

The Effect of Pair Writing Technique on Iraqi EFL University Students' Writing Performance and Anxiety

Salam Hamid Abbas

Department of Educational & Psychological Studies
College of Education / Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences
University of Baghdad, Iraq

Shaymaa Abdulbaqi Al-bakri

Department of Educational & Psychological Studies
College of Education / Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences
University of Baghdad, Iraq

Abstract

The current study aims at finding out the effect of pair writing technique on Iraqi English as a foreign language university students' writing performance and anxiety. The sample of the study includes 78 male and female students in the Department of English / College of Education Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences of the University of Baghdad, Iraq during the academic year 2016/2017. The sample is divided into a control group with 38 students and experimental group with 40 ones. After checking the equalization of the two groups in certain related variables, the researchers conduct the experiment in which the students in the experimental group are taught writing and practice it in pairs, while those in the control group are dealt with conventionally (individually). The data collection tools employed in this study; a writing posttest and second language writing anxiety inventory, are conducted on the sample at the end of the experiment. The results achieved are statistically manipulated and discussed according to which a number of conclusions are drawn, and a set of recommendations are put forward.

Keywords: pair writing, writing anxiety, writing skill

Cite as: Abbas S., & Shaymaa Abdulbaqi Al-bakri, S. A. (2018). The Effect of Pair Writing Technique on Iraqi EFL University Students' Writing Performance and Anxiety. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (2). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.2>

Introduction

Communication via English, whether oral or written, has become essential in the modern everyday life. As a productive mode of English as a foreign language in which students' language knowledge is effectively reinforced, writing represents a significant set of skills through which language learning and communication can be achieved (Weigle, 2002, p.9). Due to the requirements of the nowadays academic settings and communication situations, it is quite important for EFL students to develop effective writing skills (Defazio et al., 2010, p.34).

Writing is viewed as a basic skill of language in which students should be competent so as to achieve the aims of EFL language learning and/or academic success (Kurt & Atay, 2007, p.15). However, competency in writing requires cognitive skills as understanding, applying, and synthesizing knowledge (Defazio et al., 2010, p.34). That's why producing a written text which is accurate, organized, clear, and fluent is regarded as a challenging task (Weigle, 2002: 11).

However, writing cannot be separated from the acquisition of other EFL skills; accordingly, writing teaching in EFL programs has become more prominent and attracted more attention of scholars and researchers (Bartlett, 2003, p.39). Yet, the problem of weak EFL students' written performance is still quite common (Weigle, 2002, p.10).

Theoretically speaking, writing is supposed to be an interesting task in which students express their own ideas and interests on a certain topic. Unfortunately, due to several probable factors, "writing may instead be a laborious and even dreaded exercise of attempting to place thoughts on paper while developing mastery over the rules of writing, such as spelling, citation format and grammar"(Defazio et al., 2010, p.34). However, one possible reason for the writing shortcoming may be due to the inefficient time devoted to writing teaching and exercising or inadequate teaching techniques used (Stein et al., 1994, p.292).

Previous Iraqi related studies indicate that EFL students' written performance in general is quite inefficient (AlKarkhi 1999; Abid& Abdul Ridha 2011; Hamza 2012; and Muslim 2014). Moreover, the researchers, senior EFL writing teachers, notice that there is a real need for Iraqi EFL students not only to develop efficient communication writing skills, but also to be aware of the significance of mastering such skills. However, writing teaching in the Iraqi Academic institutions stresses students' ability to produce accurate written texts, that's why only the produced written text is evaluated by the teachers. Accordingly, writing practices may be associated with high levels of anxiety on the part of EFL students.

Aims

The study is conducted to find out;

1. the effect of pair writing technique on Iraqi EFL university students' writing performance
2. the effect of pair writing technique on Iraqi EFL university students' writing anxiety.

Hypotheses

1. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group taught according to pair writing technique and the control group taught conventionally in the writing performance test.

2. There is no statistically significant difference between the mean score of the experimental group taught according to pair writing technique and the control group taught conventionally in the writing anxiety scale.

Limits

This study is limited to Iraqi students at the English departments of the University of Baghdad (College of Education /Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, College of Education for Women, College of Arts, and College of Languages) during the academic year 2016-2017.

