

THESIS

SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING APPREHENSION AND WRITING
IDENTITIES

Submitted by

Leslie A. Davis

Department of English

Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 2016

Master's Committee English:

Advisor: Anthony Becker

Frédérique Grim

Tatiana Nekrasova-Beker

Mary Vogl

Master's Committee Languages, Literatures and Cultures:

Advisor: Frédérique Grim

Anthony Becker

Mary Vogl

Copyright by Leslie A. Davis 2016

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING APPREHENSION AND WRITING IDENTITIES

Formal academic writing tasks can produce high levels of anxiety or apprehension in students regardless of whether that writing is carried out in their native language or in a second or foreign language. The Colorado State University Writing Center sees 50% of its consultations coming from non-native English students (The Writing Center, n.d.), meaning that this population is over-represented compared to the university as a whole. This over-representation is largely self-motivated because students choose to visit the Writing Center. Given this over-representation, it is necessary to understand why this population of students might be more concerned than others with their academic writing. While much research has focused on the types of anxiety that language students may experience, the possible sources of that anxiety have not been widely discussed. Possible causes include fear of negative evaluation and fear of making mistakes, but the role of the academic discourse community and its influence on writing identities have not yet been explored. This thesis examines writing in a foreign or second language and the possible sources of second language writing apprehension, including students' writing identity and the academic discourse community. Through surveys and individual interviews with students, this study looks at the possible influences on student affect which can in turn impede student progress, such as anxiety, self-doubt, or perceived competence. The study determined that while there is not a strong relationship between writing apprehension and a

student's willingness to claim a writing identity, there is a difference between how second and foreign language students experience second language writing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the people who helped and supported me through the process of writing this thesis. This includes my advisors Frédérique Grim and Tony Becker, who gave me many suggestions and read many versions of this thesis, from proposal to final draft, and my committee members Mary Vogl and Tatiana Nekrasova-Beker. I would also like to thank the instructors who let me into their classrooms to work with their students. I wouldn't have a thesis if it weren't for willing students, so I'm especially grateful to them for taking the time to complete my survey and go through the interview process. Thanks also to Sue Doe for giving me suggestions for research from a rhetoric and composition perspective. Jenny Levin suggested that I could turn this topic into a thesis, and I'm thankful for the encouragement. And last but not least, I would like to thank my husband, Patrick Caldwell, for being patient and encouraging throughout the whole process, even though it seemed like there was always more work to do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
The Present Study	5
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Importance of Second Language Writing	7
Foreign Language Writing Apprehension	8
Influence of FLWA on Language Learning.....	9
Research on Causes of FLWA	14
The Academic Discourse Community and Student Writing Identity	18
The Academic Discourse Community	19
Writing Identities	20
The Academic Discourse Community, Writing Identities, and FLWA.....	22
Influence of Academic Discourse Communities and Writing Identity on FLWA	26
Research Questions and Hypotheses	30
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	32
Participants.....	32
Research Design.....	33
Instruments.....	34
Survey	34

Interviews.....	37
Procedures	38
Surveys.....	38
Interviews.....	39
Analysis of Data.....	39
Quantitative Analysis	39
Quantitative Analysis	40
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	43
Sources of FLWA	44
Audience: Peers and Teachers	45
Lack of Familiarity with Genres and Requirements	48
Plagiarism.....	50
Student Interest	51
Behavior and Situation.....	52
Research Question Two: FLWA.....	55
Research Question Two: Identity.....	63
Research Question Three: Connecting FLWA and Writing Identities	73
Implications of Results	76
Influence of the Academic Discourse Community	77
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	81
Limitations and Future Research	81
Pedagogical Implications	84
REFERENCES	88

APPENDIX A: ESL Survey	94
APPENDIX B: Foreign Language Survey	95
APPENDIX C: Categorization of Survey Items	97
APPENDIX D: Interview Protocol	98
APPENDIX E: Open-ended Survey Responses	99

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1- PARTICIPANTS	32
TABLE 2- INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS	33
TABLE 3- SURVEY RESULTS – BEHAVIOR	52
TABLE 4- SURVEY RESULTS – FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING APPREHENSION	55
TABLE 5- SURVEY RESULTS – IDENTITY	63
TABLE 6- OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESPONSES.....	65
TABLE 7- SURVEY TABLE OF SPECIFICATIONS.....	96

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Students coming to foreign and second language classrooms in a university in the United States bring different educational backgrounds, goals for learning, and different expectations of what the language classroom will look like. Oftentimes they have had some second or foreign language learning experience prior to enrolling in the university, though that is not always the case. Their experiences with academic writing may also vary depending on different contexts, such as their experience with literacy in the home, the education system they come from, and the emphasis that those systems and institutions placed on writing for personal, educational, or professional purposes. While these personal and educational backgrounds may differ, the expectations that instructors have for student writing in a university will look more homogeneous. Whether they are in composition courses or other courses that rely heavily on writing tasks, second language writers will enter an unfamiliar yet high-stakes discourse community.

Second and foreign language learners are learning in different contexts. A second language learner is in an environment where they are exposed to the L2 both inside and out of the classroom because it is the dominant language in the area. Foreign language learners, on the other hand, may only be exposed to the L2 in the classroom. An example of a second language learner would be an English-speaking student studying French in France, while a foreign language learner would be an English-speaking student studying French in the U.S. It is important to recognize the different influences that these language learning contexts can have on a student's experience, either positive or negative, as another factor that can influence their learning.

Another influential part of the language learning context are the writing requirements. L2 students coming to a university in the U.S. are faced with a new writing situation while still developing their language skills. Academic writing is likely new for these students; whether they are coming from an American high school that taught them citation and genre conventions of research papers or whether they have come from a country whose rhetoric does not emphasize elements like topic sentences and thesis statements in introductions, they have not yet mastered this discourse. It is instead assumed that all students entering the academic discourse community will make rhetorical and linguistic choices that allow them to act as if they belong to this community until they attain the skills needed for legitimate member status (Bartholomae, 1985).

In order to help students enter this new discourse community, composition programs and courses are intended to initiate them. One common experience that L2 students will have in a U.S. university is a writing course. Students will more than likely encounter their university's composition program at some point in their college career, unless they have been sufficiently prepared for college writing and can test out of the requirement. A one-to-two semester composition curriculum is a requirement at many universities, including the university where this study took place, and these courses are regulated in order to have little variation in the main course goals and objectives. The purpose of these courses is to prepare students for academic and research writing in either other introductory courses that rely on writing tasks, or to continue writing in their advanced coursework. Once students have completed these required courses they may continue to encounter writing tasks as a major form of assessment, depending on their continuing field of study and depending on the emphasis their university places on writing. At the university where this study took place, it has been a requirement since 2007 that psychology classes and all classes offered by departments within the College of Liberal Arts integrate writing

into 25% of the course grade (S. Doe, personal communication, April 18, 2016). Foreign language students have similar writing course requirements before they can move on to advanced course work (L***300, or Reading and Writing for Communication). L2 students will likely encounter at least a few of these classes as part of the core curriculum.

There are many reasons that students could experience anxiety about writing in an L2, among them being fear of negative evaluation, fear of making mistakes, and failing to meet their own standards for achievement. Their broader language learning context may also play a role. It is not unusual for anyone to find themselves in unfamiliar rhetorical situations, and the ability to make these shifts from one communicative situation to another relies on pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence is a combination of linguistic competence, mind-reading (inferencing), world knowledge, and meta-pragmatic awareness (Ifantidou, 2014). Ifantidou (2014) describes two necessary conditions for pragmatic competence: context and manifestness. While context is fluid and depends on the individual to notice its change, manifestness refers to the individual's capacity for inferring what is and is not true. However, not all communicative situations are comparable in their decipherability. Academic discourse is particularly contingent on the understanding and appropriate use of specialized terminology, or words that fall far outside of the most commonly used in the language. However, this isn't just a question of proper vocabulary; knowing how to write is just as important as knowing what to write in an educational setting that increasingly privileges writing processes as much as the products, and being able to appropriately address changing writing situations depends on being able to notice those changes.

In order to gain member status in a discourse community, a language user must feel that they are welcome in that community and a part of their identity must align with this community

for the time that they are in it. An L2 writing student's identity in the classroom is different from their identity in the home or in social settings. Their language use must change to become socially and culturally appropriate, and their identity as a language user itself may change depending on their context. Ball and Ellis (2008) describe four different sources of identity: nature, institution, discourse, and affinity. They represent naturally occurring, institutionally authorized, interaction-based, and activity or participation-based sources of identity, respectively. The last three sources of identity demonstrate that identity is not reliant solely on the individual, but the context they are in; the people around them must also participate in creating that identity, either by authorizing or accepting the language user's participation. Gaining an understanding of how L2 writers consider their writing identities can help get a clearer picture of the academic discourse community on L2 writers' experiences at a university, including how they may or may not experience writing apprehension.

Being accepted by or denied membership to a discourse community is only one concern that L2 writers must face. Students' difficulty in assimilating into this new academic discourse community may be the result of two broad influences: their non-native speaker status and their unfamiliarity with the expectations of academic writing. Research on language has increasingly focused on affective factors that might influence student success (e.g. Cheng, 2002, Di Loreto & McDonough, 2013, and others). These affective factors include anxiety, motivation, and self-efficacy. Depending on how students experience them, these factors can have a negative or positive effect on their ability to learn or perform in the classroom. The combination of negative affective factors, including worry, anxiety, and negative perception of competence will be referred to as foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA). Not all students experience these affective factors to the same degree or for the same reasons, so understanding why and how these

factors come about is important to understanding how we can improve their learning experience. Understanding how students' behavior is affected by can also provide clues as to how FLWA affects writing and learning processes. Student behavior can also help teachers to understand to what extent the student feels competent and empowered to make use of the strategies and resources available to them. In other words, students might have negative experiences with writing because of FLWA, or because they don't feel comfortable in the academic discourse community. That negative affective factor may also have a negative effect on the student's achievement. Because of the individual differences and experiences of students, different sources of anxiety, for example, may also lead to a lack of writing identity or belonging in the academic discourse community.

The Present Study

The purpose of this study is to better understand why L2 student writers may experience foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA). In particular, this study seeks to discover whether there is a relationship between foreign language writing apprehension and L2 writers' inclusion in or exclusion from the academic discourse community as reflected in their writing identity, and to understand the social and institutional influences of academic writing on those students. There is a complex array of possible influences on L2 writers that can result in either lack of a writing identity or a heightened level of FLWA, and looking at each of these factors may reveal connections between them.

In order to fully understand the influences on students' L2 writing experiences, this study looked at their own perceptions of and experiences with writing, in composition courses and in courses that require significant amounts of writing. This research focused on students currently enrolled in courses that serve as an introduction to academic writing in a foreign or second

language, namely First-Year Composition for International Students (CO150) and Reading and Writing for Communication (LFRE300). However, because their writing is not limited to these two classes, their experience of writing in the university as a whole was examined.

This study used a mixed-methods approach of surveys and one-on-one interviews. This was to find both a general impression of FLWA at the university, as well as more detailed information regarding students' writing experiences in English or a foreign language before attending university and the ways that they felt their writing identity shifted when going from one writing context to another. Using different approaches made it possible to confirm or contradict the findings from one method to another in order to better understand which factors, of the myriad of possibilities, may be the biggest influence on or explain a possible connection between writing identities and FLWA.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Much research has been conducted on different aspects of the L2 writing experience. Since writing is a major part of being successful in American universities, it is important to understand how students experience and are affected by these requirements. The research on L2 writing includes the efficacy of various types of error-correction, the student-centered focus on affect, and how professionals other than L2 instructors (i.e. writing tutors, mainstream instructors) can best address L2 student needs. Additionally, a body of research exists on L2 writers' experience of anxiety, achievement, and self-efficacy. The following chapter provides an overview of the research conducted on foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA), academic discourse communities, and writing identities in order to establish the possible relationships between these experiences and contexts, and the direction of this study.

The Importance of Second Language Writing

While writing is a familiar task in universities, its role in second language acquisition has been seen as a tool to assess other kinds of knowledge, rather than a task that in itself can help students to learn. There are two views: that of learning to write and of writing to learn. In the former, writing is seen as something that can be learned after a significant amount of language proficiency has been achieved (Williams, 2012). On the other hand, writing to learn sees writing as a tool for furthering linguistic knowledge. Harklau (2002) and Williams (2012) both point to the permanence of writing as a main reason for its utility; writing is reviewable, can be returned to for reference, and can be revised, all of which can help with retention. Writing also allows learners to spend more time producing, which may increase noticing. In turn, this can increase

focus on form and require the learner to make use of their explicit or analyzed knowledge (Williams, 2012).

The view that L2 learners should wait to begin writing is also based on L1 acquisition theory. As Harklau (2002) points out, “[w]hile toddlers do not say and write their first word on the same day, classroom-based second language learners may do exactly that” (p.334). This implies that using L1 acquisition theory to drive L2 teaching does not match the learning context. In other words, second language writing pedagogy may have suffered from the influence of L1 acquisition theory on L2 acquisition theory, and for university students who are expected to write academically, they need the best practice they can access. Harklau argues that writing is an opportunity for researchers to look at the influence of interactions between the teacher and student on paper, and provide an opportunity for researchers to use different methodologies, such as having students to explain their experiences via interviews and journals, rather than observing classes. Understanding these experiences and interactions may reveal possible negative effects, such as writing apprehension, on their achievement. Writing itself is an important task that students will continue to encounter as they move forward in their academic careers, and so helping them complete this task to the best of their ability can influence not only their writing achievement, but their language learning achievement.

Foreign Language Writing Apprehension

There are several ways that writing anxiety can manifest when an L2 student is writing, such as worry or a negative perception of competence, which will be discussed below. These types of anxiety, apprehension, and behaviors combine to create anxiety that is specific to the context of second language writing (Cheng, Horwitz, & Schallert, 1999). For the purposes of this research, the term “foreign language writing apprehension” (FLWA) will be used to refer to the

combination of these various manifestations of anxiety that occur when a language student is required to write a formal academic text that will be evaluated, including fear, worry, anxiety, and a negative perception of writing tasks and competence. Whichever of these anxieties a student experiences at any one time, this apprehension may have negative effects on their achievement as well as their perceived competence, also known as their self-efficacy.

Influence of Foreign Language Writing Apprehension on Language Learning

Writing, whether in a first or second language, can be a particularly anxiety-producing task for students (Cheng et al, 1999; Truscott, 1995). Students in a university are expected to produce language and writing appropriate for that context, and this is an unavoidable and reasonable task. However, for students learning a second or foreign language in a university, this writing-related anxiety may be compounded by other factors. Multiple factors can contribute to and be included in foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA), including communication apprehension, foreign language anxiety, and state and trait anxiety. Communication apprehension is an umbrella term that includes language learning and L2 writing apprehension, and it manifests itself when, for the student, “anxiety about communication outweighs his projection of gain from the situation” (Phillips, 1968, as cited in Daly & Miller, 1975, p. 243). For the purposes of this study, communication refers specifically to academic writing that is done for credit in a university course.

Writing anxiety may include trait anxiety (IE someone who is predictably anxious over a wide number of situations) and state anxiety (IE unpredictable and changing anxiety) (Horwitz et al., 2010; Woodrow, 2011). Neither of these types of anxiety are exclusive to foreign language learning or to writing but may manifest themselves in multiple contexts, of which those are two possibilities. However, given that FLWA is context-dependent, state anxiety is more likely to

occur. Cheng (2004) describes two particular more types of anxiety that characterize the student's resulting behavior. Cognitive anxiety shows itself mentally or emotionally, such as a fear of negative appraisal or evaluation, while somatic anxiety may have physical manifestations such as upset stomach or excessive sweating.

Foreign language anxiety (FLA) is considered a separate type of anxiety from other types of anxiety one might experience while learning, such as general or testing anxiety (Cheng, 2004; Di Loreto & McDonough, 2013; Woodrow, 2011). FLA is “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (Horwitz et al., 2010). Though some transfer from other types of anxiety may occur, FLA is generally thought of as situational and not significantly related to other types of anxiety (Cheng et al, 1999; Di Loreto & McDonough, 2013; Horwitz et al., 2010). Situational anxiety remains relatively stable over time and is caused by the context a learner is in (Cho, 2015). This type of anxiety could be experienced by anyone in a language-learning environment, including classes at a university.

Cheng et al. (1999) conducted a study to determine whether or not foreign language writing anxiety is separate from foreign language speaking anxiety. The researchers compared results from the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test (1975), which was modified for second language learners, and the Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz et al., 1986). The items in the FLCAS focused predominately on speaking, since that is the main form of communication in the classroom, which made it appropriate for distinguishing between the two types of anxiety. Cheng et al. found that the subcomponents of each scale were not significantly correlated, meaning that that the two scales did differentiate between general foreign language classroom anxiety and writing anxiety. The implications of these findings are

that FLWA requires separate research with different guiding theoretical frameworks, which has been the case as researchers have moved forward using the scale later developed by Cheng (2004) that was constructed specifically for second language writers.

