218	1,254		
	Total	282,691	222			
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. *	Between Groups	8,305	4	2,076	1,946	,104
	Within Groups	232,529	218	1,067		
	Total	240,834	222			
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	Between Groups	7,968	4	1,992	1,829	,124
	Within Groups	237,413	218	1,089		
	Total	245,381	222			
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	Between Groups	3,970	4	,993	,927	,449
	Within Groups	233,491	218	1,071		
	Total	237,462	222			
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. *	Between Groups	3,763	4	,941	,742	,564
	Within Groups	276,326	218	1,268		
	Total	280,090	222			
26. I'm no good at writing. *	Between Groups	7,193	4	1,798	1,373	,244
	Within Groups	285,525	218	1,310		
	Total	292,717	222			

Appendix 5: Mean and standard deviation data on students'apprehension, in terms of age

ITEMS	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I avoid writing. *	18,00	17	3,4706	1,28051
	19,00	37	3,9459	1,10418
	20,00	69	3,5942	1,01921
	21,00	50	3,2000	1,08797
	22,00	30	3,5667	,85836
	23,00	20	3,6500	1,22582
	Total	223	3,5561	1,08439
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	18,00	17	2,3529	,78591
	19,00	37	2,5676	1,01490
	20,00	69	2,6812	1,02172
	21,00	50	2,7600	1,09842
	22,00	30	2,2667	,82768
	23,00	20	2,4000	,94032
	Total	223	2,5740	,99668
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	18,00	17	2,5882	1,00367
	19,00	37	2,5676	,86732
	20,00	69	2,6522	1,05477
	21,00	50	3,1000	1,14731
	22,00	30	2,8000	,84690
	23,00	20	2,6000	1,18766
	Total	223	2,7489	1,03961
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	18,00	17	3,1765	1,23669
	19,00	37	3,4054	1,11703
	20,00	69	3,0580	1,13609
	21,00	50	2,9600	1,19455
	22,00	30	3,3667	,96431
	23,00	20	3,3000	1,26074
	Total	223	3,1659	1,14463
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience. *	18,00	17	3,4706	1,28051
	19,00	37	3,8649	1,10961
	20,00	69	3,4783	1,19569
	21,00	50	3,4000	1,04978
	22,00	30	3,7333	,73968
	23,00	20	3,3500	1,13671
	Total	223	3,5471	1,10130
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	18,00	17	2,7059	1,15999
	19,00	37	2,2973	,81189
	20,00	69	2,6377	1,08426
	21,00	50	2,9800	1,02000
	22,00	30	2,6333	,85029
	23,00	20	2,8000	1,10501
	Total	223	2,6771	1,01952
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. *	18,00	17	2,7647	1,20049
	19,00	37	3,0270	1,23573
	20,00	69	2,7971	1,15783

ITEMS	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	21,00	50	3,0400	1,12413
	22,00	30	2,9667	1,03335
	23,00	20	3,2500	1,20852
	Total	223	2,9507	1,15169
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. *	18,00	17	4,1765	1,01460
	19,00	37	4,4324	,68882
	20,00	69	4,0290	1,05679
	21,00	50	3,9200	1,14000
	22,00	30	4,2333	,50401
	23,00	20	4,1000	,85224
	Total	223	4,1166	,95145
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	18,00	17	3,0588	1,08804
	19,00	37	3,0541	1,15340
	20,00	69	3,2174	1,37059
	21,00	50	3,5800	1,34149
	22,00	30	3,5667	1,10433
	23,00	20	3,1000	1,16529
	Total	223	3,2960	1,26360
10. I like to write my ideas down.	18,00	17	2,1176	1,05370
	19,00	37	1,9459	,84807
	20,00	69	2,3768	1,07240
	21,00	50	2,7800	1,16567
	22,00	30	2,4667	,86037
	23,00	20	2,3000	1,12858
	Total	223	2,3812	1,06247
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	18,00	17	2,2353	,66421
	19,00	37	2,4054	1,11703
	20,00	69	2,4203	1,19319
	21,00	50	2,9000	1,18235
	22,00	30	2,4667	,77608
	23,00	20	2,5000	1,10024
	Total	223	2,5247	1,09794
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	18,00	17	2,6471	1,27187
	19,00	37	2,9459	1,12906
	20,00	69	2,5507	1,18242
	21,00	50	3,0600	1,28428
	22,00	30	2,7667	,67891
	23,00	20	3,0000	1,21395
	Total	223	2,8072	1,15997
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	18,00	17	3,5294	1,06757
	19,00	37	3,4595	1,09531
	20,00	69	3,3333	1,20863
	21,00	50	3,1000	1,12938
	22,00	30	3,2333	1,07265
	23,00	20	3,4000	1,14248
	Total	223	3,3094	1,13433
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	18,00	17	2,9412	1,24853