Value

This study is hoped to be advantageous to EFL university instructors and students as it attempts to experiment teaching writing collaboratively as an alternate of the conventional way of instruction to develop Iraqi EFL students writing skills who are reported to be weak writers in general.

As it sheds light on the significance of anxiety as a deterrent variable in developing writing skills and its possible sources, the current study can also be of value to other researchers who are interested in experimenting more effective writing teaching strategies and investigating the possible factors affecting the development of students' writing skill.

Literature Review

Pair Writing

The increasing interest in approaching EFL teaching communicatively leads to a greater attention being paid to collaboration in EFL classes. One of the most common phases of which is pair work (Hawkey, 2004, p.8). It is stated to provide generous opportunities for practicing the real use of the target language in various tasks (Storch, 2005, p.169).

Pair writing is the practical manifestation of pair work in writing classes. Pair writing is viewed by Storch (2005, p.154) as a situation in which two students interact with each other to accomplish a writing task. It is a technique by which students' involvement in the learning task might be effectively enhanced which, in turn, enables and supports students to challenge and authentically practice the target language.

In this context, one of the merits of EFL students working in pairs is that it stimulates students to think and work independently without waiting to be instructed by the teacher. It also creates a safe educational environment in which students feel relaxed as they share the responsibility of carrying out the task. Pair writing is also reported to allow students to be mutually supportive (Harmer, 2001, p.116).

Related Literature indicates that working in pairs may help students enhance their critical thinking skill which is one of the basic requirements of effective writing (Adams & Hamm, 1996, p.146). As writing involves a great deal of high level thinking, pair writing helps EFL students to model and learn various strategies of thinking (Carson & Nelson, 1994, p.18). Moreover, it is likely to help students get used to listen and /or read critically and give corrective feedback (Honda, 2011, p.52).

In pair writing, students are also expected, through communication, to support and enrich the linguistic competence and performance of each other. This situation is called 'peer learning' which is described as "an active way for pairs to learn from and with each other"(Boud, 2001, p.3)

In EFL writing classes, pair writing may help students acquire EFL and develop language skills through contextualized and meaningful interaction. This is in correspondence with the current orientation toward a more student-centered communicative instruction (Tsai, 1998, p.26). Related literature highlighted the possible positive effects of pair work in the EFL settings on students' mastery of language skills in general and writing in particular (Rollinson, 2005, p.24). As EFL students are expected to speak and write a lot in pairs, this interaction, even if it involves deviant forms of English grammar, is likely to have its significant positive effects, not only on students' writing, but on their language skills in general. Moreover, it may support students' motivation and engagement as they "taste the joy of being able to communicate in English" (Honda, 2011, p.47).

Although writing is usually viewed as an individual practice in which a student attempts to express his/her own ideas and thoughts, attention is being increasingly paid to pair writing as it initiates authentic communicative situations within a safe learning environment (Willis, 1996, p.23). In contrast to individual writing which involves no interaction of students with each other, pair writing strategy may also develop students' speaking skill as it maximizes the amount of a student's speaking to a classmate (Harmer, 1991, p.114). Furthermore, individual writing is usually a product-oriented teaching, while pair writing tends to be more process-oriented teaching. In individual writing, teaching usually over emphasizes the accuracy of the written text language. This may have destructive effects on students' learning and motivation (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p.143).

Students collaboration in writing was first called for by Kenneth Bruffee who reported that pair writing exercise fruited quite better written texts than those produced by individual students (Bruffee, 1973:636). This is supported by the findings of several later studies among which are Clifford (1981), Adams and Hamm (1996), Storch (2005).

In addition to produce better writing, pair writing is reported to significantly improve participant students in different language and linguistic areas. It is also stated that pair writing reinforces students' academic motivation and engagement in the writing tasks as students are usually interested in collaborative tasks (Raja & Saeed, 2012, p.156). However, Pair writing stimulates students to willingly participate in the writing task as they are usually interested in sharing their ideas and working collaboratively with class mates. The difference in students' language mastery levels may also have its advantages in peer learning. Moreover, through pair writing, students get used to give, receive, and make use of feedback. However, the work in pair writing may be slow and, due to pair mates' different thoughts, it is difficult sometimes to make decisions (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014, p.255).