Combining the apprehension that is specific to writing and specific to foreign language learning leads us to foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA), an anxiety that is unique to this context. Writing apprehension is linked to several negative influences on language learning. Students who experience significant language-learning anxiety may have lower motivation, choose schooling or living situations where communication is unlikely, and have a lower self-evaluation (Daly & Miller, 1975). Research has shown that students with high levels of writing apprehension tend to produce writing that is less profound, has lower clarity, and lower quality (Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 2000), and they tend to be out-performed by their low-apprehension counterparts (Sanders-Reio et al, 2014). Students with high writing apprehension also “compose fewer drafts, plan fewer ideas and spend less time composing than non- or low-apprehensive ones” (Abdel Latif, 2015), all which are now considered imperative to the writing process. In some cases, research has been inconclusive about whether FLWA has a negative effect on L2 success or whether the inverse is true, but in either case it has been established that the two have a negative correlation (Cheng et al, 1999; Di Loreto & McDonough, 2013).

In their study on various influences on foreign language achievement, Onwuegbuzie et al. (2000) surveyed 184 students of four different foreign languages in the U.S. For their study they used a combination of six scales, including the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI; Cheng, 2004), the FLCAS, and the Self-Perception Profile for College Students. The first two scales are widely used by researchers and have established reliability. Onwuegbuzie et al. also used the participants’ class scores (for all classes, not just the foreign language) in order

to measure achievement. The researchers used all possible scores multiple regression in order to determine the best combination of demographics, cognitive, affective, and personality variables to predict achievement. Of the variables that they tested, FLA and general academic achievement had the strongest correlations with foreign language achievement, at $-.40$ and $.50$, respectively. Together, general academic achievement and FLA had the most explanatory power, explaining 22% of the variance in foreign language achievement. While this study looked at general foreign language achievement and FLA, it has implications for FLWA as well; as a major component of language learning, it can be assumed that a student who experiences FLA will see similar effects on second language writing tasks, since those make up a portion of instruction and assessment in the foreign language and other classrooms.

Another factor that has a relationship with FLWA is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is sometimes referred to as self-confidence (Matsuda & Gobel, 2004), but in this case refers to a more specific reaction to a context (Habrat, 2013). Self-efficacy refers to a student's feeling of "confidence in one's ability to perform tasks required to cope with situations and achieve specific goals" (Sanders-Reio et al., 2014, p. 1) and as "the perception of abilities to perform actions at a particular level" (Woodrow, 2011, p. 512), which means that self-efficacy, like FLWA, is situation specific. Self-efficacy contrasts with the idea of self-concept, which is a term used to describe a student's identity that is stable across contexts (Habrat, 2013; Woodrow, 2011). Classroom transactions refer in this context to social exchanges that may be avoided due to FLWA (Cheng et al, 2000). While motivation, self-efficacy, and classroom interaction are all seen as positive affective factors that should be encouraged in the classroom in order to improve student achievement, FLWA has a negative correlation with these desirable traits (Sanders-Reio et al., 2014; Woodrow, 2011). Overall, research has shown that in addition to being a negative

emotional outcome, FLWA can have a negative effect on student writing and achievement.

Given the university context of this writing, students are investing much of their time and money into a situation that may be subtly preventing them from gaining success if causing their anxiety.

In their research on the relationship between self-efficacy, FLWA, and performance, Sanders-Reio et al. (2014) combined the Daly-Miller WAT and a previously-developed Writing Self-Efficacy Index and administered the survey to ESL undergraduates. They also had the participants complete an in-class, timed writing assignment to evaluate. They found that students who experienced more FLWA received lower grades, and those who had higher self-efficacy received higher grades. However, they did find that students with high self-efficacy were able to overcome the negative effects of FLWA. Three factors explained 15% of the variance in student performance, which were beliefs about writing, FLWA, and self-efficacy. While that is a relatively low amount of explanatory power, especially considering that these factors were combined, other studies have reinforced the importance of recognizing the influence of FLWA and self-efficacy in student achievement.

Woodrow (2011) also looked at individual (rather than contextual) factors in FLWA. She surveyed 738 EFL students in China, giving her a relatively large sample size compared to other studies on FLWA; other researchers had generally less than 200 participants. Her study looked at self-efficacy, anxiety, parental pressure, perceptions of effort, and actual effort. Woodrow looked at parental pressure because of the role and importance of English in this context as a lingua franca. In order to measure actual effort, the participants were asked to write a practice essay, which was assessed using the same rubric as a national writing exam. Woodrow found that writing anxiety strongly predicts low self-efficacy (-.71) and that self-efficacy predicts writing achievement (.43). Since self-efficacy has a positive relationship with achievement and a

negative relationship with FLWA, this study reinforces the importance of a student's belief in their competency of completing a writing task. However, Woodrow does state that there isn't a direct connection in this case between FLWA and achievement, but that self-efficacy has a mediating effect. The study also showed that students who experienced more FLWA studied less, perceived themselves as extending less effort, and experienced more parental pressure than the students with high self-efficacy. Woodrow emphasizes the importance of self-efficacy in language learning as having a positive or negative influence, depending on the student's experience, which in turn leads to questions of what teachers can keep in mind to improve self-efficacy and reduce FLWA.

Research on Causes of FLWA

As it has been shown that FLWA can have a negative effect on various aspects of students' achievement or factors in their achievement, it is important to understand some of the causes of FLWA. Several studies have been conducted in order to test the relationship between FLWA and specific causes, though few have looked at causes as an open-ended category. Among the possible causes of FLWA are the language teacher and their evaluation of the student's work, the reaction of peers, how the student interacts with the text via their process or affective reactions, the students' perceived competence, their achievement, gender, proficiency, effort, external pressure (e.g. from parents), and students' goals for achievement.

In his study of various causes of FLWA, Cheng (2002) surveyed 165 foreign language English majors using a survey modeled on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and a version of the Daly-Miller WAT modified for L2 writers. The reliability for this survey was between .86 and .95 depending on whether the items came from the FLCAS, the Daly-Miller WAT, or the researcher's own items. Cheng found that perceptions of writing

competence had the strongest explanatory power in FLWA (34%), more so than students' actual achievement (2%). Though Cheng did not state that perceived competence caused lower FLWA, there are still implications for instructors. He suggested that it is important that the student feel competent, though their achievement may not accurately reflect those perceptions. In the study, Cheng also found that, though it wasn't statistically significant, students experience more FLWA as their proficiency increases, which was contrary to previous studies. The final factors that cause FLWA that were discovered in this study were motivation and effort, which accounted for 11% and 10% of the variance.

While Cheng revealed some important causes of FLWA, there are larger contextual factors that can negatively affect an L2 student's writing experience. Abdel Latif (2015) found a combination of six factors, including perceived language competence, perceived writing competence, writing performance, language level, instructional practices, and fear of criticism. Using a combination of the Daly-Miller WAT, the SLWAI, and the Attitudes towards Writing Scale, Abdel Latif surveyed 57 English majors in Egypt, as well as had them complete a writing task, conducted interviews, and administered three proficiency assessments. The survey had a reliability of .86 and the writing tasks were modeled on TOEFL writing tasks. The results showed a moderate negative correlation between FLWA and language proficiency (-.58) and perceptions of proficiency tended to concern vocabulary more than grammar. In addition, performance on the writing tasks had a moderately negative correlation with FLWA (between -.309 and -.563 for various scores). Among the six previously-mentioned causes, participants also mentioned peer feedback, lack of adequate feedback, and excessive criticism from teachers. Those who had experienced positive peer feedback were less apprehensive, felt that more feedback would help them improve rather than create apprehension, and felt that over-criticism

of their writing made them want to avoid the task. All of these different factors in FLWA are a good starting point for the study of broader contextual causes of FLWA. However, this study was published recently (2015), meaning that these factors have not yet been explored in-depth, and there are few other studies that have looked at the context of language learning in the same way.

There are a few other examples of studies that look outside the student for causes of FLWA. In their study, Di Loreto and McDonough (2013) created an integrated writing exam and used items from the SLWAI and the FLCAS to examine the connection between instructor feedback and FLWA. In this case, the feedback was rather complex and had a few different forms: checkmarks next to satisfactory paragraphs, circling of errors discussed in class, coding of errors not discussed in class, and comments on the appropriateness and accuracy of content and organization. On the questionnaire, Cronbach's coefficient alpha on the items from the SLWAI was .52 for behavior-related items, which shows low reliability for those items, and .82 for all other items. Students reported that teacher feedback did not make them anxious, though they were concerned with understanding the prompt and the fact that the writing exam was high stakes; it helped determine whether or not they could graduate with English credits. Because there was little change in students' anxiety over the test-retest period, the researchers concluded that language learning anxiety is situation-specific. Overall, the researchers found that positive perception of feedback, that is seeing feedback as having a positive effect on their writing, resulted in less anxiety.

Another study looked more broadly at the causes of FLWA in foreign language students. In their survey of EFL students in Turkey, Kirmizi and Kirmizi (2015) used a combination of the SLWAI, a self-efficacy scale, and items designed to determine sources of FLWA. They

presented the reliability of two established surveys they used (the SLWAI and a self-efficacy scale), but they did not report the reliability for the scale that they developed themselves or for the items from the other instruments as used in their context. Explanation of the development and reliability of their own scale, designed to explore causes of FLWA in foreign language students, was also lacking. The causes of FLWA were not discussed in detail, and some of the items from that section were problematic or repetitive (e.g. “lack of sufficient English writing practice” and “insufficient writing practice” were considered as separate causes). Additionally, by limiting students to these responses there was no opportunity for them to explain causes that the researchers had not considered or did not find important.

Since most studies concentrate on the individual’s affective factors and reactions to second language writing as sources of FLWA, there is a lack of studies that have looked at the larger contextual influences. Though some studies look at the same factors in relation to FLWA, they don’t always attribute causation to one or the other. For example, both Sanders-Reio et al. (2014) and Abdel Latif (2015) looked at perceived competence or self-efficacy, but the difficulty in attributing a cause to FLWA means that the two studies discuss the factors affecting FLWA differently, as either a cause of FLWA or a factor that has some relationship with FLWA. The studies that exist have been conducted in the last five years, meaning that we are at the beginning of the research that focuses specifically on FLWA and the broader social and institutional context of second language writing. Given a topic as varied and complex as FLWA, it is difficult to assign causes that show a strong relationship; however, it is possible that other broader contextual causes have not yet been researched. In order to better understand that context, it is necessary to understand what other kind of forces may have an impact of the L2 writing student’s experience.

The Academic Discourse Community and Student Writing Identity

Most studies discussed thus far have had a focus on the individual student's experience rather than considering the contextual factors that may influence FLWA. In order to better understand the possible influence of factors outside of the individual, the context in which the students are writing must be better understood. Of the possible causes of anxiety, fear of negative evaluation is a contributing factor (Daly & Miller, 1975; Di Loreto & McDonough, 2013), meaning that instructors have a role to play in possibly increasing or ameliorating FLWA. One of the direct ways that instructors may influence a student's self-efficacy, achievement, and FLWA is through feedback on student writing. Much of the research on L2 writing has focused on the appropriateness of feedback and the form that it takes, such as underlining or correcting the error for the writer (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2007; Ferris et al, 2013; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Truscott, 1995). However, as Bruton (2009) says "[i]t is conceivable that the *climate*, either encouraging or discouraging, and the nature of the assessment systems within which the correction occurs [...] are more critical motivational factors than the correction per se" (p. 604). In focusing on error-correction in writing, researchers have largely isolated their focus to formal concerns, which also deviates from communicative approaches to language teaching (Bruton, 2009). Grammar-focused error correction is not always compatible with communicative approaches, and while research studies should have a narrow focus, the number of these studies suggests an overall preoccupation with grammatical correctness that forgets written works as a whole and the situations that contribute to its writing, as well as the emphasis on process-based writing instruction that is currently stressed in higher education in the U.S.

In order to broaden our focus to other aspects of L2 writing that may affect FLWA, other frameworks outside of SLA may be useful. Intercultural rhetoric is a term developed to account for and “understand the complexity of the writing process whose analysis should not be limited to texts and differences, but also consider the social practices around texts” (Vergara, 2011, p. 120). The perspective of intercultural rhetoric, which comes from rhetoric and composition studies as opposed to TESL or linguistics, allows educators and researchers to consider how their own attitudes, social, cultural, and institutional positions, and even teaching methodologies and approaches may prevent students from success. In other words, despite our best efforts there are still power dynamics at work in a classroom that may contribute to a student’s lack of self-efficacy or motivation and lead to an increase in FLWA, and these issues would benefit from a perspective that takes into account social practices in addition to the texts that students produce. To best understand the social forces at work a critical approach to examining students’ writing processes, including identity construction and avoidance behaviors, is necessary. This approach includes an understanding of the academic discourse community, how students see themselves as central to or marginalized in that community, and how that might manifest itself in their self-concept or writing identity.

The Academic Discourse Community

Discourse refers to “text, context, and social and ideological ways of being” (Tardy, 2015, p. 62); more importantly, it refers to a “way of projecting oneself as a certain kind of person performing a particular role within a specific social setting” (p. 64). A community may be held together by the practices and beliefs that unite its members, and certainly in universities and academia at large there are practices and beliefs that distinguish different disciplines from one another. The combination of these texts, ways of being, and beliefs in higher education are what

create the academic discourse community. Writing is one way that students participate in the academic discourse community.

When students enter a university in particular they must “appropriate [...] a specialized discourse, and they have to do this as though they were easily one or comfortable with their audience” (Bartholomae, 1985, p. 139). Learners must act as if they have “the privilege both of being inside an established and powerful discourse and of being granted a special right to speak” (p. 143). This is not necessarily unique to higher education, though there are pressures unique to this context, such as highly specialized and discipline-specific vocabulary and spoken and written genres that students are not exposed to beforehand. This means that when students enter a university, they have little to no exposure to or practice with reading or producing academic writing, scholarly articles, research proposals, and other forms of discourse that they will be required to know and produce. Bartholomae is speaking to the experience of all college students here rather than L2 learners, but there is no less pressure placed on them to take on this role because they are investing time, money, and effort in their success, along with the added pressure of FLWA.

Writing Identities

An important component of belonging to a discourse community is a writer’s identity. In their study on minority freshmen literacy and academic assimilation, White and Ali-Khan (2013) say that “language use is intrinsically tied to both social contexts [...] and to individual and cultural identity” (p. 25). While it was initially believed that identity was developed in adolescence and then remained relatively stable, more recent research has shown that it is actually “constructed and reconstructed based on what goes on within the [...] environment” (Ball & Ellis, 2008). Identity is not fixed but changes constantly, and as opposed to an internal

sense of self that may be relatively stable, identity is constantly influenced by social context, culture, and ideology (Huhtala & Lehti-Eklund, 2010; Young, 2015). Vergaro (2011) and Ivanič (1998) describe four types of identity related to the socio-cultural context of writing: autobiographical identity, discourse identity, self as author, and possibilities for self-hood. Of the four types of identities, possibilities for self-hood is the most relevant. Possibilities for self-hood refers to writers' construction of a discourse self that appears "within the range of possibilities supported by the socio-cultural and institutional context in which they are writing" (Vergaro, 2011, p. 119). In other words, what is important for this research is not how students' writing identities appear in the text, but how their writing identities, as constructed or limited by the context of the academic discourse community, may influence their FLWA and ultimately their achievement.

L2 writing research refers to students' self-perceptions and self-beliefs as *self-efficacy*, *self-concept*, or *self-esteem*, and each of these terms varies in the specificity of their situation (Evans, 2015; Habrat, 2013). Understanding how researchers define identity is helpful when discussing the topic with participants who are not accustomed to thinking consciously about the idea. Identity is also important in order to help educators understand how this positioning may influence students' affective factors, including FLWA. A useful way of thinking about self-esteem from a linguistics perspective is Habrat's (2013) description of the three levels: global, intermediate, and situational. Global self-esteem refers to a general sense of self and self-worth across contexts. Because the research for this thesis is situation-specific, the focus here is on intermediate and situational self-esteem; intermediate self-esteem is a student's evaluation of their self-worth and self-acceptance in certain contexts, such as a university, while situational self-esteem is dependent on a task. Combined, intermediate and situational self-esteem describe

the way a student feels about their competence and self-worth while writing in a university, which in turn reflects how they have constructed their writing identity in this context.

In this research the term *writing identity* will encompass several aspects of both linguistics and composition research; it can represent the current manifestation of an L2 writing students' self-esteem, their self-efficacy, and their idealized future selves in the context of writing in the academic discourse community. Their writing identity will specifically refer to how the student's self-esteem reveals their position and value within this discourse community. In part, this research is designed to examine what happens when, as Liu and Tannacito (2013) describe, L2 students' "historical and cultural practices and ideas encounter forces that can perpetuate or deny the way they chose to play out their identities when confronted with new literacy practices" (p. 356). For many students, it is possible that the identities that they wish to claim and the ones that they are assigned by others do not match or are in conflict.

The Academic Discourse Community, Writing Identity, and FLWA

Participation in the academic discourse community means that L2 writing students are not only being asked to produce a text, but that they are participating in a social interaction that is influenced by beliefs that have in turn produced a framework of what is and is not appropriate for that participation. In and of itself, this is not problematic. However, when examined in more detail it is possible that when students are not comfortable within the academic discourse community they experience a decrease in positive affective factors and an increase in negative affective factors results. Some research, discussed below, has looked at the interaction between identity and motivation, whose effects are then reflected in student behavior. As Bartholomae (1985) stated, students may choose majors, classes, and careers based on their comfort with writing. However, of more immediate concern is how L2 writers behave in writing-intensive

classrooms. Additionally, their behaviors and learning strategies may reveal how they cope with FLWA or the extent to which they experience the phenomenon. Taken together, writing identities, the academic discourse community, and FLWA each has an effect of the experience of L2 writers, though their effects on one another are not always apparent or predictable.