ITEMS	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	19,00	37	3,0270	,79884
	20,00	69	2,8841	,75802
	21,00	50	3,1200	,84853
	22,00	30	2,9667	,66868
	23,00	20	3,0000	,72548
	Total	223	2,9865	,81362
15. I enjoy writing.	18,00	17	2,2353	1,25147
	19,00	37	2,1351	,91779
	20,00	69	2,4783	1,18332
	21,00	50	2,8800	1,22291
	22,00	30	2,5333	,81931
	23,00	20	2,5500	1,14593
	Total	223	2,5067	1,12654
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	18,00	17	3,2941	1,04670
	19,00	37	3,5946	1,09188
	20,00	69	3,4203	1,04889
	21,00	50	3,3200	,99877
	22,00	30	3,3667	1,15917
	23,00	20	3,6500	,98809
	Total	223	3,4305	1,04982
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	18,00	17	2,3529	1,16946
	19,00	37	2,4054	1,01268
	20,00	69	2,6377	1,20013
	21,00	50	3,0600	1,16776
	22,00	30	2,5667	,85836
	23,00	20	2,8000	1,19649
	Total	223	2,6771	1,13255
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. *	18,00	17	3,1176	,99262
	19,00	37	3,6216	1,00971
	20,00	69	3,3333	1,14618
	21,00	50	3,1200	1,11831
	22,00	30	3,6333	,85029
	23,00	20	3,1500	1,08942
	Total	223	3,3408	1,07406
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	18,00	17	2,4118	1,17574
	19,00	37	2,2703	1,01786
	20,00	69	2,2754	1,12307
	21,00	50	2,6400	1,04511
	22,00	30	2,3000	,53498
	23,00	20	2,4500	1,05006
	Total	223	2,3857	1,02411
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	18,00	17	2,5294	1,12459
	19,00	37	2,4054	,92675
	20,00	69	2,4928	1,11965
	21,00	50	2,9400	1,21907
	22,00	30	2,6667	,84418
	23,00	20	2,7000	1,08094
	Total	223	2,6233	1,08295

ITEMS	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	18,00	17	3,1176	1,21873
	19,00	37	3,1622	1,11837
	20,00	69	3,0290	1,25991
	21,00	50	3,3000	1,09265
	22,00	30	3,1000	,99481
	23,00	20	3,1500	,93330
	Total	223	3,1390	1,12844
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. *	18,00	17	3,5882	1,06412
	19,00	37	3,6486	1,05978
	20,00	69	3,3333	1,12022
	21,00	50	3,3000	1,03510
	22,00	30	3,3000	,87691
	23,00	20	3,2500	,96655
	Total	223	3,3857	1,04156
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	18,00	17	3,2353	,97014
	19,00	37	2,8108	1,04981
	20,00	69	3,1884	1,14115
	21,00	50	3,3600	1,02539
	22,00	30	2,9333	,73968
	23,00	20	2,6500	1,08942
	Total	223	3,0852	1,05134
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	18,00	17	3,4118	1,06412
	19,00	37	3,2432	1,03831
	20,00	69	3,1594	1,06582
	21,00	50	3,2600	,98582
	22,00	30	3,0667	,98027
	23,00	20	2,9500	1,14593
	Total	223	3,1839	1,03424
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. *	18,00	17	3,2353	1,20049
	19,00	37	3,3784	1,16312
	20,00	69	3,1014	1,12649
	21,00	50	3,1000	1,12938
	22,00	30	3,3333	,99424
	23,00	20	3,1000	1,20961
	Total	223	3,1883	1,12324
26. I'm no good at writing. *	18,00	17	3,2353	1,14725
	19,00	37	3,3514	1,22964
	20,00	69	3,3768	1,23790
	21,00	50	3,3000	1,18235
	22,00	30	3,4000	,93218
	23,00	20	3,4000	,99472
	Total	223	3,3498	1,14828