Most of the related studies report that pair writing significantly affects students' ability to produce written texts with a certain level of acceptability; yet, the merits of pair writing exceed acceptable output as it encourages students to adopt this strategy as a habitual and enjoyable protocol for performing. It reinforces mutual accountability in learning and working and enhances the sociability of students (Diatue, 1986, p.389).

Writing Anxiety

Since writing requires a certain level of linguistic competence, range of vocabulary items, and writing conventions, EFL students are likely to feel anxious when being engaged in writing tasks. Due to its proved harmful impacts on EFL learning in general, and developing students' writing skills in particular, writing anxiety has become one area of interest for EFL scholars and researchers (Negari & Rezaabadi, 2012, p.2579). Writing anxiety is viewed as the negative feeling of students associated with the practice of writing. It is reflected in students' tendency to avoid writing practices and/or develop negative feelings or attitudes to associate writing such as nervousness (Atay & Kurt, 2006, p.110).

Writing Anxiety may be defined as a student's "fear of the writing process that outweighs the projected gain from the ability to write" (Tsui, 1996: 121). It is defined by Daly & Miller (1975, P.242) as the tendency of language students to approach or avoid writing practices.

Writing anxiety is one type of situation-specific anxiety or a language –skill-specific type of anxiety specific to writing (Bline et al, 2001, p.71), as other types may include test anxiety, math's anxiety, speaking anxiety..etc. In this sense, writing anxiety should not be confused with the general personality trait of anxiety, rather, it is restricted to any situation in which writing is involved especially if it includes some sort of evaluation (Tadesse, 2013, p.8).

Writing anxiety, or 'the terror of the blank page' as referred to by Donald M. Murray (Murray, 1968: 70), is not restricted to EFL students at the early stages of language learning or those with poor mastery of language skills, rather it may be experienced by students in different educational levels with different levels of language efficiency (Reigsted ,1985: 69). As stated by Witse (2001, p.2), writing anxiety may begin at any stage of language learning and be a long-lasting complication.

In the product-based programs of EFL writing teaching which requires students working individually, the feedback and evaluation of students' written texts are usually done by the teacher. This normally makes writing " a highly challenging and demanding skill and creates within students negative affective attitude towards writing" (Jahin,2012, p.63). Moreover, in such programs, students usually carry out their writing tasks individually without being supported, aided, and encouraged by classmates. This may increase the difficulty of writing tasks and the level of anxiety and other negative affective variables (Yang, 2011, p.148). Highly anxious writers are reported to avoid any task that may involve writing as they view writing as a bothersome task or punishment. During writing, they are likely to feel tense, nervous, and worry and this usually affects their writing which is reported to be noticeably shorter, syntactically inaccurate and less fluent (Faigly et al., 1981, p.10).

Writing anxiety may seriously block students' thinking and so significantly affect their writing performance (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991,p.89).Accordingly it may have significant negative effects on students' writing skills development. Students with higher levels of anxiety tend to produce written texts that are lower in accuracy, organization, quality and quantity (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996: 31).

It is reported that writing anxiety negative impacts exceed the quality of students written texts to include their behaviors while writing, self-efficacy, attitudes toward writing, and all the phases of writing process (Faigley et al., 1981, p.12). These negative effects may also exceed students' achievement to include their motivation (Kurt & Atay, 2007, p.12).

However, several studies report different possible sources of writing anxiety. These sources may include the students writing competence, efficiency of preparation for the writing practice, the worry of being evaluated and judged by the teacher and classmates, and the nature of feedback given by the teacher (Ozturk & Cecen, 2007, p.220).

Method

Due to its nature and aims, the current study adopts the non-randomized control group pretest/posttest experimental design. In this design two or more groups are involved. After checking their equalization in a number of possible effective variables including the dependent ones, the groups involved are randomly assigned as one control group and experimental one(s). During the experiment, only the experimental group(s) receives the independent variable. However, at the end of the experiment, all the groups involved in the study (control and experimental) are to be post-tested in the dependent variables and the data collected is statistically manipulated and discussed to either accept or reject the hypothesis (or hypotheses) of the study. (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p.98) .(See table1).