While research exists on L2 writers' participation and inclusion in discourse communities (Ferenz, 2005) and on FLWA separately, these are not considered together in the research. Instead, Ferenz (2005) discusses L2 writers and their social environment, which includes teachers, peers, and advisors. Via interviews and questionnaires, Ferenz explored 6 graduate students' academic literacy acquisition. Some participants stated that they learned the necessary literacy skills by reading discipline texts, not from instruction itself, while that same reading was not helpful to others. Additionally, others felt that their English writing improved because of feedback from their professors. This study ultimately found that participant goals for learning and their identity had an impact on the way that they approached writing. Specifically, participants who claimed an academic identity focused on language and organization, while those who were not academically oriented wrote in their L1 and then translated their writing. This example of the correlation between identity and behavior is informative because it shows that, whether participants have consciously considered their writing identity or not, it can have an effect on their behavior and their writing processes.

Identity research tends to take the form of case studies and other qualitative methods, and often describes identity in terms of how it affects behavior. In Cho's (2015) study on motivation and identity, self-concept was expanded to include past and future selves. Guided by the assumption that one's possible future self that will have the most effect on motivation, Cho divided participants into imagined successful and unsuccessful past and future selves. The

students' effort (energy and focus) and persistence (time on task) were observed in order to determine their motivation. Participants were given the chance to increase the amount of time spent revising their work, which showed persistence, while their effort (attention) was measured by a separate spelling error task. While Cho's initial hypothesis that successful future selves would have a positive effect on motivation was not supported (in contrast to the study it was based on), the participants who were asked to imagine a successful past self showed higher levels of effort and persistence, and therefore of motivation. Because his initial hypothesis was not supported, Cho (2015) suggests that a student's possible future self is more closely related to their past experiences.

Ivanič (1998) conducted case studies with 8 adult continuing education participants in their second year of university. She describes the possibilities for self-hood as the abstract possibilities available in a given context, while self-as-author is one of the manifestations of those possibilities. Self-as-author represents the writer's sense of their ability to write with authority. As an extension of their autobiographical self, it can reveal that they may or may not have achieved enough self-worth to claim authority while writing (p. 26). Her data included one essay, two discussions in which they explained their discourse choices for that essay and their past and current literacy practices, and interviews with the participants' writing tutors. One participant, Rachel, saw distinct differences in her current identity as a reader and the identity that she wanted to claim; she saw the pressure to close the gap as "disabling" (p. 128), and in writing her own essay Rachel moved between back and forth between several different subject positions, which she accepted or rejected to varying degrees. While this study will not look at the realizations of this authority in student writing itself, self-as-author can also be seen in how a

student positions themselves in a college writing class. In other words, it is a way of understanding how students reflect on themselves as writers.

If one's identity is determined and expressed as a "semiotic articulation of a person's evaluative stance toward interactions" (Huhtala & Lehti-Eklund, 2010, p. 275), it stands to reason that when one is less sure of their stance or position, their identity may also become uncertain. Identity is a personal and social construct and it is decided both internally by the writer and externally by others via their acceptance of a participant in a discourse community. In their study of 24 L2 students in Sweden, Huhtala and Lehti-Eklund (2010) used written narratives of students' university and language learning experiences to understand how they saw themselves as members of what they call an imagined community, or a community "where joint activity with other members is emphasized" (p. 278). Participants' expectations of linguistic and cultural assimilation were not met as quickly as they had hoped. Students who find themselves comfortable in the academic discourse community (due to being native speakers or other types of privilege) may have the advantage of demonstrating that they are familiar with knowledge that they actually do not have command of, purely because they are able to imitate the moves of that community (White & Ali-Khan, 2013). In a study by White and Ali-Khan (2013), case studies of students on academic probation showed that they lacked institutional literacy, which caused them to have problems with reading and creating texts. These students felt that they were not able to be successful because they needed skills that were not explicitly taught. Instead, they took writing prompts literally (producing a few phrases or one or two sentences for a short answer essay question), and found themselves failing. In this context those students who are able to imitate what is necessary are native speakers who have also grown up in an environment that has prepared them to fully engage in this discourse community on a formal level; in other words,

native speakers are centered rather than marginalized. L2 writing may be a place where learners are finding a “viable balance between their actual selves and their possible selves” (Huhtala & Lehti-Eklund, 2010, p. 274), though they may not be successful in that.

Influence of Academic Discourse Community and Writing Identity on FLWA

The L2 writing student’s success may be dependent on the learner, their self-efficacy and comfort in claiming a place and an identity within a discourse community, and the evaluation of instructors or peers who may dole out approval. The context of higher education can be high stakes; it is a place where students are investing much of their time and resources and where they know that assessment of their work is a major factor in their success. Case studies showed that students might feel that there are hidden rules to academic discourse that exist not only in the classroom, but outside of it as well (White & Ali-Khan, 2013). This may lead students to feel that they lack the literacy skills necessary to communicate inside the class, and classroom transactions are one of the key affective factors in their success (Habratt, 2013). While they are in an ESL or foreign language class the students are not in the minority as a student linguistically-speaking, but they are aware that outside of this context they are minorities because they are second language learners rather than native speakers, and this places them in an unsure position in the classroom. In a stark difference, “minority students’ [...] language practices, though legitimate, fluent, eloquent and vibrant in their home communities, are misplaced, frowned upon, silenced, and disempowered in the university setting” (White & Ali-Khan, 2013, p. 32). The ways that this may manifest itself depend on the student and their context, including institutional and social factors. These influences are what this current study is attempting to determine.

Rubin (1995) describes writing and identity as working together to create one another; “written language both reflects the writer’s identity, and the same time creates that identity” (p.

3). While the social practices influencing an L2 writer's identity construction include providing feedback on writing, the text does not exist in isolation. The construction of a writer's identity is not isolated to their writing process or the words that appear on the page, but is also connected to the reader, in this case instructors and peers. Readers who know or who are told that a writer is non-native are more likely to find error, and writing done by those who are perceived to be from a marginalized social group tends to be seen as non-standard (whether or not it is true that the writer is from a marginalized group) (Rubin, 1995). This is one way that FLWA and writing identity are connected; one reason for FLWA is possible negative evaluation, and an L2 writer's status as a linguistic minority tends to lead to negative evaluation about the writer's *social* identity.

Many instructors who have never done any sort of foreign language or linguistic study hold the pervasive attitude or belief in a correct or proper language that in effect privileges certain linguistic groups to the detriment of others (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009). In the case of this research all instructors have either a TESOL or foreign language background, which would presumably but not necessarily negate this possibility; however, academic writing is not confined to these particular writing-focused courses. Gitlin et al (2013) discuss the difference between discourse marginalization and structural marginalization as the difference between ways of speaking and ways of organizing. In other words, discourse marginalization may take place when a student is not recognized to have different instructional needs, or when their language use is viewed as a problem or obstacle in a mainstream classroom. It is possible in the context of this research that students experience marginalization at both the discourse and institutional level, but the focus of this research will be on the level of discourse.

Liu and Tannacito (2013) argue that language learners “invest in the target language in order to obtain symbolic and material resources that will raise the value of their cultural capital” (p. 358), though they found in their case studies that “the prestige of English is often interrelated to habitual racial prejudices” (p. 366). In these case studies, Taiwanese EFL students recognized the social, economic, and cultural advantages that would be afforded them as English speakers, but their concept of “English speaker” privileged American accents and American styles of writing over the accents of their non-native EFL teachers (p. 362). Participants in their study went as far as to construct themselves as inferior and ultimately reinforced unequal power relations between themselves, their instructors, peers, and native speakers. If students in other contexts are similarly constructing a writing identity that creates or confirms marginalization or inferiority, they may also experience a heightening of negative affective factors, including FLWA.

College systems are seeing an increase in students who are writing in a non-native language while participating in mainstream courses, taught oftentimes by teachers who have no background in second language acquisition or second language pedagogy. There are some arguments that, given its status as a lingua franca and its prestige status (Liu & Tannacito 2013; Woodrow, 2011), English should be treated differently from other foreign languages. However, in both of these cases (second and foreign language contexts) it is assumed that the student has achieved a level of competency within academic discourse. Teacher attitudes towards multilingual writers may vary. In some cases, they may embrace L2 writers as highly motivated, refer the students to outside tutors, or even question the admissions and placement process itself (Matsuda, Saenkhum, & Accardi, 2013). In the case of instructors who question placement processes, there is the assumption that the student’s deficiencies are not being caught by a failing

placement system. Contrary to this negative perspective, Ferris (2007) outlines many important considerations for ESL-trained teachers to keep in mind while teaching writing, such as realizing that they should not be striving for an "ideal" text, varying the types of feedback provided to students, and finding a balance between intervention and appropriation. However, while this advice would be helpful in combatting instruction that focuses on local issues or errors in L2 writing, this advice is targeted towards ESL-trained instructors, and it is doubtful that it would be more widely disseminated to mainstream instructors. Additionally, it does not take into account the social, political, and institutional forces that may influence negative affective factors.

When we combine this highly-regulated discourse community of academic writing and the fact that students' negative self-perceptions of writing ability tend to be self-fulfilling (Onwueguzie, 1999), L2 writing students are put in a position to struggle and possibly fail. Motivation and affect are two of the largest predictors of writers' success (Abdel Latif, 2015), and motivation tends to decrease as negative affective factors (such as FLWA) increase (Daly & Miller, 1975). Courses like first-year composition (IE CO150) or foreign language reading and writing for communication (IE LFRE300) are intended to prepare students for larger writing tasks in higher-level courses in the university. As such they have implications beyond the semester that they are taken, and even beyond the departments to which they belong. Due to their roles in preparing students for further study, it is important to understand how those courses might play a role in setting students up for success or failure. However, L2 students may experience these courses differently, depending on if they are foreign language or second language contexts; it stands to reason that a student who experiences linguistic or discourse alienation outside of the classroom as well (i.e. in a second language context) would experience more FLWA. This is because not only is that student in an unfamiliar situation in the language

class, but in all of their other classes and social situations as well. The broader learning context is an important part of this study, and so the experiences of foreign language learners and second language learners will be separated for comparison to see if there is a difference that may be caused by those different contexts.

Research on identity in composition tends to occur when there is something “other” about the participants; a quick search through a database or looking at the index of an edited book (i.e. Rubin, 1995) reveals that identity is an issue particularly for second language learners and women; this would imply that native speakers and other “centralized” populations either don’t need to consider their identity. This also means that it is difficult to combine the experiences of L2 writers and native-speaking writers, or to combine writing apprehension with writing identity as experienced by a broader population. Tying together each of these disparate threads of research is an attempt at discovering if they have an effect on each other, and if so to what degree. Given the widespread research on the various affective factors that make up FLWA it is clearly a concern to many researchers and educators. Connecting FLWA with other broader social and institutional causes will hopefully begin researchers down a path that will help them, teachers, and students to avoiding or preventing this negative influence on L2 learning and writing.

Research questions and hypotheses

This study seeks to answer three questions related to L2 writing in the context of higher education:

1. What are some of the possible causes of foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA)?
2. What is the extent and nature of the difference in how second and foreign language writers experience FLWA and writing identities?

3. To what extent, if any, does the comfort that L2 writers feel in claiming a writing identity (FLWA)?

Because the first research question may have many possible answers, the hypotheses are limited to the following, related to research questions 2 and 3:

1. Participants who are writing in a second language context as opposed to a foreign language context will experience a higher level of FLWA.
2. Participants who display a higher level of writing apprehension will be less likely to claim a strong or well-defined writing identity.

Both of these hypotheses are based on the assumption that students who do not feel like comfortable and full participants of the academic discourse community will experience higher levels of FLWA. The first hypothesis works under the assumption that students in a second language context will have difficulty because they are both new to the academic discourse community, as well as non-native speakers. This may lead to a lack of a writing identity, which in turn could lead to FLWA. The second hypothesis works under the assumption that lack of membership leads to a lack of a writing identity.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

In order to answer the research questions, this study utilized a phenomenological approach to describe the lived experiences that L2 writing students may have had with FLWA, which can include but is not limited to the writing course they were enrolled in before or at the time of the study. This research looked at the experiences of L2 writers in a university context in order to achieve the underlying purpose: to better understand and then counteract the possible practices, attitudes, or expectations of L2 students (whether internally or externally driven) in a university that might cause FLWA. While there are many possible perspectives and stakeholders to consider in this research, such instructors, program administrators, and curriculum developers, this study focused on the perceptions and experiences of the students as a starting point because they are the ones who experience this phenomenon first-hand.

Participants

A total of 49 L2 writing students participated in this study. Table 1 describes the numbers of students and the time they had spent studying the language. Participants for the study were recruited from international sections of CO150 (First-Year Composition), a second language learning context, and a third-year foreign language writing course, LFRE300 (Reading and Writing for Communication – French), a foreign language learning context.

Table 1

Participants

		CO150 (second language context)	LFRE300 (foreign language context)
Total participants		34	15
<u>Length of study</u>	Less than four years	16	13
	Four or more years	18	2

In both courses a main goal is to prepare students for further writing tasks in the target language in the university. All participants were enrolled in a medium-sized university in the West and were taking a course during which they must write in a language that is not native to them. The students studying English are doing so in a second language context, while those studying French are doing so in a foreign language context. While the survey did not explicitly ask participants for their L1, responses to open-ended questions indicated that their native languages included English, Arabic, Chinese, Malayalam, and Portuguese. No other identifying information was collected from participants in the survey. More information was gathered from the interview participants (who had previously completed the survey), which is detailed in Table 2.

Table 2

<i>Interview participants</i>								
Participant	Fen	Bo	Sara	Alim	Mei	Chunhua	Emma	Scott
L1	Chinese	Chinese	Malayalam	Arabic	Chinese	Chinese	English	Portuguese
Learning context	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL	ESL	FL	ESL & FL
Length of study	4 years	6+ years	10+ years	10+ years	6+ years	4 years	5 years	English: 6+ years; French: 5 years

Note. Length of study is reported in congruence with the survey question that included categories of 1-3 years, 4-6 years, and over 6 years; more specific information is given when possible.

Research Design

This project used a mixed-methods approach that included surveys and individual interviews in order to synthesize qualitative and quantitative results. The synthesis and analysis of mixed-methods data collection may be troublesome when the epistemologies seem incompatible (Kavanagh, Campbell, Harden, & Thomas, 2012), but individually qualitative and quantitative methods have their own strengths. The triangulation of data becomes possible in mixed-methods research because it is possible to confirm findings, find contradictions and gaps,

and use the findings of each method to complement each other (Calfee & Sperling, 2010; Kavanagh et al, 2012). The use of these two methods allows for a global picture of L2 writing at the university where this research was conducted, as well as more individualized responses from L2 writing students. Each of these methods serves to answer different research questions that could not be answered by one method alone. For example, understanding the level of FLWA experienced at this university can be done through qualitative methods, while discovering the sources of FLWA is best done quantitatively. This is also reflected in the literature review; studies on FLWA tend to use quantitative methods (e.g. surveys), while studies on identity tend to use qualitative methods (e.g. interviews and case studies).

Instruments

Survey

A survey was created in order to collect quantitative data and to help in understanding the writing experience of students at CSU. The majority of the survey used was based on the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) developed by Cheng (2004). The SLWAI was originally based on other tests, such as the Daly-Miller Writing Anxiety Test (1975), that looked at native-speaker writing anxiety and communication apprehension. The SLWAI was then modified for non-native writers (Cheng, 2004). Cheng (2004) organized his survey items based on four categories: reasons, situations, somatic anxiety, and writing processes. Cronbach's alpha for the original survey, which included 21 items, was .91, and the test-retest reliability was .85. Cheng found three subscales via a factor analysis that measured somatic and cognitive anxiety and avoidance behavior. Together these subscales have a stronger reliability, while separately they were .82, .81, and .83, respectively. Several other studies have used the SLWAI or certain of its items, including Abdel Latif (2015), Di Loreto & McDonough (2013), and Kirmizi &

Kirmizi (2015), while retaining high reliability. Cheng also compared the SLWAI to 10 other scales measuring various types of anxiety and found that it did differentiate between different kinds of language and writing anxiety, which established its construct validity.

In order to adapt the SLWAI for the purposes of this research, the categories that Cheng used to measure anxiety were differentiated. The research questions for this study asked for causes of FLWA and any relationship between FLWA and identity, while the SLWAI had a broader focus. The questions from the SLWAI that are pertinent to this research and that were included in this study are those developed in relation to reasons for FLWA and the writing situations that cause students FLWA. The questions that were developed to test somatic anxiety and the effects of the anxiety on their writing processes were excluded because somatic anxiety and writing processes are not relevant to why a student experiences FLWA. On the other hand, questions that ask the participants about reasons for their FLWA or situations in which they experience more FLWA can help to understand causes. The latter two categories (somatic anxiety and writing processes) give specific information that is not relevant to writing identity and the social, political, and institutional contexts that take precedence from the perspective of intercultural rhetoric. Additionally, questions that specify the effects of time constraint were modified to be more broadly applicable because time-constrained writing is rarely a feature of assignments in the classes these students were recruited from.