Appendix 6: One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) related to the difference among students' apprehension levels in terms of their ages

ITEMS		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
1. I avoid writing. *	Between Groups	12,368	5	2,474	2,158	,060
	Within Groups	248,682	217	1,146		
	Total	261,049	222			
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	Between Groups	6,794	5	1,359	1,379	,233
	Within Groups	213,736	217	,985		
	Total	220,529	222			
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.	Between Groups	8,986	5	1,797	1,689	,138
	Within Groups	230,951	217	1,064		
	Total	239,937	222			
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. *	Between Groups	6,617	5	1,323	1,010	,412
	Within Groups	284,244	217	1,310		
	Total	290,861	222			
5. Taking a composition class is a very frightening experience. *	Between Groups	7,062	5	1,412	1,169	,325
	Within Groups	262,194	217	1,208		
	Total	269,256	222			
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	Between Groups	10,406	5	2,081	2,049	,073
	Within Groups	220,348	217	1,015		
	Total	230,753	222			
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. *	Between Groups	4,630	5	,926	,693	,629
	Within Groups	289,828	217	1,336		
	Total	294,457	222			
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. *	Between Groups	6,628	5	1,326	1,480	,197
	Within Groups	194,340	217	,896		
	Total	200,969	222			
9. I would enjoy sending my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	Between Groups	10,548	5	2,110	1,331	,252
	Within Groups	343,919	217	1,585		
	Total	354,466	222			
10. I like to write my ideas down.	Between Groups	16,495	5	3,299	**3,058**	**,011**
	Within Groups	234,106	217	1,079		
	Total	250,601	222			
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing.	Between Groups	9,858	5	1,972	1,660	,146
	Within Groups	257,756	217	1,188		
	Total	267,614	222			
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written.	Between Groups	9,675	5	1,935	1,453	,207
	Within Groups	289,033	217	1,332		
	Total	298,709	222			
13. I'm nervous about writing. *	Between Groups	4,226	5	,845	,652	,661
	Within Groups	281,424	217	1,297		

ITEMS		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
	Total	285,650	222			
14. People seem to enjoy what I write.	Between Groups	1,726	5	,345	,516	,764
	Within Groups	145,233	217	,669		
	Total	146,960	222			
15. I enjoy writing.	Between Groups	13,443	5	2,689	2,175	,058
	Within Groups	268,297	217	1,236		
	Total	281,740	222			
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. *	Between Groups	3,016	5	,603	,542	,745
	Within Groups	241,657	217	1,114		
	Total	244,673	222			
17. Writing is a lot of fun.	Between Groups	12,623	5	2,525	2,013	,078
	Within Groups	272,130	217	1,254		
	Total	284,753	222			
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. *	Between Groups	9,501	5	1,900	1,672	,142
	Within Groups	246,597	217	1,136		
	Total	256,099	222			
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	Between Groups	4,881	5	,976	,929	,463
	Within Groups	227,953	217	1,050		
	Total	232,834	222			
20. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	Between Groups	8,271	5	1,654	1,424	,217
	Within Groups	252,087	217	1,162		
	Total	260,359	222			
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. *	Between Groups	2,207	5	,441	,341	,887
	Within Groups	280,484	217	1,293		
	Total	282,691	222			
22. When I hand in a composition I know I'm going to do poorly. *	Between Groups	4,401	5	,880	,808	,545
	Within Groups	236,433	217	1,090		
	Total	240,834	222			
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions.	Between Groups	12,159	5	2,432	**2,263**	**,049**
	Within Groups	233,222	217	1,075		
	Total	245,381	222			
24. I don't think I write as well as most people.	Between Groups	2,850	5	,570	,527	,755
	Within Groups	234,612	217	1,081		
	Total	237,462	222			
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. *	Between Groups	3,072	5	,614	,481	,790
	Within Groups	277,018	217	1,277		
	Total	280,090	222			
26. I'm no good at writing. *	Between Groups	,523	5	,105	,078	,996
	Within Groups	292,194	217	1,347		
	Total	292,717	222			

CURRICULUM VITAE

She was born in Erzurum in 1985. In 2007, she graduated from the ELT Department of Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education at Ataturk University. During three months she taught English at a primary school in Erzurum. At the same year, she embarked on his MA education. In December 2007, she started working as a lecturer in the School of Foreign Languages at Ataturk University.