Table 1
The Experimental Design

Groups	No	Pre-test	Independent Variable	Post-test
Experimental	40	Writing Performance +	Pair Writing Technique	Writing Performance +
Control	38		X	

Population and Sample

Third-year students at the English departments of the University of Baghdad (College of Education /Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, College of Education for Women, College of Arts, and College of Languages) during the academic year 2016-2017 represent the population of this study. From third year students at the Department of English / College of Education Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences, section B (38 students) and section D (40 students) are randomly selected to represent the sample. The total number of the sample is 78 male and female students.

Equalization

To ensure that the study is likely to achieve accurate and indicative results, the equalization of the two groups involved in this study is checked according to a number of variables that may cause a variance in the participants tested performance.

Therefore, the equalization of the two groups is checked according to writing pre-test scores, intelligence, and writing anxiety.

The data required for equalization checking is collected by employing a writing performance pre-test, Raven's progressive matrices intelligence test (RPM), and a writing anxiety scale.

The manipulation of the data achieved through conducting the three instruments by t-test for two independent samples formula reveals that there are no statistical significant differences between the experimental and control groups in the checked variables. The computed t-test values are found 0.651, 0.985, and 1.075 for writing performance in the pre-test, intelligence test, and writing anxiety respectively which are all lower than the tabulated t-test value 2.0 (see table 2).

Table 2
The Equalization of the Experimental and Control Groups in the Writing Pre-test, Intelligence, and Writing Anxiety

Variable	Groups	No.	M	SD	t- value		Sig.		
					computed	tabulated			
Writing Pre-test	Experimental	40	18.32	6.44	0.651	2.0	No		
	Control	38	19.20	5.68					
Intelligence	Experimental	40	33.23	9.12	0.985		2.0	No	
	Control	38	31.25	8.91					
Writing Anxiety	Experimental	40	86.11	4.23	1.075			2.0	No
	Control	38	87.24	5.15					

Instruments of the Study

Writing Post-test

To achieve the aims of the study, the participants' writing performance should be accurately evaluated. For this purpose, a writing test is prepared in which the participants are asked to write a composition of no less than 250 words on a topic suggested by them. The compositions of the participants are to be scored according to the analytical rubric suggested by Brown (2007). By this rubric participants' writing performance can be evaluated on five components; namely, content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Each of these components is evaluated on a scale of 1-4. Accordingly, the scores achieved in the test can range from 10 to 40. (See Appendix A).

Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI)

This inventory is adopted from Cheng, Y.S. (2004). It consists of 22 items to be responded to according to a five-point Likert scale (strongly disagrees, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree). These five points are graded 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. (Appendix B).

Face Validity

To achieve face validity of the study instruments, data collection instruments are exposed to two juries of experts. The scoring rubric of the writing test is exposed to 10 experts in Teaching English as a foreign language, while the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) is exposed to 12 jurors in the field of educational psychology. However, mostly all the jurors in both fields agree on the suitability of both instruments to the aims and sample of the current study.

Pilot Administration

To help the researchers check the clarity of the SLWAI items and compute its reliability, 35 third year students the Department of English/College of Education-Ibn Rushd who are not included in the study sample are randomly assigned to conduct the pilot administration.

Statistical Analysis of SLWAI

The construct validity of the SLWAI can be evaluated through conducting statistical analysis of the inventory items to check the patterns of correlations between the scores achieved by the individuals responding to the inventory items (Trochim et al., 2015, p.159). This procedure aims at evaluating the effectiveness of each item in the inventory. The statistical analysis involves computing the discrimination power and item-total correlation of the SLWAI. The statistical analysis sample includes 100 third year students who are randomly selected from the Department of English/ College of Languages/ University of Baghdad.

Item Discrimination Power

Computing the item discrimination power helps to determine the necessary power of each item to discriminate between individuals who have the trait indicated by the item, and those who do not have it. To compute the discrimination power, the scores achieved by the individuals in the statistical analysis sample are divided into an upper and a lower groups. T-test for two independent samples is utilized to check the difference between the mean of the scores in each group. T-test values are found to range between 2.21 -13.12 all of which are higher than the tabulated t-value.

Table 3
Ranges of T-test Values of Items in SLWAI

Scale	Range of Computed t-values	tabulated t-value	Level of significance	Degree of Freedom
SLWAI	2.21-13.12	1.98	0.05	98

Item- Total Correlation

Pearson Correlation Formula is employed to check the correlation between the score of each item in the SLWAI and its total score. This procedure is done to check the items' homogeneity and their likelihood to measure what they are intended to measure (Anstasi, 1976, p.209). However, all items in the SLWAI are found to have statistical significance.

