RESEARCH ARTICLE

Interlanguage effect on writing anxiety in a foreign language context

Tülin Türnük[1]

Selami Aydın[2]

[1] İstanbul Medeniyet University, Turkey / Contact: tulin.turnuk@medeniyet.edu.tr

[2] İstanbul Medeniyet University, Turkey / Contact: selami.aydin@medeniyet.edu.tr

Abstract

Both writing anxiety and interlanguage errors may have adverse effects on writing achievement and performance among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners. However, whether writing anxiety and interlanguage error are related or not remains an unanswered question. This study aims to investigate whether interlanguage errors relate to writing anxiety in the EFL learning context. The sample group of the study consists of 106 Turkish EFL learners studying English at the preparatory school of a state university. After administering a background questionnaire and a survey that contained 22 items that aimed to determine the level of writing anxiety among students, students' written products were used to find and categorize interlanguage errors. The frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviations were calculated to show the levels of interlanguage errors and writing anxiety. Then, the relationship between writing anxiety and interlanguage errors was analyzed by using ANOVA. The results indicated that EFL learners who have more interlanguage errors experience writing anxiety at higher levels. In light of the findings, the study provides some practical recommendations for target groups.

APA Citation

Turnuk, T., & Aydin, S. (2020). Interlanguage effect on writing anxiety in a foreign language context. *The Literacy Trek, 6*(1), 1-19.

Introduction

Writing constitutes a significant role and place in the EFL learning context due to several reasons. To begin with, as Celce-Murcia (2001) points out, it is an

effective means of communication that can be used to convey various messages to readers who are near or remote, familiar, or unfamiliar. Second, as Cook (2014) and Scrivener (2011) emphasize, learners may need writing instructions for many different purposes such as academic studies, examination preparation, business, social media use, taking notes, and sending e-mails. Finally, in most examinations, writing proficiency is tested to measure the learners' knowledge (Harmer, 2004), and the results of these exams usually determine the future lives of the learners. Therefore, it is not surprising that teaching writing becomes an important part of the EFL learning process and teaching processes. Thus, it may include habit formation as well since some learners have never written a single piece in their first language (L1) either (Harmer, 2013). Despite its level of importance as a skill, several potential problems occur in EFL writing classes.

One of these most considerable problems in the EFL learning context is writing anxiety that is caused by numerous factors. First of all, according to Harmer (2013), it is evident that foreign language learners never produce a written text even in L1 which can make the learners anxious for not being used to the procedure. Second, as Hedge (2000) states, writing is a complex process that includes several activities such as defining the purpose, finding ideas, organizing thoughts, selecting appropriate vocabulary, drafting, revising, and editing. Furthermore, writing is a productive skill that is carried out individually; therefore, learners can feel helpless and become stressed (Kurt & Atay, 2007). Third, anxiety may also be caused by some instructional procedures such as selecting obscure topics, giving a very short time span to complete the tasks, or imposing strict rules (Cheng, 2004). The last factor which leads to anxiety is that learners try to express themselves with limited communicative competence and that they are subjected to correction (Littlewood, 1984) and negative feedback which may put learners under pressure, especially the ones with low self-esteem.

As noted above, interlanguage may relate to writing anxiety for several reasons. To begin with, Seliger and Shohamy (1989) emphasize that foreign language learning is a process of hypothesis testing. These hypotheses come from the knowledge of language that learners already have, that is, L1. In other words, as Corder (1977) and Littlewood (1989) mention, foreign language learners already

speak a language and transfer what they know about their language into the context of foreign language learning. When the foreign language and L1 are similar in some respects, positive transfer occurs; thus, learners benefit from this transfer (Yule, 2010). If their hypotheses come to be true, learners become more self-confident and less anxious. Second, keeping in mind that some of the learners' errors are caused by L1 through negative transfer, a contrastive analysis between L1 and the foreign language can be conducted to detect the differences which may lead to errors so that the curricula can be developed accordingly, and teaching can focus on these differences (Wilkins, 1974). In this way, awareness can be raised, and not only the number of errors but also writing anxiety may decrease. Dramatically enough, research lacks the relationship between interlanguage and writing anxiety, as given in the literature review section. However, before presenting a synthesis of research, a theoretical background is provided below.