Questions relating to writing identity were created for this survey in order to determine how students felt about claiming a writing identity, whether that identity changed between their L1 and L2, and to elicit open-ended reflection on the topic. All questions are on a Likert scale between 1 and 6 from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, with the exception of two open-ended questions relating to writing identity and one yes/no question relating to writing identity

differences between L1 and L2. On the original SLWAI the items were on a 1-5 scale, but a 1-6 scale helps to avoid ambivalent answers. Two versions of the survey were created, one survey asking students about English writing and the other survey asking students about foreign language writing. Initially, there were other foreign languages involved in the study but they ended up unable to participate. The modified versions of the surveys can be found in Appendices A (for CO150) and B (for LFRE300).

After modifying the original SLWAI survey questions and adding additional questions relevant to this research, the questions were re-categorized in order to be measured for the purposes of my research questions. The survey questions fall under three categories: writing identity, behavior (or situation), and FLWA. The table of specifications can be found in Appendix C. Writing identity questions gauged whether participants had a strongly held writing identity and how they might describe their writing identity in one language compared to another. These questions were used to determine the relationship between FLWA and identity. Items measuring behavior determined whether students avoided or sought out opportunities to write in the language being learned, which may indicate an effect on their L2 university writing experience and academic achievement. The behavior category also mirrors Cheng's (2004) situation category in that it can help researchers to understand when students may feel more or less anxious about their writing (e.g. when they have to share their writing with peers).

Lastly, FLWA questions fell into two further categories, social and individual. These differences are also indicated in Appendix C. These questions measured affect in relation to whether the particular situation occurred when the participant was writing (individual) or when they were sharing their writing with an instructor or with peers (social). While measuring FLWA in a broader sense, these two affective situations also serve to distinguish whether or not a

participant was more likely to feel FLWA when they are actively participating in the academic discourse community (social) or if their FLWA occurs independent of that context (individual). Items that covered FLWA were further split into two categories: negative and positive affect. Negative affect includes FLWA, while the positive affect questions showed a possible lack of FLWA, or possibly the presence of self-efficacy or self-confidence depending on how strongly participants responded. An example of a positive social affect question is item 9, “I don’t worry that at all that my English compositions are a lot worse than others”, while an example of a positive individual affect question is item 7, “while writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly”.

Interviews

In order to fully understand how students experience and comprehend their own writing identities, it is necessary to have an open dialogue with the students where their responses can be explored in more detail, giving qualitative responses. Using Creswell’s (2013) procedures for phenomenological studies, two initial survey questions were developed to provide a “textual and structural description of the experiences” (p. 81), as well as to explain participants’ common experiences. The interviews were semi-structured, and initial questions were relatively open-ended to get a sense of the participant’s background and experience, and gradually asked why the participant felt a particular way in different situations. Students may not have consciously considered the sources of their own writing identities or apprehension, so questions being too specific or narrowly focused may be misunderstood or at least not well understood.

For the purposes of this research and because my subject is individual rather than institutional, the questions focused on the participant’s experience of writing, before and during university, their concept of writing identity (including their own and its importance), and what

they believe some of the causes of their possible FLWA consist of. Though students' self-assessed level of apprehension being determined beforehand via the survey, the interview focused on both all three of the main factors discussed in the research: identity, FLWA, and behavior or situation. Regarding identity, the interviews focused on a discussion of how the students see their writing identity, and whether they feel that their identity differs from their L1 experience to their current L2 university experience. In particular, the interviews focused on gaining in-depth responses and understanding of survey questions numbers 2, 3, 22, 23, and 23a, or the questions that are related to writing identity. In addition to these questions regarding identity, questions asking the participants about their experience with FLWA were developed in order to understand the source of these possibly negative experiences. From these two main lines of questioning, participants naturally responded in ways that gave information about their behavior, including writing processes and avoidance. The complete interview protocol can be found in Appendix D.

Procedures

Five instructors of seven L2 writing courses were contacted for this study, for a total of 168 potential participants; the requirements for participation meant that a larger pool of participants was not possible. Classroom presentations were given to four of the five classes involved in order to inform potential participants about the goals of the research, its importance, why they were being asked to participate, procedures of the research, and to answer any questions they may have had before participating.

Surveys

The survey was created on surveymonkey.com and was sent to participants via emails provided by the instructors or through the learning management system Canvas. After reading

the consent form the survey was available to participants, and responses were periodically checked to find participants who had indicated willingness to participate in the interview. Participants were able to complete the survey on their own time, but they were asked to complete it within one week of distribution. The survey took participants approximately 10 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey students were invited to share their contact information if they were interested in being interviewed. If students did not agree to an interview, no identifiable information was collected from them.

Interviews

After the survey was completed, interviews with 6 students in first-year college composition and 2 students in the third-year foreign language course were conducted. Table 2 includes more detailed information about the interview participants. Participants who consented to be interviewed were met for a 30-minute session on campus. Their responses were recorded electronically and the recordings were transcribed using pseudonyms. During the interview participants were asked a series of open-ended questions. After participants responded to these initial questions, follow-up questions were asked in order to clarify or expand upon their responses. The questions were used to gauge a student's familiarity with the concept of writing identities, as well as to gauge their level of comfort with their own writing identity in English/a foreign language, as compared to their native language.

Analysis of data

Quantitative analysis

After survey data was collected a comparison was made between students' level of FLWA and willingness to claim a writing identity between ESL and foreign language students. Dependent variables include the level of writing apprehension (negative affect), level of writing

confidence (positive affect), and willingness to claim a writing identity. Independent variables include whether the student is in a foreign language or second language environment. Means and standard deviations for each item determined the level of writing apprehension that each group experiences, as well as indicated the participants' willingness to claim a writing identity. Different comparisons between the means were made in order to answer the research questions in the following ways:

- Research question 2:
 - Identity and FLWA, focusing on negative affect items between groups
 - Behavior or writing situation and FLWA between groups
- Research question 3:
 - The level of FLWA between the two groups (second and foreign language learners)
 - Willingness to claim an identity between groups
 - Behavior or writing situation and FLWA between groups

Qualitative analysis

The analysis of qualitative data, including open-ended survey questions and interviews, was conducted using guidelines from Creswell (2013). This structure is as follows:

- 1) Highlight “significant statements” that provide understanding of how participants experienced the phenomenon.
- 2) Write a description of what the participants experienced, context (structural description)
- 3) Write composite description of the phenomenon, the “essential, invariant structure”.

Transcription of the interviews followed Davidson (2009). Davidson describes transcription as theoretical, representational, selective, and interpretive; in other words, it is a practice grounded in theory in which the transcriber makes choices about what to include and how to do so that may ultimately have an effect on a reader's interpretation of the data. In order to minimize the effect of possible political bias or reader misinterpretation, participants' responses were transcribed verbatim so that all relevant information was readily available. The researcher's questions and input were kept to a minimum and only included in transcription in order to provide context for a response. The questions that led to a particular answer were numbered in the transcript based on the interview protocol (Appendix D) to keep the focus on the participant. However, questions that deviated from the script were transcribed in full. Non-verbal cues were not transcribed, and grammatical errors were kept intact. While Davidson (2009) describes selectivity as an important part of transcription, the interviews were not so long that it became necessary to eliminate details that, while initially seem unimportant, may become relevant.

Both the commonalities and the differences in participant's experiences were noted to compare and contrast the possible sources of these similar or differing experiences. In order to codify the qualitative responses, they were read to find common or unifying themes, those themes were established across responses, and then responses were reread in order to apply the coding. For both surveys and interviews, participants' responses were coded in order to determine the common themes and to discover the time spent discussing five categories. These categories were determined according to the framework in which the participant placed their language use and identity at the time: *social*, *cultural*, *self*, *affect*, and *rhetoric*. *Affect* reveals any discussion of emotional reactions to writing, *self* refers to any time the student discusses their writing identity, *social* refers to students' discussion of teachers' or peers' interaction with their

writing, *cultural* compares the students' L1 with second language writing, and *rhetoric* refers to either writing processes or formal concerns, such as citation or organization. Examples of each of these categories follow:

- *Social context*, in which the participant is conscious of how their writing is perceived: e.g. "I don't want the professor to see the paper and she can recognize it is from [an] international student" (Fen)
- *Cultural context*, in which the participant is aware of how the culture of their L1 may affect their writing identity or FLWA: e.g. "English readers are usually more sensitive and prone to being offended by something than Arabic" (Alim)
- *Self*, (including self-evaluation, literacy, and identity): e.g. "straight-forward" (Sara)
- *Affective reactions*: e.g. "nervous" (Emma)
- *Rhetorical concerns*, which includes form, genre, and writing process; e.g. "I have to think about my grammar, or spell, or organization" (Bo)

The categorization of these responses is mirrored in the coding of the open-ended survey responses and interviews, though some categories were more productive for certain questions, participants, or groups. The same categories were used for all of the qualitative data collected, be that surveys or interviews, in order to facilitate comparison and contrast between the qualitative and quantitative data and to make connections between the two methods of data collection. After all of the data was collected and organized according to the various categories or contexts that it helped to explain, it was then collected according to how it answered the research questions.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results from each type of data collection can help to answer more than one research question, so those results and their implications will be presented according to the research questions and hypotheses. Qualitative data collected includes interview responses and open-ended questions. The qualitative data that was gathered was designed to answer research questions one (“what are some of the possible causes of FLWA?”) and two (“what is the extent and nature of the difference in how second and foreign language writers experience FLWA and writing identities?”). The responses also had implications for research question three (“to what extent, if any, does the comfort that L2 writers feel in claiming a writing identity correlate with foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA)”? Quantitative data included Likert-scale survey items and was designed to answer research questions two and three.

The quantitative data, as discussed previously, included 49 survey responses, 34 from second language (SL) students and 15 from foreign language (FL) students. Due to time constraints the survey was not piloted, and Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was .53. Di Loreto & McDonough (2013) found a reliability of .52 for their behavior items coming from the SLWAI, but in this survey the behavior items were a combination of Cheng’s (2004) behavior and situation items, for which he found a .82 and .83, respectively. In this case the survey performed with a lower reliability than other uses of the same items. The possible reasons for and implications of this low reliability will be discussed in the limitations.

The qualitative data was collected in two ways: via the open-ended survey questions, and the individual interviews. The first open-ended question on the survey was required and received 49 responses, while the second question open-ended question was optional and received 27

responses. Twenty-eight participants indicated that their writing identity is different in their native language, while 21 indicated that it is not. The responses to all open-ended questions can be found in Appendix E.

The second set of qualitative responses came from interviews. A total of 8 interviews were conducted in order to understand causes of FLWA from the students' perspective, as well as to understand the ways they considered their writing identities. The interview participants' information is summarized in Table 2. Each interview was coded according to identity or affect, using the same categories as the open-ended survey questions, and those responses contributed to answering all of the research questions.

Sources of FLWA

The first research question was open-ended and asked for sources of FLWA. The data gathered to answer this question included the interviews and open-ended survey results. During the interviews participants were asked what they felt when writing for college, why they felt that way, and were also asked to compare that experience to writing for personal reasons. Interview responses to writing varied from having moved past the point of writing anxiety (Scott and Emma), to feeling afraid to even ask for help (Sara and Mei). Sources of FLWA could potentially be external (peers, instructors, or the wider academic discourse community) or internal (e.g. goals or expectations for personal achievement). In comparing the two groups, FLWA was higher in foreign language students on the quantitative survey results, equal to the second language students in the qualitative survey results, and lower than the second language students during interviews. It is possible that, given a more equal number of participants in each group these comparisons would change and the differences would be more or less marked. It is also possible that these two groups consider the tasks differently; whereas Scott wanted to prove

himself to his teacher, Fen did as well, but for different reasons. Fen wanted to be sure that her writing did not mark her as a non-native writer, and Scott wanted to prove that he knew the rules. Being marked as a non-native writer, for Fen and Sara, was a disadvantage.

The open-ended survey questions asked the participants about their writing identities, but their responses did imply some causes of FLWA. On these questions (available in Appendix E), foreign language students tended to describe their affective reactions as related to grammar; responses included “grammar is difficult and confusing”, descriptions of over-thinking resulting in mistakes, lack of confidence, and a frustration at a lack of vocabulary. The uniformity of these responses leads to the conclusion that the language itself is what causes much of foreign language students’ FLWA. In contrast, second language students described their identity in terms of rhetorical categories like organization and process. The responses to the surveys and interviews gave several possible causes of FLWA, including being afraid to make mistakes, not wanting to be judged negatively by either the teacher or peers, being unfamiliar with the genre or requirements of an assignment, worry about being accused of plagiarism, concern for the effect they are having on their audience (including using offensive or incorrect phrases), and a lack of interest in either the task or the topic of the text. Among all of these causes, how the student is being perceived by the reader, genre conventions, and assignment requirements were the most frequent concerns.

Audience: Peers and Teachers

On the surveys, participants showed a difference in their FLWA when an audience comes into the picture. Participants in both groups had higher FLWA when the social affect question was about their work being evaluated by a teacher; for question 10, “If my foreign language composition is to be evaluated, I worry about getting a very poor grade” the means for second

language (SL) and foreign language (FL) participants were 4.12 and 4.60 out of 6, respectively. When the question was about the peer as audience there was less concern. For example, question 15, “I’m afraid that the other students would make fun of my English composition if they read it” had means of 2.65 and 2.27 for second language and foreign language participants, respectively. This supports findings of other research that FLWA can be caused by fear of evaluation (e.g. Cheng, 2002; Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015). Their teachers have a combined effect in that they provide evaluation, and interview participants Scott, Fen, and Chunhua treated their teachers as someone they needed to prove themselves to.

Overall, peers do not seem to be a large factor in the way that L2 writers react to writing. However, one interview participant described a peer group influence that was unique to her situation. Sara described a peer group that consisted of the community of Indian students on campus. She said that they ask each other about their GPAs and use that to decide whether the other person is good enough to talk to. She takes this situation for granted, and said that they can be really hard on each other but that it is a good community that generally provides her with support. She believes this kind of community could be helpful for other international students, so that they can “connect with their own kind”. Sara described other students who don’t have this kind of community as being “really scared to talk” because “they don’t want to be corrected or judged, like ‘oh, they are not saying that right’”.

Different interview participants saw their audience in different ways, though they were all conscious of the different ways their audience might interpret their writing. Chunhua is concerned about the effect she has on her audience because of her grammar mistakes and the sense that what she is writing is not adequately expressing her feelings and what she means. She avoids sharing her own experience in her writing because she is worried that she will use

informal or incorrect words, and she is also concerned that people will feel attacked after reading her writing. Her audience is a vague presence (are they the author she is responding to, the author whose work she is using, a reader she might offend?), but has a clear influence on how she feels about writing. According to Chunhua, English writing tends to have less consideration of the feelings of the reader, which is tied in to her desire to avoid argument.

In addition to being concerned about teacher evaluation, Chunhua is also aware of her effect on peer audiences. Though she said that she has less confidence to post on Facebook because she doesn't want friends to see "these weird expressions", she stated moments later in the interview that she doesn't care what others think of her writing. While she feels upset if a teacher sends her article back to her and there are many grammar mistakes, it is because she feels upset for herself, that "I don't do well, I think I can do better, but I try to avoid because I don't want to make myself sad". Though she seems to value the opinions of peers more than teachers, the largest amount of pressure seems to be self-inflicted. Rather than understanding that her ability to recognize previous mistakes is a sign of progress, it reduces her current self-confidence. In this case, the audience that Chunhua is writing to serves to remind her of the ways in which she is not performing the way she wants to.

Scott's experience with writing was determined by others in a few ways. Scott, like Emma, Chunhua, Sara, and Bo, was conscious of the effect his writing would have on his audience in terms of evaluation. His writing in French might be determined by how he expected his teacher to react to his use of a certain grammatical structure or vocabulary word, but with friends he says that he knows they "aren't going to judge me if I don't use rhetorical devices [and] you can just do your own thing". He said that the difference is related to the pressure he had described earlier. Though Chunhua had described herself as still being nervous to post on

Facebook because she was worried her American friends would judge her language use, Scott's experience is that this is not something to worry about. Scott also takes cues from his friends whose writing he describes as "singing". Overall, the two biggest influences on Scott's L2 writing are his proficiency in the language and others' reactions to it.

When discussing writing Emma had two main concerns in mind: form and purpose. Both of these were important in relation to other people. Regarding form, her grammar ceased to cause her anxiety when she knew that her reader recognized her level; at a lower level she knew that a teacher would recognize that she would make mistakes and have a limited vocabulary. Her purpose for writing was also tied to how it could help her communicate with others. Though she had a low level of anxiety that was not long-term, the way that she described her few experiences with FLWA align with others who are concerned about the impression they are giving the reader.

Chunhua seems to have difficulty in accepting some of the genre conventions that she has encountered in the U.S., specifically in regards to how writers respond to each other. She said that in China, rather than confronting an incorrect idea or conclusion, they will say, "you have some good ways to describe something, but maybe others will agree with my opinion". She described Americans as approaching the same situation with a confrontational strategy, such as "this part you say is not good, it is incorrect because..." and then they give examples. The hedging that is present in Chinese writing as Chunhua has experienced it provides the writer with other authors to support them, while American writers do not seek the same support.