Table 4
Ranges of Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Items in SLWAI

Scale	Range of Pearson Correlation Coefficients	Computed tabulated value	Level of significance	Degree of Freedom
SLWAI	0.234-0.411	0.196	0.05	98

Reliability

Checking the Reliability of a data helps to determine the amount of confidence with which the results achieved through the instrument are dealt with (Gronlund, 1976:105). However, checking the reliability can be done by different procedures among which Alpha Cronbach represents one of the most common procedures. Using Alpha Cronbach yields reliability equivalent 0.86. Accordingly the SLWAI is regarded reliable since its reliability equivalent is higher than 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994, p.256).

The Experiment

The experiment is started with the beginning of the second semester of the academic year 2016/2017 and lasted for 15 weeks. Both experimental and control groups are taught writing by one of the researchers and assigned two writing lesson periods weekly. Moreover, both groups are given the same number and topics of writing tasks and trained to write by following five phases, namely; ideas generation, drafting, revising, editing, and sharing. However, during the experiment the participants in the control group are asked to practice and accomplish the writing tasks individually, while experimental group participants are asked and trained to do this in pairs.

Directly at the end of the experiment period the post writing test and SLWAI are conducted on the participants in both groups.

Results

The data collected through the two instruments is statistically manipulated by utilizing t-test for two independent samples to find out the significance of the differences between the means of the scores of the two groups' participants. Below is a discussion of the results achieved.

Results Related to the First Hypothesis

The experimental and control groups' mean scores in the writing post-test are 32.21 and 23.45 respectively. The computed t-test value 4.786 is higher than the tabulated value 2.0. (See table 5).

Table 5
T- test Value of Students' Scores in the Writing Post-test

Variable	Groups	No.	M	SD	t- value		Sig.
					computed	tabulated	
Writing posttest	Experimental	40	32.21	7.23	4.786	2.0	Yes
	Control	38	23.45	9.11			

This shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the writing performances of the participants in the two groups in the post-test. Since the mean score of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group, the difference is in favor of the former. Accordingly, the first null hypothesis is rejected.

To decide on the effect size value of pair writing technique on experimental group participants' writing performance, Eta-squared (η^2) is utilized and results a value 0,96 which indicates that the effect size of this independent variable is strong.

Results Related to the Second Hypothesis

The means of the scores achieved by the participants in the experimental and control groups in the SLWAI are computed and found 80.45 and 84.32 respectively. The computed value of t-test 2.51 is higher than the tabulated value 2.0 as shown in table 6.

Table 6
T- test Value of Students' Scores in SLWAI

Variable	Groups	No.	M	SD	t- value		Sig.
					computed	tabulated	
SLWAI	Experimental	40	80.45	5.36	2.51	2.0	Yes
	Control	38	84.32	8.21			

T-test results indicate that the difference between the scores achieved by the participants in the two groups in the SLWAI is statistically significant. Again, this difference is found in favor of the experimental group since its mean score is higher than the control group's one. Thus, the second null hypothesis is also rejected.

The value of Eta-squared (η^2) is computed to find out the size value of the effect of the independent variable (pair writing technique) on participants' writing anxiety. It yields a value 0.47 which indicates that the independent variable has a weak effect size.

Conclusions

According to the results achieved in this study, it is concluded that;

1. pair writing technique has a positive effect on developing EFL students' writing performance.
2. pair writing technique can be used effectively to reduce EFL students' writing anxiety which may seriously hinder students' development of writing skill.
3. the positive effect of pair writing technique is found to be greater on developing EFL students' writing skill than on reducing their writing anxiety.
4. the positive effect of pair writing is not restricted to the quality of writing, but it also positively affects the quantity. This is indicated by students' written compositions which are found to be not only better in quality but also longer in size.
5. in addition to practice writing, students indirectly practice speaking and communication as they interact in pairs to accomplish pair writing tasks.