Theoretical background

Several terms and concepts need to be clarified before reviewing the literature. First, writing in the EFL learning context can be defined as a productive skill in which learners produce a piece of written language in the target language (Harmer, 2013). Second, anxiety can be defined as a psychological factor that is associated with feelings of helplessness and inadequacy, which constructs a barrier to learning in the writing process (Littlewood, 1989). Third, interlanguage is a term coined by Selinker (1972), which refers to ever-changing and enlarging language systems of learners that resemble the foreign language day by day from the input they receive through inborn strategies and natural inquiry (Richards, 1985).

Several hypotheses and theories also need to be discussed. First, writing is hypothesized to be a cognitive activity that includes many stages starting with finding ideas and finishing with reviewing the written text (Hedge, 2005) and which involves thinking skills (Brown, 2001). Moreover, there are four approaches to writing: the Product-based Approach, the Process-based Approach, the Genre-based Approach, and the Reader-dominated Approach. According to the Product-based Approach, the success of the final product is measured by its resemblance to a model composition (Raimes, 1991). On the other hand, in the Process-based Approach, the focus is on the

content and on the writing stages that lead to the final version such as prewriting, drafting, and rewriting. Thus, it is argued that there should be a balance between the two approaches (Brown, 2001). Through the Genre-based Approach, models of different genres are provided and analyzed analytically so that learners can produce samples of those genres with the assistance of the teacher in terms of lexis and grammar (Çakmak, 2017). In the Reader-dominated Approach, the focus is on the expectations of academic readers outside the language classroom and the goal is to become a part of the academic discourse community (Raimes, 1991). Second, there are several types of learner anxiety; state anxiety, trait anxiety, situation-specific anxiety. While *state anxiety* is temporary and not a personality characteristic, *trait anxiety* is consistent and permanent. In the *situation-specific anxiety*, on the other hand, the person becomes anxious only in a distinct setting (Aydın & Zengin, 2008; Horwitz, 2001). Foreign language anxiety, speaking anxiety, test anxiety, and writing anxiety are of this type (Wilson, 2006). The research presumes that while moderate levels of anxiety stimulate learners to perform well and cause *facilitating anxiety*, too much of it results in *debilitating anxiety* (Littlewood, 1989). Writing anxiety is skill-specific anxiety which may arise from low self-esteem, a negative attitude towards writing, and fear of negative evaluation (Cheng et al., 1999). Finally, Interlanguage Theory suggests that learners have a different kind of language called learner-language which is the combination of L1 and the second language (L2) and that they have inner syllabi, which means that they learn aspects of language according to their own pace (Richards, 1985). It also theorizes that some errors of learners are caused by their negative transfer of structures from L1. However, the issue of transfer can also be positive at points where the two languages have similarities (Yule, 2010).

Literature review

Research shows that L1 interference in L2 production skills is one of the factors that create difficulties for language learners by causing errors. As an example, given that interfering effects of students' native language and culture in EFL writing were underestimated by language teachers, Bennui (2016) aimed to study L1 interference among 28 university students in a basic writing course. Students' paragraphs were analyzed from three dimensions of interference, syntax, lexis, and discourse. Bennui (2016) identified all three kinds of interference and concluded that

4

these prolonged problems should be solved so that EFL writing instruction can be qualified.