Lack of Familiarity with Genres or Requirements

The ESL participants in this study were much more aware of genre, citation, organization, and other expectations of academic writing. As previously stated, the purpose of CO150 as a core university course is to ensure that students are prepared for academic writing.

The foreign language learners' rhetorical vocabulary was limited to conventions, and they used the words *grammar* and *vocabulary*. The open-ended questions asked participants to describe their writing identities, but ESL participants used words like *ethos*, *pathos*, *logos*, *parallelism*, *organization*, *passive voice*, *metaphor*, and *imagery* to answer this question. The ESL students' current enrollment in CO150 is one possible reason that they are concerned with form, purpose, audience, and other rhetorical concerns; one of the objectives of the course is for students to become familiar with and be able to use audience, purpose, and context to help them with different writing situations. Because most students must take CO150 the foreign language participants were probably familiar with the same vocabulary, but don't place as much importance on it because they are already more familiar with this academic discourse community, and are likely not currently enrolled in CO150. In my experience, some students coming into CO150 from an American high school might be familiar with features of rhetoric, logos, ethos, and pathos, as well as citation conventions before coming to college, but given that it has probably been some time since they have used those terms in a class, they weren't thinking about writing in those terms when answering the questions about their writing identity.

An incident in her first semester caused Sara (ESL) to have some of the negative reactions to writing that she still experiences. She was required to write a lab report and she described herself as being "really frightened" because she "had no idea what a lab report really was". She said that they "gave us a sample lab report but it didn't really make sense to [her] because [she] couldn't relate it with [her] topic". Overall, Sara seemed to be very sure of herself and the way she writes (even if it isn't her favorite task) until confronted with an unfamiliar writing situation. Her experience with the lab report marked a moment when she wasn't sure how to meet the requirements of the assignment, even with a model. In this case, it seems that

models of assignments can be problematic because instructors assume that a student will be able to look past the topic and understand the rhetorical moves that a writer is making, the kind of information that is being presented and the way that is organized; however, when they come from different writing backgrounds, this might not always be the case.

Alim and Mei's (both ESL) early college experience in plant sciences was similar to Sara's; none of them knew what was expected of them in genre of a lab report, how to find scholarly sources, or how to use and cite them correctly. Mei didn't know how to find scholarly sources and she did not go out of her way to find help, so she turned the assignment in late, failed it, and ended up doing poorly in the class. Not knowing the conventions of a genre, the methods for finding material, or the requirements of an assignment continue to be a problem for Mei. In her current class they are given a lot of instruction about how to write a paper, but after reading through all of it, she still doesn't understand what is required of her. She also has difficulty understanding the instructor while in class. Alim had to write a lab report and describes that experience as frustrating because the TA "assumes that students know how to write a lab report even though it is a first level biology lab". He said that he will have to look up the structure, and that it will be a challenge because of the changes between languages, and that he doesn't know "how English is structured in every certain genre".

Plagiarism

Tied in with being unsure of how to find and use scholarly sources is a fear of being accused of plagiarism. The lab report required finding scholarly articles, which Sara didn't know how to find, and so she and a friend worked together to find sources. She and her friend were accused of plagiarism, which caused her to have panic attacks because she was worried she was going to get kicked out. She describes the transition from high school to college in terms of how

much she used to like writing, compared to her change of heart now, which is mainly due to not understanding assignments and trying to avoid plagiarism. Alim stated that he is nervous “about the whole plagiarism thing”, but usually he feels “ok”. Part of the reason he is not too worried is because in his CO150 class he knows that his instructor “is going to be understanding and point [plagiarism] out and not make a big deal of it because she knows that this is new to me”. Overall Alim didn’t experience as much FLWA as some of the other second language interview participants, but citation and plagiarism was the one area that made him uncertain. The FL students didn’t mention citation during their interviews, but this could be because they attended high school in the U.S. and began learning about it earlier than the SL participants.

Student Interest

Some of the responses to FLWA indicated that it wasn’t writing in a second language that caused students difficulty, but the task of writing itself. Many of them described writing as “boring” (Fen), “not getting any fun out of it” (Bo), and the majority of the interviewees described enjoying writing when they get the chance to choose their topic or when the writing is less structured and more creative. While these responses didn’t directly answer the research question as it relates to causes of FLWA (as opposed to apprehension about writing in general), they are still useful considerations for instructors when they create writing tasks. Each of the interview participants seemed much more willing to extend the effort necessary to complete a task when they were interested in the task, and effort has been shown to have a positive relationship with motivation (Cho, 2015), as well as a positive relationship with self-efficacy and a negative relationship with FLWA (Woodrow, 2011).

Behavior and situation

Since FLWA is situation specific, it is important to understand the contexts it might be more likely to occur in. While L2 academic writing is a good start to narrowing our focus to a particular situation, if instructors understand what aspects of the process are causing more FLWA, they might be able to make a positive change. Certain questions on the survey were retained from Cheng (2004) in order to understand how students might react in different situations, as it relates to FLWA. Survey results and interview responses both indicated that students, whether they feel a significant amount of anxiety or not, were willing to write in their L2. The means and standard deviations were again calculated and collected in Table 3, where the questions are organized to reflect willing participation in writing tasks or avoidance behaviors.

Table 3

Survey results - behavior

Question	Second Language		Foreign Language	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q6: BE +	3.88	1.47	2.73	1.28
Q21: BE +	3.62	1.37	2.47	0.74
Q8: BE -	2.79	1.37	3.13	1.19
Q11: BE -	2.94	1.37	3.13	1.51
Q12: BE -	2.97	1.31	3.27	1.39
Q16: BE -	2.76	1.13	2.07	1.03

Note. + refers to participation, while - refers to avoidance behavior

Dividing the responses by language learning context was more useful again with these items than evaluating them as a single group. Initially the responses for these items seemed to be the most neutral of all of the questions on the survey, with the lowest and highest total means being about items related to FLWA. However, dividing them they show that the groups respond differently to these situations. Foreign language participants disagreed with the participation behavior items and even more strongly with the final avoidance behavior item. Second language participants, on

the other hand, responded favorably to the participation items and slightly negatively to the avoidance questions. This means that foreign language students may be more likely to avoid writing, while second language students are more likely to willingly participate in writing tasks. As previously stated, foreign language students showed higher levels of FLWA based on the survey, which means that, in this case, students who experienced more FLWA were more likely to avoid writing. Given that this is one of the major categories of anxiety that Cheng (2004) found in the SLWAI, this is not surprising.

Given the contradictions between the survey and interview responses to behavior questions, it is difficult to say that these avoidance behavior patterns are the same for each student in the same language learning context. While the survey results would suggest that foreign language students are more likely to experience FLWA and are more likely to avoid writing, the interview responses did not align with those findings. The two groups had some common reactions to writing as a task, in addition to language or discourse community concerns. For example, second language students were aware that they needed to practice their writing to improve, and this wasn't something they could avoid.

When situations present themselves where she is unfamiliar with the assignment or genre, Sara's reaction is fear, though she didn't display any sort of avoidance behavior; she had no problem doing the work that was required of her, as long as she understood how it should be completed and what the writing conventions required of her. Mei, like Chunhua, seems to experience a difference in her current and idealized future writing identities, though the obstacles to get from one to the other seemed difficult for her to get past. Towards the end of our interview Fen observed that when she has reached out for help with her writing before, she was not always satisfied. She attributed this to differences in her own culture and that of the writing tutor that she

went to see. She described her writing as “in Chinese thinking, and [she] want[s] to change it”. While it isn’t clear what she views as “English thinking” and “Chinese thinking”, it is apparent that Fen sees herself as not yet having met her goal of being a creative English writer who is indistinguishable from other native writers.

Taken as a whole, these reactions support the idea that the academic discourse community is alienating because of the unfamiliar genres, conventions, and inability to decipher assignments, but more so for international and second language students than foreign language students, which supports an underlying assumption that the discourse community has an effect on students’ experience of FLWA. On the other hand, L2 writing is no less apprehension-inducing for foreign language students. They clearly experienced FLWA, but the categorization of their responses in the qualitative data indicated that it might come from different sources than it does for second language students. Whether or not this alienation actually causes FLWA is still yet to be determined. While ESL students seemed to experience less FLWA based on the survey results, their reactions to academic writing during interviews described a different story. Looking at the interaction between FLWA, identity, and behavior may help to explain this inconsistency. Participants’ responses varied depending on how they viewed the concept of writing identities beyond second language writing, whether they had an idealized future self, and whether or not they felt comfortable with the conventions of academic writing. While the interaction between anxiety, identity, and behavior was unexpected (e.g. students who experienced FLWA did not necessarily avoid writing) and while it did not support the original hypotheses, this interaction did show some interesting sources of FLWA that can be investigated further.

Research Question Two: FLWA

The amount of writing anxiety experienced by participants in this study was moderate. Items asking participants for their reactions to both negative and positive affect had results that varied from “disagree” to “agree”, with no strong trends found in either category.

Table 4

Survey results – Foreign Language Writing Apprehension

Question	Second language		Foreign language	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q4: AI +	3.59	1.31	2.73	1.44
Q9: AS +	3.37	1.50	3.40	1.68
Q17: AS +	3.88	1.34	3.33	1.23
Q19: AI +	3.74	1.33	3.07	1.16
Q20: AS +	2.76	1.33	2.73	1.44
Q5: AS -	3.97	1.34	3.80	1.66
Q7: AI -	3.94	1.35	4.47	1.30
Q10: AS -	4.12	1.30	4.60	1.50
Q13: AI -	2.53	1.05	3.60	1.24
Q14: AS -	3.65	1.35	4.33	1.35
Q15: AS -	2.65	1.18	2.27	1.71
Q18: AS -	2.91	1.22	3.60	1.24

Note. AS = social affect, AI = individual affect

The means and standard deviations for survey responses related to FLWA were calculated and are collected in Table 4 according to the construct they were meant to measure on the table of specifications (Appendix C). Participants in this research showed a moderate amount of FLWA; while the mean of responses for all negative affect questions for both groups combined was between 2.49 and 4.06 (somewhat disagree and somewhat agree), the mean between positive affect questions was just as moderate: between 2.39 and 4.19. Many participants disagreed with item 4 (they are not nervous at all when they write) by rating it a 1 or 2 (n=17), while many also agreed with the same statement by rating it a 5 or 6 (n=12). With the two groups combined, the

responses to positive affect questions ($M = 3.47$) and the responses to negative affect questions are nearly identical ($M = 3.46$). Given the range of responses, it is not possible to state the L2 writers at this university experience a particular level of FLWA; there is a wide range of experiences that become clearer when speaking with students. The responses were divided into two groups, second and foreign language students, to show possible differences between groups that were not immediately apparent. When separating the two groups (ESL and foreign language) it becomes a bit clearer who experiences FLWA and to what extent; Table 4 shows the results of affect questions divided by language learning context.

Items from the survey were also divided into positive and negative affect, and social and individual affect items in order to determine whether any trends were attributable to those differences. While some items regarding FLWA had similar means (e.g. question 20), others showed a marked difference between the two groups. Foreign language participants responded to these questions in a way that showed higher levels of FLWA. Foreign language students agreed with negative affect questions more than second language students, and they disagreed with the positive affect questions more. There are three exceptions to this rule, questions five, nine, and 15. However, the difference is only .17 for question five and .03 for question nine. Question 15 has a slightly larger difference of .38. Two of the questions are negative and related to peers, meaning that second language students may experience more FLWA because of peers, as opposed to teachers. This coincides with Sara's experience of students asking each other their GPAs and Chunhua's worry about posting awkward phrases on Facebook (both of them being in a second language context), as well as Scott's feeling that peers are not going to judge him for not using proper language (being in a foreign language context).

Though the open-ended survey questions were designed to get a sense of participants' writing identities, their responses reveal a lot about their FLWA as it relates to writing identity. In this section of the survey foreign language participants described themselves as “terrible”, “poor”, and “nervous” writers who “over-think” and that grammar and writing are “difficult” and “confusing”. Four participants described their writing as being more simplified in the foreign language not because their identity is necessarily different, but because they avoid structures they don't know or don't feel comfortable with, mostly to avoid making mistakes. As previously stated, many participants described their writing identities in terms of the structure or process of writing rather than referring to themselves. It is possible that they did this because they are not familiar or comfortable with the idea of writing identities.

Because foreign language respondents scored lower on the positive FLWA question and higher on the negative FLWA questions, there is evidence that foreign language students experience a slightly higher level of FLWA than ESL students. However, interview responses did not show the same trends. As will be explained further, the interaction between FLWA, identity, and behavior was perhaps more significant than the individual results of those constructs.

The interview participants had varying affective reactions to L2 writing. Contrary to the survey responses, second language writers had clear recollections of specific writing experiences that had caused them to worry, be anxious, or made them feel disappointed in their competence. Of the six second language interview participants, Alim did not experience as much FLWA and seemed to be an exception. He did not have strong affective reactions to writing. He is aware of other classes in the future that he will have to write for (psychology, biomedical sciences, German) but did not seem concerned about those classes. Alim did mention something that was

common to all participants, which is that if he is not interested in a topic then he will find it much more difficult to write about, because he has no feeling associated with it. Alim said that his biggest challenge in learning English was writing because he does so as if he is talking, which is something he is overcoming. He says that in comparison to other students he uses bigger words and has a bigger vocabulary, so sometimes other students don't understand him when he is speaking. There seemed to be a blurring of the lines between his writing and speaking because he described himself as using big words while speaking, and then writing as if he were speaking. Alim also showed awareness of his audience, and said that he has to be more respectful when writing in English because the reader will be more likely to find something offensive. However, none of these potential problems caused him to feel anxious or worried about writing.

Fen's affective reactions to writing were always in reference to the task. Rather than describe how she felt about writing after being asked, she discussed how she views CO150 as a class with many tasks to complete. When asked if she felt confident about writing, she said no and that she needs to revise several times, and seeks out help in the Writing Center and from her TAs. Her reaction to academic writing is that it is restrictive because it is formulaic, and she largely has a negative view of this kind of writing because she feels that "you couldn't have different opinions from your classmates, everyone is totally similar".

Bo had clear ideas about how academic writing in English makes him feel. His description of writing was much more centered on its relationship to other people than the way that Fen described it. Bo said that he "really care[s] about the professor's or teacher's comment, they can say 'good job' or something like that, I will be happy and I will like writing more". He describes his teacher's reaction as very important to him because it allows him to make

improvements. However, he doesn't respond well to a reader's confusion and says that native speakers should always be able to understand him if only because their first language is English.

Sara's affective reactions to writing changed her demeanor during the interview. The profuse and confident student started giving shorter, sometimes single-word answers to questions that dealt with how she felt about academic writing in college. She described this writing as making her "scared", that turning in a paper is her biggest fear, and that she is worried that she isn't doing her work well. This was both according to her expectations and according to how the work would be received by her teachers. Regarding teachers, she describes her experience as being determined by her status as an international student. She feels that international students "need to be the best, or to prove [their] worth to the professor". She says that she is "always scared of giving in a poor paper or it's not done right". When she hands in work she generally does it with an attitude of, "I don't know if this is good enough but this is the best I can do, I'm sorry".

Mei described her experience with and feelings about college writing using the word "difficult". She doesn't like to write, though her friend tells her it is the easiest thing, and Mei points to her lack of effort as the cause of her problems. She prefers to stay in her comfort zone rather than seek help from teachers or TAs. Of all the interview participants she exhibited the most signs of avoidance behavior, though she knew that it was not beneficial to her. She describes writing as something boring and difficult, and that is mostly because she hasn't figured out yet "how to write an essay in college". In general, she doesn't like to challenge herself, and prefers doing things that she is already comfortable and familiar with, and moreover things she is interested in. According to her, this could be because she is afraid of failure, but not necessarily because she is uncomfortable with the people who could potentially help her. Her avoidance

goes so far as to keep her from seeking out help that she knows is available, even during times when she knows that failure is a possibility. Chunhua has a similar experience in that her confidence has an influence on her writing, and she will avoid writing a particular thought if she is not sure that she is expressing it in the correct way. She describes her first attempts at writing while she was still in China as hurting her confidence because now she can look back and see how many mistakes she had made.

The foreign language interview participants showed much less FLWA during the interviews than the second language participants. This reaction contradicted the survey responses, but there are two important differences between the survey and interviews groups. First, there were only two foreign language students compared to six second language students for interviews, and second, one of the foreign language students could also be considered a second language student. Having a more diverse group of foreign language students (they all came from the same course and section) may have made these differences less marked.

Scott came from the foreign language classroom, but had only begun learning English when he was 13 and his family immigrated. Scott's affective reaction to writing depends on how proficient he is in the language, and is usually related to what kind of writing he wants to produce and whether he is able to achieve that. Although he has spent less time learning English than some of the other second language interviewees (e.g. Alim), it only came out through his responses to the interview questions about his language learning history that he wasn't a native English speaker. Because he feels that his proficiency helps to reduce his anxiety, he could still be treated as a foreign language student; one of the major differences between these two groups is that second language students leave the classroom but remain linguistic minorities. This is not the case for Scott because his English was native-like. Scott discussed why he does not

experience much FLWA. His description of college writing is that, certain writing assignments he really hates (e.g. lab reports), there is a lot of pressure, and he says the pressure “has always been and always will be about the grades”. Similar to Emma’s response, this doesn’t differentiate writing from any other task in a class that has to be handed in for a grade. She describes writing in English for college classes as “just another assignment”, and that if she were to turn in a math problem she would “see it as the same thing as a paper in another language”.