6. pair writing involves indirect peer reviewing as each student review his/her pair mate sentences and ideas. This provides additional opportunities for learning from the feedback given, although the case of students giving inaccurate feedback is still possible

Recommendations

In the light of the results and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are set foreword:

1. Due to its beneficial effect in EFL learning, collaborative learning in general and pair writing activities in particular should be initiated in the EFL classroom.
2. EFL writing teachers should seek to enhance their students' learning by employing various approved teaching techniques.
3. EFL writing should not be taught separately. It is more useful to employ techniques that promote integrative practice of different language skills.
4. Since pair writing moves a great deal of responsibility of instruction and interaction from the classroom teacher to students, EFL writing teachers need to work hard to structure and initiate suitable pair writing tasks and train their students to be actively engaged in such tasks.
5. Due to the noisiness and movement result from students' interacting in pairs; control of the class may be lost. Accordingly, writing teachers should give greater attention to keep order and avoid possible destructive behaviors of students. This can be achieved by carefully monitoring the writing pairs. and setting certain rules and time limits for pair writing task completion.
6. Shy and unmanageable students or those who prefer to work independently should be encouraged to do pair writing tasks because, as a collaborative learning technique, pair writing trains students to work collaboratively, accept the different ideas of others, and get used to lead and to be led.
7. EFL writing teachers should promote their students' ability to analyze their own writing as readers to be aware of their personal writing needs.
8. In pair writing activities, the EFL classroom teacher should be wise concerning the amount of intervention he/she makes in pair students' interaction.
9. Suitable topics should be chosen for students to write on in pairs. Topics about personal life and experiences, for example, are more suitable for individual writing tasks.
10. It is always useful to encourage students to reflect on the pair writing task experiences they have so as to increase their awareness of the beneficial effects of collaboration and to help classroom teachers improve the tasks they prepare for their students.

About the Authors:

Dr. Salam Hamid Abbas received his PhD in methods of TEFL in Baghdad University 2005. He works as a professor at the University of Baghdad, College of Education/Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences and teaches at both under and post graduate levels. Dr. Salam's main research interests are within the scope of EFL teacher training and education, language assessments, variables affecting EFL learning, and developing EFL writing skill.

Dr. Shaymaa Abdulbaqi Al- Bakri was awarded her Ph.D. in 1998 by the University of Baghdad in English Language Teaching & Curriculum. Her scientific rank is a professor and she works in

the College of Education/Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences - University of Baghdad. She has special interest in ESP, EFL curriculum, Learning Styles & Strategies, Teacher Development, and Thinking Skills.