Research also shows that feedback which has two types, focused and unfocused, constitutes an important factor for foreign language writing development. As an example, having seen that few studies have considered the issue of complexity while measuring the efficacy of feedback on writing, Ruegg (2010) aimed to measure the influence of unfocused feedback considering the repetition of errors. Students who were divided into two groups submitted weekly journals which were compared on the basis of the frequencies of repetition of the same errors. Whereas one group was only provided with focused feedback on content, the other was given both focused feedback on content and unfocused feedback on errors. Ruegg (2010) concluded that although unfocused feedback did not increase accuracy, it might develop learners' interlanguage. In another study, given that the influence of different types of feedback provided for errors in second language writing has not been measured much in research studies, Rob et al. (1986) aimed to evaluate the effects of different kinds of feedback on errors in a study with 134 Japanese university freshmen. Four kinds of feedback on error were compared and contrasted through a factor analysis which was used to decrease 19 measures of writing to a subset of seven. Then, for an examination of covariance design to contrast the effects of different feedback types, each of these seven measures in the subset was used as a dependent variable. Rob et al. (1986) concluded that whereas detailed feedback on structure may not be very useful, feedback on content may be. On the other hand, in another study having seen that research on L2 writing is highly dependent on L1 research, Myles (2002) aimed to study writing errors according to the aspects of second language acquisition and writing theories in L1 and L2 and through a detailed literature review, concluded that learners needed feedback on both content and structure and that this feedback must be given to improve writing skills.

However, proficiency levels of learners determine the effectiveness of feedback according to research. For instance, Jang (2014) aimed to find out whether different proficiency levels determine the effectiveness of written corrective feedback. English article errors were the focus of this quasi-experimental study in which

university students were divided into eight groups considering their proficiency levels and types of corrective feedback to be received. Three narrative tasks were carried out with pre-test, immediate, and delayed post-test sessions. Two subtests measured explicit and implicit knowledge during each session. Jang (2014) concluded that the proficiency level of students was an important factor for the efficacy of written corrective feedback, but it did not affect the level of foreign language anxiety, specifically speaking anxiety. As another example, given that no research has explored the presence of language learning anxiety from an interlingual point of view, Mahmoodzadeh (2012) aimed to find out the degree to which Iranian EFL learners associated their speaking anxiety with their interlanguage systems and whether there were level differences in this association. The interlanguage system was divided into three elements; Phonology, Grammar, and Semantics. A five Likert scale self-reporting survey was given to 31 male and 43 female Iranian EFL learners in two different levels. Mahmoodzadeh (2012) concluded that Iranian learners tended to attribute most of their speaking anxiety to their interlanguage meaning and interlanguage grammar systems and that the higher level of proficiency did not decrease the anxiety level.

In research, it is also shown that there are no significant differences between L1 and L2 development. As an example, having seen that previous SLA research has not dealt with grammatical constructions necessary to relate information units, Kenkel and Yates (2009) aimed to explore the similarities between the linguistic choices of L1 and L2 writers to order informational units. 90 essays, 60 of which were written by native speakers and 30 by non-native speakers, were analyzed and 360 structures that are used to order information were identified. Kenkel and Yates (2009) concluded that native and non-native speakers made similar linguistic choices to order information. In another study, having seen that there was not as much research in second language writing as in first language writing, Kim (1998) aimed to find that learners use errors as fruitful strategies for learning how to write by carrying out a case study in which compositions of a single college student were examined for two years. Kim (1998) concluded that the number of errors would decrease and proficiency would increase over time just like in L1 and that measuring structural maturity and counting errors could be helpful for research on L1 and L2 writing improvement.

Finally, the research draws attention to orthographic varieties which may create additional problems when one tries to learn how to write in a foreign language. As an example, hypothesizing that description of script-speech relationships and discovery of the effects of orthographic varieties on information processing systems may help explain the relationship between languages and thought better, Fang et al. (1981) aimed to explore the relationship between the information processing and the orthography of particular languages. Three separate experiments were conducted with Chinese-English, Spanish-English, and Japanese-English bilinguals in which each subject performed a modified task where the stimulus and the response language might either be the same or different. Fang et al. (1981) concluded that orthographic varieties had certain effects on the word processing system.

In conclusion, research shows that there are three kinds of L1 interference in L2 productive skills; syntax, lexis, and discourse. In addition, research indicates that feedback that focuses both on content and structure improves writing and interlanguage. However, while the proficiency level of students determines the efficacy of written corrective feedback, it does not decrease foreign language speaking anxiety. Research also shows that there are no serious differences between L1 and L2 development since the number of errors decreases and proficiency level increases in time in both cases. Nevertheless, orthographic differences between the languages create additional difficulties for L2 learners.