Emma’s experience with writing changes, depending on her level and the teacher’s expectations. She is aware that instructors will have different expectations of her if she is a beginner or if she is a higher level and therefore expected to know more. This might help to explain Cheng’s (2002) findings which stated that students experience more FLWA as they become more proficient, though Scott, again, doesn’t fit that finding. Emma describes herself as being nervous in the beginning stages of learning a language when she is unfamiliar with it. Last semester she put off writing until the last minute, which is unlike her usual practice. However, once she becomes acclimated to what is expected of her the anxiety dissipates. The source of her nervousness comes from grammar; she is a native English speaker learning both French and Arabic, and she says that it makes her nervous to know that she isn’t doing well, but that in Arabic she is less nervous because she is at a lower level and she isn’t expected to do well yet. This could explain two different situations; students may experience more FLWA at the beginning of their study because they aren’t familiar with the expectations, or they might experience less FLWA at the beginning of their study because they know that their instructor won’t hold them to the same standards as if they were intermediate or advanced students. Either way, combined with Cheng’s (2002) findings, this means that a certain level of proficiency does not mean a certain level of FLWA.

Scott and Emma, foreign language students, only experienced negative affective reactions at the beginning of their study, while the ESL participants used words like “scared”, “nervous”, “afraid”, “difficult”, and “annoyed” to describe their current experiences. Scott and Emma both explained that for them writing was just another task to be completed in college. This gives the impression that once foreign language students become familiar with their teachers’ expectations, they will become more comfortable writing in a foreign language. This could potentially be corroborated with second language students’ experience once they get further in their studies and become more familiar with finding and using scholarly sources and adjusting to different genres of academic writing.

The hypothesis related to research question two was that second language students would experience more FLWA than foreign language students; taken alone, these responses do not confirm or contradict that hypothesis. There was evidence in the open-ended survey questions that foreign language students are slightly more concerned (20%) with affect than second language students (7%), but it was not a major feature of either group’s responses. Additionally, responses that included positive affect were included in those totals. However, when affect responses were further divided into negative and positive, it reinforces the difference between the groups. Three of the four second language affect responses were positive, while only one of the five foreign language responses were positive. While a small amount of information to work with, it is possible that, combined with the other data, foreign language students actually experience more FLWA, which could contradict this hypothesis.

The first hypothesis assumed that second language students would experience additional alienation from the academic discourse community because of their non-native speaker status. Based on the survey responses it would seem that foreign language students experience more

FLWA, but in the interviews the two foreign language students who participated also showed a low level of FLWA. While it is apparent that second language students' FLWA is caused by the academic discourse community, it is not necessarily true that they experience it at a higher rate than foreign language students. While some participants seemed concerned with peers' or teachers' reactions, others seemed to have self-imposed affective reactions. Although it is difficult to say that one group definitively experiences more FLWA than the other, exploring the contexts in which it is experienced help to further answer the first and second research questions.

Research Question Two: Identity

Research question two looked at the difference in the way that both groups experience their writing identity. This is connected to FLWA by the assumption that they will have some effect on one another: a low likelihood to claim a writing identity might correspond with higher FLWA because the writer doesn't feel confident in their position within the academic discourse community. The survey had four questions asking participants about their writing identity; because of its subjective nature, two questions on the survey were rated on the Likert scale, while two others were open-ended. The means and standard deviations were also calculated for the closed survey items to compare groups, the results of which are collected in Table 5.

Table 5

Survey results- identity

Question	Second language		Foreign language	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Q2: ID	3.53	0.93	4.47	0.99
Q3: ID	3.88	1.57	5	1.13

The first of the two Likert-scale items asked participants if they would call themselves writers, and the second asked if they enjoy writing in their native language. Overall, participants were comfortable stating that they are writers. The means for these questions were among the

highest for all survey questions, though from English learners to French learners this number increased significantly. Foreign language learners who agreed with the statement that they are writers will also be more likely to enjoy writing in their native language, while the same is not true for second language learners. Responses to these questions also had some of the lowest standard deviations of all the survey questions. Though foreign language learners tended to experience more FLWA based on the surveys, it seems that they were also more comfortable claiming a writing identity, which is a piece of evidence that disproves hypothesis two.

Open-ended survey responses were coded based on trends found within the responses. When participants described their own identity while writing in English, they tended to describe this in personal terms: how they felt, what their process looked like, and how they would rate themselves as writers of English. On the other hand, responses about the differences between their own writing identities in different languages revealed a broader awareness of context. In this case, participants noticed aspects like cultural and rhetorical differences between writing in English and writing in their native language. In other words, when participants found a difference in their writing identity from one language to another they recognized that difference as being determined by the cultural and social context. These trends led to similar categorization of responses as the interviews. In order to get an idea of the frequency of a certain kind of response, the totals of each category from the open-ended survey questions were calculated and can be found in Table 6.

These two questions asking participants about their writing identity in the L1 and L2 received 51 and 24 responses, respectively. The first question (question 22) was required while the second item (question 23a) was optional depending on whether the participant felt that there was a difference in their writing identity from their L1 to their L2. Since the two questions

received different numbers of responses, they are represented separately. The responses fell under five categories, which were also used to categorize interview responses.

Table 6

Open-ended survey responses

	Question	Responses	Social	Self	Affect	Rhetoric
Foreign language	Q22	15	1	13	2	1
	Q23a	9	1	5	3	1
Second language	Q22	34	4	22	3	14
	Q23a	17	2	9	1	10

Note. Responses for the two survey questions are counted individually

There were two main differences in how the two groups responded, which were related to the self and rhetoric. Twenty-two (63%) second language participants on Q22 were self-evaluative and self-descriptive, which was to be expected given the nature of the question. However, 14 of 34 responses (41%) were also concerned with rhetoric; they tended to describe themselves in terms of the process and form of their writing in addition to describing themselves as “creative” or “straight-forward”. On the other hand, the foreign language responses were overwhelming focused on the self; of the 15 foreign language responses on the first question, 13 (87%) responded in a way that reflected identity, self-evaluation, or literacy, and only one (6%) participant mentioned rhetoric or form. An example of an identity response is “I’m a terrible writer when I write in a foreign language”, and the one participant who mentioned form wrote “I can utilize a wider range of vocabulary”.

The other categories, social, cultural, and affect, did not show significant differences between the two groups. Two of the categories seem to show a difference between the groups, despite the small numbers; two (8%) foreign language responses were about social context, and six (11%) second language responses were in the same category. This may be important, given the difference in responses to social FLWA questions seen earlier, where second language

students experience more FLWA than foreign language students when their peers were involved. Regarding affect, there were five (20%) foreign language responses and four (7%) second language responses. The culture category that initially seemed to be productive when looking at the collected data turned out to be lacking from the survey responses; it was only mentioned during interviews, and not to a large extent. Total, these three categories were only present in 9 of the 24 responses for foreign language participants, and 10 of the 51 ESL responses.

Since the open-ended questions were designed to get information on identity from a broader group of students, trends in responses that relate to “self” should be examined further. There are not noticeable differences between the two groups in how they describe their writing or self-evaluate. Some of the examples of second language responses are “professional”, “poor”, “story-teller”, “straight-forward”, and “visual”. Some examples of foreign language responses are “terrible”, “less animated”, “basic”, “fact-based”, and “simple”. One trend among both groups was that they felt they needed to avoid complex sentences or vocabulary in order to avoid mistakes, which, according to the responses, is not how they write in their native language. These responses are to be expected in language learners who aren’t able to express themselves in the ways that they want. However, these responses are all related to the language itself, rather than any contextual influence.

Question 23a asks participants to explain why their writing identity is different between their L1 and L2, and there are some possible explanations there. Five SL participants said that confidence is the reason they write differently, either because they have more in their L1 or less in their L2. Seven (78%) FL participants describe their grasp of grammar and vocabulary as reasons why they have a different writing identity; only five (19%) SL participants cite vocabulary and grammar. One possible reason for this is L1 literacy. Three SL participants said

that they don't write in their native language, so they have a hard time expressing themselves that way. Many SL participants said that they are more capable of using things like metaphor, imagery, pathos, and organization in their L1. Both groups are concerned with how their knowledge of the language restricts what they can write, rather than considering how they might be read or evaluated by a different audience. One major difference between them is that SL participants seemed more concerned with rhetoric, which could be attributed to their enrollment in a course that focuses on that approach to teaching; however, they also used vocabulary that they probably would not discuss in that class, such as *metaphor*, *imagery*, and *parallelism*.

Research question two asked about the differences in how foreign and second language students experience FLWA and identity; based on the open-ended survey questions, it seems that while SL students are concerned with the rhetoric of academic American writing, FL students are more concerned with their writing identities, and slightly more aware of or concerned with their affective reaction to writing. When discussing the self in their responses, both groups tended to use phrases that were descriptive and self-evaluative (e.g. "confident", "poor"). There were a total of six responses that indicated that the participant didn't understand the concept of a writing identity, which was expected to some extent. Both questions asked participants about their writing identity, and given the amount of responses that reflected aspects outside of the self, such as the structure of their writing, it is possible that many participants were only able to describe themselves using writing-related terminology.

The interviews gave some more clarity regarding why students may experience a particular writing identity. There were three major trends in how interview participants described their writing identity. The first was to believe that it wasn't important and to feel less strongly about it; the second was to have a strong writing identity and to feel that it was important to their

success; the third was to have a writing identity that was closely tied to what kind of writer they are now, and what kind they want to be in the future.

Two participants, Bo (SL) and Emma (FL) said that they don't claim a writing identity. Bo's writing identity was a limited topic in the interview; he was the only participant who explicitly said that he does not have a writing identity in English. During interviews participants were sometimes asked to compare their writing identity in the L1 and L2 in order to understand how their experiences were different. Especially for participants who weren't sure what their identity was, this comparison helped them to articulate their experience with L2 writing. When we discussed Bo's Chinese writing identity, he described it in terms of its purpose; this was mostly to talk about news, politics, and his daily life via Twitter. When asked how strongly he feels about his writing identity he was ambivalent: his response was "50%, half and half".

When Bo described positive feedback to his writing, this was the only point in the interview when he seemed to look favorably on writing in English. However, his reaction to writing in Chinese was eloquent, and even poetic. He said that he thinks that writing

"is a beautiful thing, through just A, B, C, D, through some letters you can feel your feelings through the paper, and if I write in Chinese I can use every beautiful word and leave meaning deeply, so people can feel deeply, but in English I just know some basic word, I am always afraid that people cannot understand me."

Bo's description of the differences between his writing in English and Chinese are revealing; they more closely reflect the responses of foreign language participants on the survey who were more likely to say they enjoyed writing in their native language. However, he did not share the same sense of having a strong writing identity. To Bo, writing in the U.S. is limiting, and you "cannot get out". He pointed to the source of all the differences he described as based in the language, rather than social or cultural situations. He saw very little utility in what he was learning in composition; he described his process of learning English as based on "real life", and

said that “main idea, thesis, conclusion [...] I’m not going to use it”. He did say that if he would enjoy writing creatively in English if he becomes as proficient in English as he is in Chinese.

Similarly to Bo, Emma sees writing identities as not as important as what can be done with writing. She doesn’t claim to be a writer in English, which carries over to other languages. Not only does she say that she doesn’t have a writing identity, but she believes that it isn’t important to have an identity because she feels that it is giving yourself a title that doesn’t necessarily reflect what you are capable of. According to her, it’s not about saying “I’m this kind of writer or that kind of writer, as long as you are able to do it [...] that’s what is important”. Interestingly enough, while some participants described their writing identity by the kinds of writing they prefer doing, Emma did the same, but without saying that was her identity. For example, during the interview she mentioned kinds of writing that she enjoyed (letters to her host family, writing down prayers) and that is similar to what other participants had done who had actually claimed an identity. Other participants described their writing identity in terms of how they prefer to write (Mei and Fen) while Emma wanted to avoid labeling herself but was as capable of describing her writing as the others.

The second trend was for the participant to have a strong writing identity and to think it is important to have. Among those participants are Sara (SL), Alim (SL), and Scott (FL). Sara has a very clear sense of what kind of writer she is, and she sees this as tied closely to her personality. Throughout the interview she described herself as “concise” several times, made reference to the fact that that is because of her personality, and is reflected in her choice of major (math). Much of her description of herself as a writer came outside of the confines of the questions about her writing identity. When asked if she has a writing identity, Sara said that the only writing she ever does is for class and that she prefers being concise. She said that she only writes creatively if it is

required of her, and that if a topic doesn't relate to her then she can't give anyone her understanding of it. She also mentioned word counts and her method of reaching them: she will expand on what she has said by mentioning what she feels about the topic, and if she can't do that then she says "I guess this is what I feel but I don't know anymore". Being asked to expand beyond her concise nature seemed to stretch her capabilities as a writer, but it is also something that she seemed proud of because it made her different from other international students who have difficulty being concise in their writing.

Alim had a good sense of how his writing identity changes in different situations, and how it compares in English and Arabic. In fact, his lack of strong affective reaction could be related to his writing identity in English, which he sees as more rational than when he writes in Arabic. He does not speak formal Arabic, whereas in English he must write academically, and this, according to him, is the source of his different writing identities in the two languages. His writing in Arabic is more emotional. He has distinguished these two writing voices by listening to the tone he uses when he is writing in each language. He also describes his English writing as concise to the point, that it is sometimes too concise for what his teachers want him to do. For him it was an advantage to be concise, though it frustrated his teacher and she wanted him to provide more explanation. In regards to the importance of a writing identity, Alim believes that it is dependent on context. In academic writing he believes that it should not be important because the information is what you need to see on the page. On the other hand, he said that having a wide audience would mean that your readers should know you and that you are crafting your identity rather than the information you are talking about.

Scott's writing identity is related to whether or not he is interested in the topic he is writing about and how proficient he is in the language, so it is context dependent in the same

way it was for Mei and Alim. Most participants said that they feel more comfortable writing when they are interested in the topic and that they felt limited by their L2. However, since Scott is a near-native English speaker and writer, he does not feel the same about his English/Portuguese writing identities and Spanish/French. His writing identity in English and Portuguese is “concise” and “straight to the point”, but then he has to add on to his writing to meet assignment requirements. These are the languages in which he is fluent or nearly fluent. On the other hand, in French and Spanish, which he feels he is still learning, he intentionally works to make his writing more “flowy” and longer because he feels that, though he prefers being concise in languages he is more comfortable with, he is being too concise and not creative enough in languages he is still learning.

Scott’s writing identity in his less-proficient languages is determined by others’ reactions to his writing more than by himself. He describes his teacher as a major reason why he goes against his normal writing identity when writing in French. When he writes in French he is “writing to impress”, to show that he knows all of the rules for grammar and the different rules for vocabulary. When there is a mistake that he knows someone else has made he will intentionally include that grammatical structure or vocabulary in his writing to prove that he knows how to do it correctly. In English he finds himself having to add to his writing when he wouldn’t normally, just to meet assignment requirements. These different expectations of each language stem from a desire to prove that he is capable of writing in different ways, even if his writing identity will eventually be stable across languages and not necessarily creative.

According to Scott, it is important to have a writing identity or else the writer will sound lost. He also described a writing identity as necessary when there is pressure on the writer, so for academic writing it is especially important. This is the opposite of Mei and Alim’ opinion that in

academic writing the information is what is important, rather than the writer. For Scott, having a strong writing identity means that the writer might create different styles of writing from one moment to the next, or that if he didn't finish a piece of writing at the same time then it would sound disjointed.

The final trend in identity was participants whose identity was closely tied to their goals for what kind of writer they want to be in the future. There is a difference in the way that Fen sees her current writing identity (as still Chinese, a beginner) and the writer she wants to be in the future. When speaking about her current writing identity, it was in terms of how she is viewed by others (her teacher or her peers). She spoke of not wanting the teachers to see her paper and recognize that she is an international student, and of wanting to write quickly but not wanting it "to look like you are a child". Fen's future writing self was more self-determined and creative; she described it as "vivid", and she values the idea of a writing identity. According to her, it is important to have a strong writing identity because "if you can know more about yourself you can know more about what kind of writing you do best, and you can go into the field more deep, and you can practice as much as possible so you can make progress".

Chunhua's writing identity is related to her current and idealized future selves, much like Fen and Mei. In her writing she does not like to share her opinion because she doesn't want to be wrong or offend anyone, but she believes that it is important to express one's own personality. What this means for Chunhua is that her current and idealized future selves are nearly opposite. She feels that it is not good for her to have these different identities because "it is a different you, you write different articles". She hopes that "in the future [...] there is no difference in my own language and in English", but "now there is a difference, like I don't always express my feelings but I still want to express myself in English". There are things that Chunhua avoids currently that

prevent her from having an identity in English, such as including her own opinion or expressing how she feels, that she feels are important to writing. When she becomes familiar with a style of writing or a typical assignment in a class she doesn't avoid those tasks anymore, but she is still not to the point where she feels that her identity is present in her writing.