References

- Adam, D. M., & Hamms, M. (1996). *Cooperative learning, critical thinking and collaboration across the curriculum*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Ltd.
- Atay, D. & Kurt, G. (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
- Atay, D. & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8 (4), 100-118.
- Bartlett, T. (2003). Why Johnny can't write, even though he went to Princeton. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49 (17), 39-40.
- Bline D., Lowe, D.R., Meixner, W.F., Nouri, H., & Pearce, K. (2001). A research note on the dimensionality of Daly and Miller's writing apprehension scale. *Written Communication* 18, 61-79.
- Boud, D. (2001). Introduction: Making the move to peer learning. In D. Boud, R. Cohen & J. Sampson (Eds.), *Peer learning in higher education: Learning from & with each other*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Brown, J. D. (2007). Multiple views of L1 writing score reliability. *Second Language Studies*, 25(2), 1-31.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1973). Collaborative learning: Some practical models. *College English*, 34, 634-643.
- Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1994). Writing groups: Cross-cultural issues. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 17-30.
- Cheng, Y.S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313-335.
- Clifford, J. (1981). Comparing in stages: The effects of a collaborative pedagogy. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 15, 37-53.
- Daly, J. A. , & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 242-248.
- Defazio, J., Jones, J., Tennant, F., and Hook, Sara A.(2010). Academic Literacy: The importance and impact of writing across the curriculum- a case study. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10 (2), 34-47.
- Diatue, C. (1986). Do 1 and 1 make 2? Patterns of influence by collaborative authors. *Written Communication*, 3 (3), 383-408.
- Faigley, L., Daly, J.A. & Witte, S. (1981). The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, 16-21.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. New York: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hawkey, R. (2004). *A modular approach to testing English language skills: The development of the Certificates in English Language Skills (CELS) examinations*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Honda, M. (2011). Creative Writing in Pairs: Pedagogic Possibilities in Japanese University EFL Classes. *Komaba Journal of English Education*, 2, 45-63.
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The effect of peer reviewing on writing apprehension and essay writing ability of prospective EFL teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37 (11), 60-84.
- Kurt G, Atay D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *J. Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1), 12-23.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: OUP.
- MacIntyre, P.D. & Gardner, R.C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety in language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, 41, 85-117.
- Murray, D.M.(1968). *A writer teaches writing: a practical method of teaching composition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Negari, M. G. & Rezaabadi, T. O. (2012). Too nervous to write? The relationship between anxiety and EFL writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (12), 2578-2586.
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. 3rd Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunan, D. & Bailey, K. (2009). *Exploring Second Language Classroom Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. Boston: Heinle Center Engage Learning.
- Ozturk, H. & Cecen, S. (2007). The effect of portfolio keeping on writing anxiety of EFL students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 3(2), 218-236.
- Raja, N., & Saeed, A. (2012). The Effectiveness of Group Work and Pair Work for Students of English at Undergraduate Level in Public and Private Sector Colleges. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4 (5), 155-163.
- Reigstad, T. J. (1985). Perspectives on anxiety and the basic writer: research, evaluation, instruction. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 4, 68-77.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59 (1), 23-30.
- Stein, M, Dixon, R. C. & Isaacson, S (1994). Effective writing instruction for diverse learners. *School Psychology Review*, 23 (3), 392-405.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflections. *Journal for Second Language Writing*, 14 (3), 153-173.
- Storch, N., & Wiggleworth, G. (2009). Pair versus individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy. *Language Testing*, 26 (3), 445-466.
- Tadesse, D. T. (2013). *Investigating writing anxiety of grade 11 students and its effect on their writing skill: The case of Boditi preparatory school, Wolatia Zone*. MA Thesis, Haramaya University.
- Trochim, W., Donnelly, J. P., & Arora, K. (2015). *Research Methods: The Essential Knowledge Base*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning
- Tsai, S. (1998). *The effects of cooperative learning on teaching English as a foreign language to senior high school students*. MA Thesis. National Kaohsiung Normal University.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). *Reticence and anxiety in second language learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.

- Wiltse, E. M. (2001). *The effects of motivation and anxiety on students' use of instructor comments*. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED458630> (August 2017).
- Yang, S. (2011). Exploring the effectiveness of using peer evaluation and teacher feedback in college students' writing. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 20 (1), 144-150.

Appendix A

Writing Performance Scoring Scheme

Aspect	Score	Performance Description	Weighting
Content (C) 30% - Topic - Details	4	The topic is complete and clear and the details are relating to the topic	3 x
	3	The topic is complete and clear but the details are almost relating to the topic.	
	2	The topic is complete and clear but the details are not relating to the topic.	
	1	The topic is not clear and the details are not relating to the topic.	
Organization (O) 20% - Identification - Description	4	Identification is complete and descriptions are arranged with proper connectives	2 x
	3	Identification is almost complete and descriptions are arranged with almost proper connectives	
	2	Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with few misuse of connectives	
	1	Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with misuse of connectives	
Grammar (G) 20% - Use present tense - Agreement	4	Very few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	2 x
	3	Few grammatical or agreement inaccuracies but not affect on meaning	
	2	Numerous grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	
	1	Frequent grammatical or agreement inaccuracies	
Vocabulary (V) 15%	4	Effective choice of words and word forms	1.5 x
	3	Few misuse of vocabularies, word forms, but not change the meaning	
	2	Limited range confusing words and word form	
	1	Very poor knowledge of words, word forms, and not understandable	
Mechanics (M) 15% - Spelling - Punctuation - Capitalization	4	It uses correct spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	1.5 x
	3	It has occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	
	2	It has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	
	1	It is dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	

Appendix B

Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory

No	Items	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	While writing in English, I am not nervous at all.					
2	I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraint.					

3	While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.					
4	I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.					
5	I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.					
6	My mind often goes blank when I start to work on an English composition.					
7	I don't worry that my English compositions are a lot worse than others.					
8	I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.					
9	If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade.					
10	I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.					
11	My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint.					
12	Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.					
13	I often feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraint.					
14	I am afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.					
15	I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.					
16	I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.					
17	I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions.					
18	I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.					
19	I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when write English compositions.					
20	I am afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.					
21	I am not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor.					
22	Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.					