Overview of the study

Writing has an important role and place in the EFL context. On the other hand, one of the most significant problems in the EFL context is writing anxiety. It can be stated that interlanguage may be related to writing anxiety. Research shows that L1 interference causes errors and some difficulties for L2 learners. Research also shows that both focused and unfocused feedback has a considerable effect on the development of writing skills. However, the efficacy of written corrective feedback depends on the proficiency levels of learners. Finally, research shows that differences in orthographic systems may cause extra problems. Nevertheless, in the related literature, there are no studies that focus on interlanguage and writing anxiety together. With these concerns in mind, the current study asks one research question:

- Does interlanguage influence writing anxiety among foreign language learners?

Method

Research design

The study uses an analytic approach since only one aspect of foreign language learning will be studied carefully and examined closely. It has deductive objectives as it begins with a preconceived expectation of foreign language education. The study is designed to be descriptive because the phenomenon is described in its natural setting without being experimentally manipulated (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). The purpose of the study is to find out whether interlanguage affects writing anxiety. The independent variable in the current study is interlanguage whereas the dependent one is writing anxiety.

Participants

The sample group in the study consisted of 106 Turkish EFL learners studying English at the preparatory school of a state university in Istanbul, Turkey. 56 (52.83%) of the participants were female and 50 (47.16%) of them were male. Their mean age was 19.11 falling within the age range between 17 and 22. Of the participants in the sample group, 50 (47.16%) were learning English at the lower intermediate level, 39 participants (36.7%) at the intermediate level, and 17 (16.03%) were at the upper-intermediate level. The rationale behind choosing the sample group was having learners from all different levels and creating a balanced gender distribution.

Tools

The data collection tools consisted of a background questionnaire that gathered demographic information of the participants including their age, gender, and proficiency level and the Writing Anxiety Scale which was developed by Cheng (2004) consisting of 22 items. Each item was rated according to the Likert scale from one to five (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). The rationale behind the scale adoption instead of developing a new survey was that the scale developed by Cheng (2004) was validated and preferred by many researchers who focused on writing anxiety.

8

Procedure

The background questionnaire and the Writing Anxiety Scale were administered to the participants during the second semester of the academic year of 2018-2019 after having explained the purpose and significance of the research. The data collected were analyzed using SPSS software. First, the reliability coefficient was calculated in Cronbach's Alpha indicating an acceptable level of reliability (r=0.735). Two items, item 7 and item 21, were removed since they were not functioning in terms of reliability. The total variance of the scale showed that the scale was valid for measuring the level of writing anxiety among preparatory school students (% of the variance=63.83). After obtaining the reliability and validity of the scale, descriptive statistics were presented. For this purpose, the frequencies, mean scores, and standard deviation were calculated. Then, writing samples of the participants were collected by photocopying their homework and exam papers with the consent of the school administration and examined in terms of interlanguage by focusing on grammatical and lexical errors. Finally, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to see the relationship between the number of errors and the items in the Writing Anxiety Scale. As a note, as the study focused on the relationship between the number of errors and the levels of writing anxiety, no calculation was performed regarding the participants' age, gender, and proficiency levels.

Results

This section presents the results of the study obtained. For this purpose, first, the data on interlanguage errors have been given. Second, the participants' level of writing anxiety has been presented. Finally, the findings on the relationship between interlanguage errors and the level of writing anxiety are noted.

Interlanguage errors

Interlanguage errors mainly relate to grammar and vocabulary, as seen in Table 1. In terms of grammar, Turkish EFL learners experienced problems regarding using the words countable in Turkish but uncountable in English. For instance, they used the plural form of 'homework' in their written products (12.82%). They tended to use the possessive *'s* for both animate and inanimate nouns as there is only one

form of possessive in Turkish (7.69%). In addition, they failed to add the plural suffix for the plural nouns used with a quantifier as the plural form is not used in Turkish in such cases (5.12%). In terms of vocabulary, Turkish EFL learners had errors regarding different parts of speech (58.96%). Other problems were the tendency to translate phrases and idioms directly from Turkish (10.24%) and direct transfer of words from Turkish (5.12%). Finally, as indicated in Table 2, 73 participants had no errors, 27 of them had one error, and six participants had two errors ($\bar{x}$=.36). As a note, it should be stated that the values in Table 2 showed the number of errors made by the participants.