Mei's writing identity is "casual", because she likes to write about whatever she thinks about and things that happened. However, this is limited to Chinese and when she writes in English it is because she has to. In these cases, her writing is academic. She says that the difference is because one type of writing (in Chinese) is something she wants to do, and the other (in English) is something she has to do. The source of difference in her writing identities is based on whether or not the writing is an obligation, and this is also related to her interest in the topic as well. The most important thing in a writing task is whether or not the topic is interesting to her, which will have an effect on how long it takes her to write. Mei echoes Alim's belief that a writing identity is not important when it is for a class, but she specifies that for creative writing, like poetry, it is more important.

It is possible that SL students are more conscious of rhetorical choices that they must make when writing in the university because it is a discourse community they are not yet comfortable with. This is reflected in the interview responses from Scott and Emma that writing is generally "just another assignment". They are the only interview participants who had attended high school in the U.S. and so it is possible that they were better prepared for this discourse community.

Research Question Three: Connecting FLWA and Writing Identities

The third research question looked at the relationship between writing identities and FLWA. During interviews students who were most anxious (Chunhua, Mei, and Fen) also had a

clear idea of what their current writing identities are and what they want them to be in the future. Emma showed a low level of FLWA and did not claim a writing identity, which is also contrary to the first hypothesis, but from the perspective of a foreign language writer. Alim and Bo only showed a moderate level of FLWA and neither claimed a writing identity or thought it was important to do so. Not all participants believed that they either had a writing identity or that a writing identity was important. Indeed, their definition or description of writing identities changed from individual to individual. While it is difficult to generalize a conclusion based on participants who experienced different levels of FLWA and for different reasons, one trend that became apparent during the interviews was the idea of current and future selves, and this idea could tie together FLWA, writing identities, and the academic discourse community.

The concept of current and future ideal selves (Cho, 2015) seems to have some relevance to this question of identity and FLWA. Cho (2015) found that future ideal selves of his participants did not necessarily determine their motivation, but that motivation may be more closely tied to past experiences instead of future goals. This seems to be mirrored in at least one of my participants (Chunhua) who was aware of what kind of writer she wants to be in the future, but seems unwilling to do what she knows is necessary to improve her writing. She and other participants who knew that they were not currently performing their best and had an idea of the kind of writers they wanted to be in the future experienced higher FLWA, possibly because they recognize that they are not currently performing as they wish to. Some of them (Chunhua, Bo, and Mei) had an idea about what kind of writers they could be or wanted to be in the future, but their behavior was not affected, confirming Cho (2015); in other words, these students had goals for what kind of writer they want to be, experienced FLWA because they weren't achieving that, and yet did not seek out help or practice to improve. Others who did seem to have

an idea about what they wanted to achieve (Fen and Sara) seemed more prepared to take some kind of action to meet their goals. They have a clear idea of where they are and where they want to be, whereas with other students, who felt that academic writing was not relevant to their future goals, this difference between current and future writing identities was not apparent because it wasn't important to them.

Hypothesis two posited that second language students who experienced a higher level of FLWA would also be less likely to claim a writing identity. Based on the responses on the surveys and the interviews, this hypothesis was disproven. As stated above, participants who experienced high levels of FLWA sometimes had thoroughly considered what kind of writers they are and what kind of writers they want to be. In an unexpected result, some of the participants who experienced the least amount of FLWA (Scott and Emma) also felt that writing identities were not very important. Emma and Bo both felt that they didn't really have a writing identity, and experienced different levels of FLWA. The most telling responses were from students who had a clear idea of what kind of writer they want to be in the future, though that future goal seems to have mixed effects; some of them experienced a higher level of FLWA but didn't take any action to meet their future goals (Chunhua), but others who also experienced FLWA were more willing to take positive action (Sara).

Research question three can be answered by combining the information from the surveys that was previously analyzed. This question looked at the likelihood that a student experiencing FLWA would claim a writing identity and was connected to the hypothesis that a high level of FLWA would result in a lack of writing identity. Again, mirroring the results from the quantitative data, it seems that students who experience higher levels of FLWA do not have a problem claiming a writing identity. Foreign language students were both more likely to claim

that they had a writing identity ($M=4.47$) than their second language peers ($M=3.53$), but also showed a higher level of FLWA; means for foreign language writers were generally higher on negative affect items and lower on positive affect items than they were for second language writers, and all of the statistically significant differences implied that foreign language writers experience more FLWA.

Implications of Results

After analyzing the data and discussing each of the findings in relation to the research questions and hypotheses, it is important to look at the sum of this information. The first research question was “What are some of the possible causes of FLWA?”, research question two was “What is the extent and nature of the difference in how second and foreign language writers experience FLWA and writing identities”, and research question three was “To what extent, if any, does the comfort that L2 writers feel in claiming a writing identity correlate with foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA)?” The hypotheses related to the second and third research questions were proven incorrect or not strongly supported, though those results were fruitful in that they led to different implications that can be explored in the future. Additionally, looking at the responses that relate to research question one might help to understand why the hypotheses were incorrect, and lead to further research in the future. The survey results would suggest that foreign language students are more likely to experience FLWA, are more likely to avoid writing, and are more likely to claim that they are writers; however, the interview responses did not align with those findings. The first hypothesis, that participants who experienced FLWA would also lack a writing identity, was ultimately not supported by either the survey results or interviews. Based on this information, some conclusions can be drawn regarding the influence of writing identities and the academic discourse community on FLWA.

There was a strong, though unexpected, relationship between writing identity and FLWA that was supported by all three types of data; participants who experienced FLWA (generally speaking, foreign language students) did not hesitate to claim a writing identity, whether that identity represented their future ideal self or their current writing identity. For the most part participants stated that they recognized that practice would improve their writing, they knew that writing is required in college, and felt that there isn't a real way to get out of it. Each of these responses and behaviors tells us about part of L2 writers' experiences, and together they can help us to understand the effect that FLWA and identity may have on their wider university writing experience.

Influence of the Academic Discourse Community

It wasn't until students were asked to compare their experiences in L1 and L2 writing on the open-ended survey questions and during interviews that their real awareness of a discourse community became apparent. For these questions participants referred to differences in their identity that came from cultural and social contexts, but when asked about their identity writing strictly in a foreign language they did not refer to this external context. It is possible that they don't consider this context consciously until it is in comparison to another writing situation.

In his article on his experience as an L2 graduate student writer, Shen (1989) described a similar experience to some of the participants in this study – it is not merely that processes or attention to form may change when going from one writing situation to another, but for some students the change is ideological. Both survey and interview participants indicated that there were cultural and conceptual differences that they had to navigate in order to become more successful American academic writers. Interestingly, this feeling was echoed by the second language participants, but not by the foreign language participants. This could be easily

explained when one considers that foreign language students are only momentarily changing social and cultural contexts, while second language learners find themselves surrounded by unfamiliar contexts daily. While foreign language students are in a relatively familiar situation, for ESL students, “learning the rules of English composition is, to a certain extent, learning the values of Anglo-American society” (Shen, 1989, p. 460). While responses in open-ended survey questions and interviews did not focus on cultural differences, it is worth noting that the ESL students were the only ones to make these distinctions.

Another trend that occurred among ESL participants was uncertainty or anxiety regarding research and citation conventions. One of Fen’s great frustrations with academic writing came from citation conventions, which show that she is not always the only author present on the page. Sara also had a negative experience with citation and plagiarism. Additionally, Sara and Alim both expressed frustration at not understanding what is expected of them in different genres. If, as Ivanič (1998) states, new members of a community can only become full members by “copying, adapting, and synthesizing from the work of other members” (p. 4), the identity of an L2 writer is uncertain, especially if they don’t know how to navigate these genre conventions. As some of my participants stated in their interviews, it can be important for a writer to have a strong sense of their identity in order for them to succeed in whichever writing situation they find themselves in and to become known to their audience. While this study did not look at how students express their voices in their writing, this could be a potential problem for students who want to express their own interests, opinions, and feelings (Fen, Chunhua, Mei, and Scott) but are unable to do so; instead they must use the ideas and words of others, while somehow finding a space for themselves on the page.

Students who were anxious about writing did not avoid it; both the survey data and the interview data support that for the most part students knew that they must participate in writing and that it would be necessary for them to succeed in their programs. The survey results and interviews both indicated that the group overall did not avoid L2 writing. In the survey, Q8 (I usually do my best to avoid writing in English/a foreign language) had a large number of participants who strongly disagreed or disagreed ($n=21$), while the number who agreed or strongly agreed was much lower ($n=5$). This conclusion is supported by interview responses from participants that indicated that they understand the value of practicing writing and seeking out help when they are having difficulty (even if they didn't actually do this). This was specifically demonstrated by Fen and Chunhua, who knew that they were not doing their best work, but avoided potential help because the FLWA they were experiencing (annoyance, lack of confidence, fear of failure) prevented them from doing so. Other than these few participants, L2 writers seemed willing to do what is required of them, whether they experience FLWA or not.

Taken separately, each of these factors seems to have a small effect on FLWA: the students' identity, the importance they place on writing identity, whether or not their work is going to be evaluated, whether they are familiar with the grammar, genre, and citation conventions, the social and cultural context, and the purpose they have for writing included. All have an effect on how much students experience FLWA, and it is difficult to isolate one cause and say that it is a common experience for L2 writers. What is clear is the difference between second and foreign language students; they each experience FLWA to different degrees and for different reasons, which lends support to the role of a discourse community in relieving or causing FLWA. However, though ESL students described their cultural context and foreign language students ignored their cultural context, there may not be a direct connection between

discourse communities and writing identities; whereas Alim and Bo said that their writing identity was important so that the audience can be familiar with the writer, for Emma a writing identity was more personal. Combined, each of these factors and influences on FLWA give us a clearer picture of how and why L2 writing students may experience FLWA.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This research was conducted with the underlying goal of discovering some of the sources of foreign language writing apprehension (FLWA) in L2 writers. While identity was assumed to be an influence and was explicitly measured, other factors became apparent through the open-ended survey questions and interviews. In order to determine the overall writing experience of L2 writers at this university, trends should be found either between or within the two groups, which are foreign and second language writers. While differences were found between the two groups, the differences were not restricted to or consistent within one construct or one group. For example, experiences of FLWA were different between the two groups, but the surveys and interviews contradicted each other. Willingness to claim an identity seemed more related to individual preference and future goals than it did to learning or other contexts, such as the academic discourse community. Participants who experienced FLWA did not necessarily avoid writing. The strongest findings came when the groups were compared with each other, rather than comparing particular constructs with each other, such as FLWA and identity. While the first hypothesis had mixed results and the second hypothesis was not supported, the first research question (what are some causes of FLWA?) resulted in several possible responses that can be investigated further.

Limitations and future research

Because this research was searching for causes of FLWA it was sometimes difficult to triangulate a precise answer to the research questions. Separating the data and looking at groups in isolation was more revealing than looking at the two groups together, which helped to mitigate some of the contradictory results from the surveys in comparison to the interviews. While the

current research was constrained by time and the amount of data collected and its analysis was sufficient for drawing initial conclusions to answer the research questions, further statistical analysis of the survey data in the future may reveal trends that were not apparent from means and standards deviations alone. T-tests or ANOVAs could be used to compare the categories of survey questions to each other, in addition to comparison of second language and foreign language responses to individual questions that was done. Many of the survey items had large standard deviations (e.g. 1.68, 1.71), which makes conclusions about those items less reliable and generalizable. Although the SD being between 20% and 30% is acceptable, it is high given the small sample size. In the future it will be important to increase the reliability of the survey being used by piloting it and checking the influence of individual items on the overall reliability. The reliability was not acceptable enough to draw strong conclusions from the information that was gathered, and so it would be useful to better understand which items or factors were causing reliability problems. Di Loreto & McDonough (2013) reported a reliability coefficient of .52 for the behavior items from SLWAI that they used, though Cheng reported a .83. Given that those items made up a significant portion of this survey, that may have had a negative effect on the reliability. However, given the information gathered to answer research question one, there is still enough information to draw conclusions from, which can be used to guide further research.

The survey contained only four items out of 24 that were related to writing identity, and it might have been more helpful to replace some of the behavior-related items with items that asked participants for more detailed information regarding their writing identity, as was done during interviews. Most information related to identity came from two questions on the survey and the interviews, which made it more difficult to generalize those findings.

It is possible that participants had a difficult time answering questions about their writing identity because they do not consider the concept often. One issue that came up in surveys and interviews was students' difficulty in articulating their writing identity and the different methods they used for describing the concept. During interviews most participants asked for clarification on the questions about writing identity, and on the surveys 6 participants (12%) wrote responses indicating that they either didn't know what their writing identity was or they didn't understand the question. Future research could develop different ways of asking about writing identity, either by describing the different ways that it may be viewed by writers, or by asking more questions about how writers' identity may change from one situation to another. While this and previous research have looked at identity of different populations, it is important to remember that participants may not have consciously considered the construct they are being asked about, and given a concept as fluid and nebulous as identity, they may even define the construct differently than each other and the researchers. It is important to not only consider what the construct means and how it can be measured, but whether or not it is something that participants must have articulated for themselves, either consciously or unconsciously. The participants answered the survey without having a discussion about what a writing identity is, which the interview participants had the benefit of. Having more interview participants who were part of that discussion may have changed the ways that they answered the survey.

This research was exploratory in nature, and so many changes could be made in the future to adapt it to focus on a particular aspect of FLWA, discourse communities, or writing identities. While it was assumed that a writing identity was closely linked to the discourse community, that connection was not explicitly tested and more work should be done in order to verify a connection. The second hypothesis that high FLWA would lead to a lack of writing

identity was not supported, and it is possible that the assumption that discourse communities would have a negative effect on writing identity was the problem. Instead of looking at the connection between FLWA and identity, future research could focus on FLWA and the discourse community in order to discover a more direct connection. Students' writing identity is determined by factors such as their L1, their future goals, and their concept of what a writing identity is and whether or not it is important. Because of these individual differences, looking at the discourse community could be more productive as it is not determined by the individual, but can still be experienced in different ways.

Pedagogical Implications

The richness and variety of responses to the open-ended survey questions and the interviews provides a lot direction for future research, and insight for teachers as to how to approach students who seem to experience a high level of FLWA. Understanding that a multitude of issues are affecting L2 students is the beginning of helping them to navigate academic writing. While it seems that one would want to increase a student's self-confidence, it is not always certain that students will act on that belief, as was evident in some interviews and other studies, such as Sanders-Reio et al. (2014). Research shows that the relationship between achievement and self-efficacy is uncertain; in some cases, self-efficacy has a positive effect on achievement (Matsuda & Gobel, 2004), while in others the relationship may be evident but the causality is not (Sanders-Reio et al, 2014). This research corroborated previous research because participants were aware of what they needed to do to improve but they were not always willing to make those steps to become the kind of writers that they either needed or wanted to be. For some of the writers in this study, it seemed that being reminded of their lack of proficiency or progress made them experience more FLWA, and so they avoided the issue altogether.

Reiterating the importance of outside assistance, such as tutors, librarians, or other teachers, should be emphasized as a normal part of the learning process so that students become familiar with them.

The richness of the responses that were captured from the open-ended questions and interviews help to remind us that assumptions that we make about the background, affective reactions, literacy, and motives that drive students can be wrong or misleading. Participants who preferred writing creatively or expressing their own opinions seemed to have a difficult time with the restrictions of academic writing. This was not particular to ESL students, but foreign language students also expressed the importance of their interest in the topic to help them write more, better, and in a timely manner. While it isn't always possible to allow students the freedom to choose topics that interest them, this could be done whenever possible. If the student's writing performance is being assessed, rather than content or topical knowledge, opening up the topic possibilities can help students have a favorable view of the task. In this case teachers would need to make their expectations and the parameters of the assignment clear, and possibly require proposals or another method of ensuring that students do not choose a topic that is too broad, too narrow, or inappropriate for the class.

FLWA is a concern for both SL students moving on to mainstream courses, and to foreign language students who may continue in courses with other non-native speakers. Foreign language students are assumed to have mastered the academic discourse required of them, and in higher levels they are no longer considered to be in language courses but in content courses. However, it is equally true that their presumed language and rhetorical competency may not be in line with what instructors would prefer, especially considering that the teachers also come from different backgrounds. When teaching academic writing we must be aware of and discuss

the power dynamics that result in participation in or exclusion from this community. Many of the negative experiences with writing that participants described didn't originate in the classes that they were recruited from, but came from mainstream courses. Academic written English is by no means widely understood or disseminated, but rather exclusive and sometimes difficult to comprehend, which seems to be forgotten by instructors who are not used to teaching second language writers. The participants in this study recognized that their L2 writing instructors were aware of their language levels and familiarity with academic writing conventions and would therefore treat them accordingly, but they do not have the same sense of comfort with other instructors. It wasn't that the L2 writing instructors' expectations were lowered, but they were cognizant of the students' potential difficulties, which in turn made students more comfortable with the tasks. Similarly, writing in a foreign language can be an opaque process for learners as they learn how to communicate in a new language while it is assumed that they have fully grasped academic language in their native tongue. It is possible that the result of this negotiation between different discourse communities can influence L2 students' experience will influence their affective factors, specifically their FLWA.