Table 1. The types of interlanguage errors

Topic		Examples		Frequency	%
		Incorrect Form	Correct Form		
Grammar	Countable/ Uncountable	Students have to do homework.	Students have to do homework.	5	12.82
	Possessive case	People are aware of town life's benefits.	People are aware of the benefits of town life.	3	7.69
	Singular/Plural	There are a lot of university.	There are a lot of universities.	2	5.12
Vocabulary	Wrong verb usage	I won the university.	I entered the university.	11	28.2
	Wrong noun usage	That subject is going to make a big impact.	That issue is going to make a big impact.	3	7.69
	Wrong adjective usage	I got a decent grade in the exam.	I got a good grade in the exam.	3	7.69
	Wrong preposition usage	People should avoid from social media.	People should avoid social media.	6	15.38
	Direct translation of phrases	People should say "stop" to this.	People should stop this.	2	5.12
	Direct translation of idioms	My friends call me the heart of yoghurt.	My friends call me volunteer buttermilk.	2	5.12
	Direct transfer of words	People use emojis in their messages.	People use emoticons in their messages.	2	5.12
			Total	39	100

Table 2. Descriptives for interlanguage errors

Number of errors	Number	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
0	73	68.9			
1	27	25.5	.36	.59	.06
2	6	5.6			

Writing anxiety

The values in Appendix A show that students suffer from writing anxiety in the EFL context regarding 13 items. For instance, they stated that they felt their hearts pounding when they wrote English compositions under time constraint ($\bar{x}$=3.34), whereas they felt worried and uneasy while writing English compositions if they knew they would be evaluated ($\bar{x}$=3.42). They also asserted that they did their best to avoid writing in English ($\bar{x}$=2.58) and their minds often went blank when they started to work on English compositions ($\bar{x}$=3.37). In addition, the learners stated that they trembled or perspired when they wrote English compositions under time pressure ($\bar{x}$=2.74). EFL learners said that they would worry about getting a very poor grade if their English compositions were to be evaluated ($\bar{x}$=3.41). Furthermore, they declared that their thoughts jumbled up when they had to write in English ($\bar{x}$=3.58). They also asserted that they would not use English to write compositions unless they had no choice ($\bar{x}$=3.25) and often felt fear when they wrote English compositions under a time constraint ($\bar{x}$=3.20). Finally, they said that they froze when asked unexpectedly to write English compositions ($\bar{x}$=3.25).

On the other hand, the values in Appendix A show that EFL learners have a moderate level of writing anxiety. For instance, some EFL learners stated that they were not nervous at all while writing English ($\bar{x}$=2.78). They also asserted that they often chose to write their thoughts in English ($\bar{x}$=2.57). Third, they declared that they did not worry at all about what other people would think about their English compositions ($\bar{x}$=3.75). Finally, the findings indicated that writing anxiety seemed to be caused mostly by the time constraint ($\bar{x}$=3.34), peer pressure, ($\bar{x}$=2.01), and being evaluated ($\bar{x}$=3.42) and it results in dislike for writing compositions and poor performance in writing.

Interlanguage effect on writing anxiety

The values in Appendix B indicate a strong relationship between the number of interlanguage errors and the levels of writing anxiety among EFL learners. In other words, the more students have interlanguage errors, the more they feel anxious. First, the ones who made one or two mistakes felt nervous while writing in English (p=.01). Second, while writing English compositions, they felt worried and uneasy when they

knew they would be evaluated (p=.00). Third, they did their best to avoid writing English compositions (p=.00). Fourth, their minds often went blank when they started to work on English compositions (p=.00). Fifth, they trembled or perspired when they wrote English compositions under time pressure (p=.00). Next, they would worry about getting a very poor grade if their English compositions were to be evaluated (p=.06). Then, they did their best to avoid situations in which they had to write in English (p=.00). Moreover, their thoughts jumbled up when they wrote English compositions under time constraint (p=.00). Furthermore, they would not use English to write compositions unless they had no choice (p=.05). In addition, they often felt fear when they wrote English compositions under time pressure (p=.00). Next, they were afraid that the other students would laugh at their English compositions if they read them (p=.00). Then, they froze when asked unexpectedly to write English compositions (p=.00). Next, they would do their best to excuse themselves if asked to write English compositions (p=.00). Also, they usually felt their whole bodies rigid and tense when they wrote English compositions (p=.00). Moreover, they were afraid of their English compositions being chosen as a sample for discussion in class (p=.00). Finally, they would use English to write compositions whenever possible (p=.02). The more the number of mistakes they did, the more they were worried when they were evaluated (p=.00). They felt more worried when there was time constraint (p=.00). To be evaluated also increased the level of anxiety (p=.00). Peer pressure was another factor that caused anxiety (p=.00).

On the other hand, several items in the scale are not related to writing anxiety. For instance, the level of interlanguage errors did not relate to their hearts pounding when they write English compositions under time constraint (p=.19). Second, no correlation was found with writing down their thoughts in English (p=.19) and fear of failure (p=.06). Finally, interlanguage errors did not affect fear of negative evaluation (p=.08) and activities performed outside of class (p=.58).

Conclusions and Discussion

According to the findings obtained in the study that aims to explore how interlanguage relates to writing anxiety in a foreign language learning context, three conclusions were drawn. First, the interlanguage errors made by Turkish EFL learners

are mainly related to grammatical and lexical issues. In terms of grammar, Turkish EFL learners mainly have difficulties in the use of singular and plural nouns, possessive case and countable/uncountable nouns. In terms of vocabulary, they use wrong verbs, nouns, and prepositions, phrases, and idioms. Second, Turkish EFL learners experience writing anxiety at a high level. For instance, they feel worried due to time constraints, fear of failure, and fear of negative evaluation by teachers and peers during the writing process. Third and last, there is a strong relationship between the levels of writing anxiety and the number of interlanguage errors. As an example, the ones who have more interlanguage errors feel more anxious in terms of fear of failure and negative evaluation. On the other hand, it should be underlined that time constraints, organizing ideas, and activities performed out of class do not relate to interlanguage errors. A comparison of the conclusions reached in the current study to the ones obtained from prior research is given below.

A summary of the results found in the study is provided below. In the broadest perspective, the findings of the study contribute to the current literature in the Turkish EFL context regarding interlanguage effect on writing anxiety, as there is a serious lack of research on the mentioned issue. First, as reviewed previously, the studies mainly focus on first language interference in second language production and the influence and effectiveness of different kinds of feedback regarding writing errors in first and second language contexts (Myles, 2002; Rob et al., 1986; Ruegg, 2010). The second difference is that some studies explore the differences between first and second language development (Jang, 2014; Kim, 1998) and linguistic choices (Kenkel & Yates, 2009). Third, how writing anxiety is related to speaking anxiety in the foreign language learning context is an issue to examine (Mahmoozadeh, 2012). Finally, one study reports on the orthographic differences between the first and the second language (Fang et al., 1981). To be brief, it can be stated that this study differs from the mentioned studies as it focuses on the relationship between interlanguage errors and the writing anxiety in a foreign language learning context. In other words, the findings of the study contribute to the related literature as there is no research on the mentioned issue.

In light of the results obtained in the study, some practical recommendations can be made. First, curriculum developers should implement some topics to raise awareness to decrease the number of interlanguage errors regarding the differences and similarities between Turkish as a native language and English as a foreign language. For example, they should emphasize the differences between the grammatical systems of Turkish and English and the drawbacks of direct translations from Turkish to English. They should also produce some materials which teach how to use bilingual dictionaries to choose the correct alternative for the given context. Teachers should also raise their awareness of those interlanguage errors and use strategies to decrease the number of interlanguage errors. Second, in terms of writing anxiety, teachers should focus on peer and teacher feedback to strengthen writing pieces and decrease writing anxiety by emphasizing strong points rather than weaknesses. For instance, more attention should be paid to the feedback than to the grade and errors should be seen as valuable sources for improvement. Last, teachers should be sensitive to the time limitation during written tests and allow students to spend more time on improving their writing by decreasing the number of the errors they have without feeling nervous under time pressure.