Foreign language students experienced most of their FLWA regarding language use, while second language writers experienced FLWA due to the academic discourse community. For foreign language writers, this cause is related specifically to the language itself but it was not necessarily related to grades; teacher evaluation was one cause of FLWA, but participants did not feel that the teachers themselves were causing it. Both foreign language and second language students wanted to prove something to their teachers and themselves, but there were no direct actions taken by the teachers (or peers) that caused FLWA. On the other hand, second language writers' lack of familiarity with different academic genres and citing conventions was a major

cause of their FLWA. While "the native speaker target has been more a manner of exerting the power of the native speaker than a recognition of what students actually need" (Cook, 2005, p. 54), it is unlikely that this model will lose ground any time soon. Given the emphasis of writing across the curriculum in higher education, it is important to understand what may be preventing student success in this context. If we understand the sources of students' writing apprehension, it may be possible to work to resolve this issue so that a truly diverse and open system of higher education can be achieved.

A participant in the interviews told me that she had participated because she wanted to practice her speaking. While this was not related to the interview questions, it does reveal something about L2 students; they are often willing to put themselves in unfamiliar and potentially uncomfortable situations in order to improve their language skills. Recognizing students' goals is one way to help them feel more comfortable as writers. The responses given from interview participants showed that when they had someone they felt they could go to for support that was something that they were willing to take advantage of. However, differing cultural expectations might create a barrier to providing that support, if the student either doesn't feel comfortable seeking that out, or if it isn't clear what kind of support a teacher is willing and able to provide. Given these different influences on L2 writing apprehension, teachers and researchers should continue to consider the ways that contexts beyond their own classroom may have an effect on the experience and success of L2 writing students.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Latif, M. M. (2015). Sources of L2 writing apprehension: a study of Egyptian university students. *Journal Of Research In Reading*, 38(2), 194-212. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9817.2012.01549.x
- Ball, A. & Ellis, P. (2008). Identity and the writing of culturally and linguistically diverse students. In C. Bazerman (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Writing* (499-514). New York: L. Erbaum Associates.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the University. In M. Rose (Ed.) *When A Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composition Process Problems* (134-165). New York: Guilford.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001
- Bruton, A. (2009). Improving Accuracy Is Not the Only Reason for Writing, and Even If It Were.. *System: An International Journal Of Educational Technology And Applied Linguistics*, 37(4), 600-613.
- Calfee, R. C., & Sperling, M. (2010). *On mixed methods: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

- Cheng, Y. (2002). Factors Associated with Foreign Language Writing Anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(6), 647-56.
- Cheng, Y. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 313-335.
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language Anxiety: Differentiating Writing and Speaking Components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 417-446.
- Cho, M. (2015). The Effects of Working Possible Selves on Second Language Performance. *Reading And Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 28(8), 1099-1118.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- 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.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for Qualitative Research. *International Journal Of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2), 35-52.
- Di Loreto, S., & McDonough, K. (2013). The Relationship between Instructor Feedback and ESL Student Anxiety. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(1), 20-41.
- Evans, D. (2015). The Identities of Language. In D. Evans (Ed.), *Language and Identity: Discourse in the World* (15-35).
- Ferenz, O. (2005). EFL writers' social networks: Impact on advanced academic literacy development. *Journal Of English For Academic Purposes*, 4(4), 339-351.
doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.002
- Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 165-193. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.003

- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 307-329.
doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009
- Gitlin, A., Buendia, E., Crosland, K., & Doumbia, F. (2003). The Production of Margin and Center: Welcoming-Unwelcoming of Immigrant Students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 91-122.
- Habrat, A. (2013). The effect of affect on learning: self-esteem and self-concept. In Ewa Piechruska & Elzbieta Szymanska-Czaplak (Eds.), *Language in Cognition and Affect* (239-253).
- Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 11(4), 329.
- Horwitz, E., Tallon, M., & Luo, H. (2010). "Foreign Language Anxiety". J. Cassady (Ed.). *Anxiety in Schools: the causes, consequences, and solutions* (95-118). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Huhtala, A., & Lehti-Eklund, H. (2010). Writing a new self in the third place: language students and identity formation. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 18(3), 273-288.
doi:10.1080/14681366.2010.504647
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.
- Ifantidou, E. (2014). *Pragmatic competence and relevance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Kavanagh, J., Campbell, F., Harden, A., & Thomas, J. (2012). Mixed methods synthesis: a worked example. In K. Hannes & C. Lockwood (Eds.) *Synthesizing Qualitative Research: Choosing the Right Approach* (113-136). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kirmizi, Ö., & Kirmizi, G. D. (2015). An Investigation of L2 Learners' Writing Self-Efficacy, Writing Anxiety and Its Causes at Higher Education in Turkey. *International Journal Of Higher Education*, 4(2), 57-66.
- Liu, P. E., & Tannacito, D. J. (2013). Resistance by L2 writers: The role of racial and language ideology in imagined community and identity investment. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 22(4), 355-373. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2013.05.001
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637-651.
- Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 22(1), 68-86. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.10.001
- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 32(1), 21-36.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99. doi:10.1016/
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (2000). Cognitive, Affective, Personality, and Demographic Predictors of Foreign-Language Achievement. *Journal Of Educational Research*, 94(1), 3-15.

- Preto-Bay, A. M., & Hansen, K. (2006). Preparing for the Tipping Point: Designing Writing Programs to Meet the Needs of the Changing Population. *WPA Writing Program Administration: Journal Of The Council Of Writing Program Administrators*, 30(1-2), 37-57.
- Prior, P. (2015). Community. In P. Vandenberg & P. Heilker (Eds.), *Keywords in Writing Studies* (26-31). doi:10.7330/9780874219746.c013
- Rubin, D. (1995). Composing Social Identity. In D. Rubin (Ed.), *Composing Social Identity in Written Language*. (1-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sanders-Reio, J., Alexander, P. A., Reio, T. G., & Newman, I. (2014). Do students' beliefs about writing relate to their writing self-efficacy, apprehension, and performance?. *Learning & Instruction*, 331-11. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.02.001
- Shen, F. (1989). The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition. *College Composition And Communication*, 40(4), 459-466.
doi:10.2307/358245
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009). What Can TESOL Do in Order Not to Participate in Crimes against Humanity?. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal For Teachers Of English To Speakers Of Other Languages And Of Standard English As A Second Dialect*, 43(2), 340-344.
- Tardy, C. (2015). Discourse. In P. Vandenberg & P. Heilker (Eds.), *Keywords in Writing Studies* (57-61). doi:10.7330/9780874219746.c013
- The Writing Center. (n.d.). *Colorado State University Writing Center*. Available from: colostate.mywconline.com
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-69.

- Tsai, S. L. (2010). Language skills and status attainment in Taiwan. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9, 229-249.
- Vergaro, C. (2011). Shades of impersonality: Rhetorical positioning in the academic writing of Italian students of English. *Linguistics & Education*, 22(2), 118-132.
doi:10.1016/j.linged.2010.11.001
- White, J. W., & Ali-Khan, C. (2013). The Role of Academic Discourse in Minority Students' Academic Assimilation. *American Secondary Education*, 42(1), 24-42.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321-331. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.007
- Woodrow, L. (2011). College English Writing Affect: Self-Efficacy and Anxiety. *System: An International Journal Of Educational Technology And Applied Linguistics*, 39(4), 510-522. doi:10.1016/j.system.2011.10.017
- Young, M. (2015). Identity. In P. Vandenberg & P. Heilker (Eds.), *Keywords in Writing Studies*, (88-93). doi:10.7330/9780874219746.c013

APPENDIX A

ESL survey

Thank you for taking time to participate in this survey. If you consent to an interview and leave your contact information, I will contact you within 3 days to set up a time to meet. Interviews will last approximately 30-45 minutes.

1. How long have you been studying English? (less than a year, 1-3 years, 4-6 years, more than 6 years).

Answer the following statements according to whether or not you agree with them:

2. I consider myself to be a writer.
3. I enjoy writing in my native language.
4. While writing in English, I'm not nervous at all.
5. While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.
6. I often chose to write my thoughts in English.
7. While writing in English, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.
8. I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.
9. I don't worry that at all that my English compositions are a lot worse than others'.
10. If my English composition is to be evaluated, I worry about getting a very poor grade.
11. I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.
12. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.
13. I often feel panic when I write English compositions.
14. While writing in English, I often worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of English writing.
15. I'm afraid that the other students would make fun of my English composition if they read it.
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'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.
19. I usually feel comfortable and at ease when writing in English.
20. I'm not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor.
21. Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.

(Open comment questions)

22. What is your writing identity when you write in English or a foreign language? In other words, what kind of writer are you?
23. Is your writing identity different when you write in your native language?
 - a. If yes, please explain.
24. Please leave your name and email address if you would like to be contacted for an interview related to this survey. The interview would take place within 2-3 weeks and take approximately 30-45 minutes.

APPENDIX B

Foreign Language survey

Thank you for taking time to participate in this survey. If you consent to an interview and leave your contact information, I will contact you within 3 days to set up a time to meet. Interviews will last approximately 30-45 minutes.

1. How long have you been studying a foreign language? (less than a year, 1-3 years, 4-6 years, more than 6 years).

Answer the following statements according to whether or not you agree with them:

2. I consider myself to be a writer.
3. I enjoy writing in my native language.
4. While writing in a foreign language, I'm not nervous at all.
5. While writing foreign language compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.
6. I often chose to write my thoughts in a foreign language.
7. While writing in a foreign language, I often worry that I would use expressions and sentence patterns improperly.
8. I usually do my best to avoid writing foreign language compositions.
9. I don't worry that at all that my foreign language compositions are a lot worse than others'.
10. If my foreign language composition is to be evaluated, I worry about getting a very poor grade.
11. I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in a foreign language.
12. Unless I have no choice, I would not use foreign language to write compositions.
13. I often feel panic when I write foreign language compositions.
14. While writing in a foreign language, I often worry that the ways I express and organize my ideas do not conform to the norm of writing in that language.
15. I'm afraid that the other students would make fun of my foreign language composition if they read it.
16. I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write foreign language compositions.
17. I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my foreign language compositions.
18. I'm afraid of my foreign language composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.
19. I usually feel comfortable and at ease when writing in a foreign language.
20. I'm not afraid at all that my foreign language compositions would be rated as very poor.
21. Whenever possible, I would use a foreign language to write compositions.

(Open comment questions)

22. What is your writing identity when you write in a foreign language? In other words, what kind of writer are you?
23. Is your writing identity different when you write in your native language?
 - a. If yes, please explain.

24. Please leave your name and email address if you would like to be contacted for an interview related to this survey. The interview would take place within 2-3 weeks and take approximately 30-45 minutes.

Foreign language survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZV68VDS>

APPENDIX C

Categorization of Survey Items

Table 7

Survey table of specifications

	Identity	Behavior	Affect – individual	Affect - social
<u>Neutral</u>	Q2, Q3, Q22, Q23			
<u>Positive</u>		Q6, Q21	Q4, Q19	Q9, Q17, Q20
<u>Negative</u>		Q8, Q11, Q12, Q16	Q7, Q13	Q5, Q10, Q14, Q15, Q18

APPENDIX D

Interview Protocol

- 1) What is your experience with writing in English (or a foreign language) while in college?
- 2) What factors or contexts have influenced your experience writing in college?
- 3) How does writing for a college class make you feel?
- 4) Do you think that you have a writing identity in English (a foreign language)? What is it?
- 5) How strongly do you feel that this identity belongs to you?
- 6) Is your writing identity different in your native language?
- 7) Why do you think that it is/is not different?
- 8) Do you think it is important to have a writing identity?
- 9) Do you enjoy writing for personal reasons more than for college? Why or why not?

APPENDIX E

Open-ended survey results

What is your writing identity when you write in English? In other words, what kind of writer are you when you write in English?

English responses:

1. N/A
2. I think I am a writer who always prefer transform others' idea rather than express my own idea, since I am afraid to use informal or impolite words.
3. Usually I write the some essays.
4. I like free writing
5. Story teller i guess
6. The reason why I need to write in English is because of homework or application. So I will follow the outline and format to write essay.
7. straight forward
8. If I don't have to conform to a specific structure I like to play around with narratives and the tense in order to make it more artsy and interesting to read.
9. Most often, I think it's student.
10. students writing for assignments and papers
11. I think I may be a casual writer when I write in English because I would not think organizedly in English . I feel difficult to memorize different parts of a long English essay too .
12. Professional writer
13. I always identify myself as a professional writer when I am writing in English.
14. I'm a good writer for an international student.
15. I feel for an international student, I write decently.
16. I use straight forward words.
17. Average writer. Nothing special
18. I write as a passive voice usually and tend to use a more complex vocabulary set in my English writing
19. I am comfortable in writing in english. Even though I am international, I prefer english over my own language. I am good at writing in english but my vocabulary is not very advanced.
20. always write essay.
21. I won't deliberate practice my writing, sometimes just write down what I think in mind
22. Avoiding making grammar mistakes, trying to find words and expressions to support my opinion
23. Poor writer
24. I am a very straight forward writer
25. When I write in English, I tend to be elaborate on my sentence; trying to expand my ideas and sentence into the paragraph and sometimes into the same sentence as much as I can.
26. reasonal

27. I seem to be better in writing papers that ask me to talk about my opinion.
28. i love writing in english even if sometime i don't have enough vocabulary to express my feelings and thoughts
29. Idk
30. Not good, I will be very nervous during writing.
31. I consider my self to be an average writer as an international student
32. I am not sure.
33. Visual
34. I do not understand this question.

Foreign language responses:

35. I'm a terrible writer when I write in a foreign language. Grammar is difficult and confusing when I write in a foreign language
36. It is usually pretty sarcastic and whimsical
37. Simple and basic
38. When I write in my native language, I will express more opinions and state my argument very strongly, while when I write in foreign language, I tend to be more calm and analytical.
39. I am poor at composition, but I am eager to improve in this area.
40. I'm a very straight-forward writer.
41. I am a structural writer when I write in a foreign language. I often use a lot of English structure because I think in English first then translate it.
42. When I write in a foreign language I tend to over think everything I know and make more mistakes then I should. I am a nervous writer.
43. I am less animated in a foreign language
44. myself
45. I tend to be as fact-based and/or chronological as possible in order to cut down on opportunities for meaning to get lost in translation
46. I feel like when I write in a foreign language I end up being a more descriptive whereas when I write in my primary languages (Portuguese and English) I am more straight to the point.
47. I am a very simple writer. I try to avoid using complex sentences unless I absolutely HAVE to.
48. I'm not entirely sure what this question means but I think there's a lot of similarities to how I write in English... For example, I like to keep my writing very organized. I also sort of tend towards humor.
49. N/A

If you answered yes to question 4 (your writing identity is different when you write in your native language), please explain.

English responses:

1. I would express my own view directly in an acceptable way
2. When I write in my native language, I am very confidence. Maybe since I have accumulate lots of good expression ways. And I am very familiar with my native language. I often write some diaries and some essays.

3. I use metaphorical terms and parallelism such kind of words in my native language essay but I won't use these in English writing. In addition, in my native language essay, I can express what I want to write and also my feeling and my opinion.
4. I feel more like a elementary writer when I write in English because I only use basic sentences which are just enough to express my meaning but no logos, pathos, ethos, etc.
5. I can describe my words better when I use my native language.
6. I don't usually write in my native language and i find it hard to express myself in my native language
7. My writing in my native language is reliant on pathos more than my English writing
8. It is different because I do not know how to write in my language. I was brought up in country that was not my home country, so I am not that good at my language.
9. Orgnaziation
10. If I write in Chinese, I will not worry about the problem of grammar, just consider the expression
11. My writing in my native is filled with imagery
12. The formate and expression are totally different.
13. I have a broader vocabulary in my native language
14. huge different
15. Chinese writing is focus on the event which you write in your article. I had to describe what had happened from point to point in my writing, and the purpose is not so important you can just write it in the conclusion. American writing is focus on the relationship between the events and the main idea.
16. I sometimes find it hard to write academic essays etc... in my native language, Arabic, because it is a hard language and I find it hard to express my thoughts in Arabic.
17. In my native language, I don't need to worry about problems of grammar and vocabulary because I am an expert on this field.

Foreign language responses:

18. I consider myself to be a very good writer in my native language and understand grammar much better
19. I can utilize a wider range of vocabulary
20. When I write in foreign language, I will feel lack of vocabulary. Lack of words upsets me because I have the willingness to write more. The limitation of vocabulary may affect my mood of writing and the quality of my writing. Also, I am learning two foreign languages at the same time, so my logic of writing can be messed up sometimes. Most of the time I am very satisfied with my first draft/final draft if I write in my native language. But after I write in a foreign language, I need to revise the composition for a long time.
21. I know that my grammar is a lot better and my vocabulary is more rich in my native language.
22. I'm more descriptive in english because my french vocabulary isn't very plentiful.
23. I am a natural writer and the information I want to express just flows. I am more relaxed.
24. I am more confident in my native language because I make less mistakes and understand the grammar. Also I know an abundance of vocabulary where as in a foreign language I can't always express what I want.
25. I am more animated and descriptive with my native language

26. My writing identity in my native language, I would say, is entirely more elevated than when I write a composition in a foreign language. It's safe to say that I am not at all confident in myself when writing - or even speaking sometimes - in a foreign language.
27. I don't think I have a totally different writing identity, but I do usually have to simplify my writing style because French often has different sentence structures than English and I don't know all of the rules for the grammar in those situations. Also, because I understand English better, I find it easy to adapt my writing style to what the situation calls for, i.e. formal writing versus story-telling versus papers for class, and I can't really do that in French yet.