Some limitations of the research include that the participants were 106 Turkish EFL learners studying English at the language preparatory school. The scope of the study is limited to a descriptive research design that includes a background questionnaire interrogating gender, age, and proficiency levels, the Writing Anxiety Scale consisted of 22 items and participants' written pieces. To conclude, it should be noted that the data collected were limited to participants' actual written products and their perceptions of writing anxiety in a foreign language context. In light of the current results, the aim of further research should be focusing on the levels of the effects of interlanguage errors on writing anxiety levels in an experimental research setting. Further studies should also concentrate on the interlanguage effect on oral language production and speaking anxiety. Finally, correlational studies are necessary to examine the relationship between interlanguage, writing anxiety, and certain variables in addition to age, gender, and proficiency levels.

Notes on the contributors

Tülin Türnük is an instructor at the School of Foreign Languages at İstanbul Medeniyet University. She is also an MA student in the field of English language teaching.

Selami Aydın is a professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at Istanbul Medeniyet University, Turkey. His research has been mainly in EFL writing, language testing, affective factors, and technology in EFL learning and teaching. His articles appeared in national and international journals. Aydin teaches ELT courses for pre-service English teachers.

References

Aydın, S., & Zengin, B. (2008). Anxiety in foreign language learning: A review of literature. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *4*(1), 81-94.

Bennui, P. (2016). A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *4*(1), 72 - 102.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* New York: Longman.

Çakmak, F. (2017). A case study on teacher practice of genre-based writing and classroom interaction patterns of an advanced level. *The Literacy Trek, 3*(2), 114-129.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). EFL students' writing anxiety: Sources and implications. *English   Teaching & Learning, 29*(2), 41-62.

Cheng, Y.S., Horwitz E., & Schallert, D.L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning 49*(3): 417-446.

Cook, V. (2014). How do people learn to write in a second language? In V. Cook & D. Singleton, *Key topics in second language education* (pp. 73-88). Bristol, UK: MM Textbooks.

Corder, S. P. (1977). *Introducing Applied Linguistics.* Great Britain: Penguin Books.

Fang, S. P., Tzeng, O. J., & Alva, L. (1981). Intra-language vs. interlanguage Stroop effects in two types of writing systems. *Memory & Cognition*, *9*(6), 609-617.

Harmer J. (2004). *How to teach writing.* Essex, UK: Pearson Longman.

Harmer, J. (2013). *The practice of English language teaching.* Essex, UK: Pearson Education.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 112-126.

Jang, S. S. (2014). Learners' proficiency level and the efficacy of written corrective feedback on L2 acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(3), 27-49.

Kenkel, J., & Yates, R. (2009). The interlanguage grammar of information management in L1 and L2 developing writing. *Written Communication*, *26*(4), 392-416.

Kim, A. C. (1998). A case study of error analysis/syntactic maturity as indicators of second language writing development. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education*, *15*(1), 79-88.

Kurt, G., & Atay, D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education 3*(1), 12-23.

Littlewood, W. (1984). *Foreign and second language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mahmoodzadeh, M. (2012). Investigating foreign language speaking anxiety within the EFL learner's interlanguage system: The case of Iranian learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(3), 466 – 476.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ*, *6*(2), 1-20.

16

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly 25*(3), 407-430.

Richards, J.C. (1985). *The context of language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(1), 83-96.

Ruegg, R. (2010). Interlanguage development: The effect of unfocused feedback on L2 writing. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 12*(1), 247-254.

Scrivener, J. (2011). *Learning teaching.* London: Macmillan Education.

Seliger, H. W. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 209–231.

Wilkins, D.A. (1974). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

Wilsons, J.T.S. (2006). *Anxiety in learning English as a foreign language: its associations with student variables, with overall proficiency, and with performance on an oral test.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Universidad de Granada, Spain.

Yule G. (2010). *The study of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A. The levels of writing anxiety

Number of the Items	Items	Number	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Deviation
16	I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions.	106	3.75	.12	1.25
10	My thoughts become jumble when I write English compositions under time constraint.	106	3.58	.10	1.07
3	While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	106	3.42	.12	1.20
8	If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade.	106	3.41	.12	1.26
6	My mind often goes blank when I start to work on English composition.	106	3.37	.11	1.18
2	I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under a time constraint.	106	3.34	.11	1.12

11	Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.	106	3.25	.13	1.33
14	I freeze when unexpectedly to write English compositions.	106	3.25	.12	1.24
12	I often feel fear when I write English compositions under time pressure.	106	3.20	.11	1.17
1	While writing in English, I am not nervous at all.	106	2.78	.10	1.10
7	I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	106	2.74	.13	1.32
5	I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.	106	2.58	.12	1.19
4	I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.	106	2.57	.11	1.15
20	Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.	106	2.49	.11	1.13
15	I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	106	2.48	.12	1.23
9	I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.	106	2.48	.11	1.13
17	I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	106	2.47	.11	1.18
13	I am afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	106	2.28	.11	1.09
18	I usually feel my whole-body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	106	2.26	.12	1.20
19	I am afraid that the other students would laugh at my English composition if they read it.	106	2.01	.12	1.21

Appendix B. Relationship between interlanguage errors and writing anxiety (ANOVA)

Items	Number of errors	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
While writing in English, I am not nervous at all.	0	73	3.00	.97	5.37	.01
	1	27	2.26	1.02		
	2	6	2.50	1.64		
I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraint.	0	73	3.26	1.13	1.70	.19
	1	27	3.37	1.15		
	2	6	4.17	1.60		
While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	0	73	3.16	1.24	7.46	.00
	1	27	3.78	1.05		
	2	6	4.83	.41		
I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.	0	73	2.67	1.17	1.68	.19
	1	27	2.44	1.05		
	2	6	1.83	1.33		
I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.	0	73	2.14	.95	33.90	.00
	1	27	3.30	.95		
	2	6	4.83	.41		
My mind often goes blank when I start to work on English composition.	0	73	3.10	1.10	10.65	.00
	1	27	3.74	1.16		

	2	6	5.00	.00	
I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.	0	73	2.47	1.20	
	1	27	3.15	1.43	
	2	6	4.33	.52	8.17 .00
If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade.	0	73	3.23	1.18	
	1	27	3.74	1.29	
	2	6	4.17	1.60	2.85 .06
I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.	0	73	2.12	.91	
	1	27	3.07	1.00	18.75 .00
	2	6	4.17	1.60	
My thoughts become jumble when I write English compositions under time constraint.	0	73	3.33	1.05	
	1	27	4.07	.83	7.14 .00
	2	6	4.33	1.21	
Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.	0	73	2.99	1.30	
	1	27	3.70	1.14	5.42 .05
	2	6	4.33	1.63	
I often feel fear when I write English compositions under time pressure.	0	73	2.93	1.13	
	1	27	3.52	.97	12.04 .00
	2	6	5.00	.00	
I am afraid that the other students would laugh at my English composition if they read it.	0	73	1.71	1.02	
	1	27	2.67	1.33	8.06 .00
	2	6	2.67	1.51	
I freeze up when asked unexpectedly to write English compositions.	0	73	2.85	1.14	
	1	27	4.07	.96	15.34 .00
	2	6	4.33	1.21	
I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	0	73	2.08	1.04	
	1	27	3.07	1.07	23.58 .00
	2	6	4.67	.52	
I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions.	0	73	3.92	1.22	
	1	27	3.44	1.22	2.62 .08
	2	6	3.00	1.41	
I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.	0	73	2.52	1.05	
	1	27	2.44	1.39	.54 .58
	2	6	2.00	1.67	
I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.	0	73	1.97	.94	
	1	27	2.89	1.42	7.89 .00
	2	6	3.00	1.67	
I am afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	0	73	2.02	1.01	
	1	27	2.89	1.01	7.29 .00
	2	6	2.67	1.37	
Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.	0	73	2.63	1.11	
	1	27	2.37	1.11	4.07 .02
	2	6	1.33	.82	