Too Nervous to Write? The Relationship between Anxiety and EFL Writing

Giti Mousapour Negari
University of Sistan & Baluchestan, Iran
Email: mousapour@hamoon.usb.ac.ir

Omid Talebi Rezaabadi
University of Sistan & Baluchestan, Iran
Email: omidreza1365@yahoo.com

Abstract—The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between the students' anxiety in essay writing and their writing performance in EFL context. The subjects were chosen from among 75 Iranian EFL students who took part in TOFEL proficiency test. 27 students majoring in English have been selected. They studied either English translation or English literature. The instruments to collect data were: a) Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) (Cheng, 2004) b) Open - ended questionnaire and c) Writing performance tests. The results suggested that the students felt less nervous in writing when the teacher assured them that their papers will not be scored in contrast to the time when their papers were to be scored by the teacher. In addition, the correlation between final writing test and anxiety were significantly high. The participants' responses to the open-ended questionnaire revealed that during their first stage of writing experience (when the teacher assured them that their papers will not be scored), the students had less physiological and psychological changes than their final test. The results suggested that by taking advantage of the facilitative aspect of anxiety, the students' writing performance will be improved. The study has some pedagogical implications that will be discussed in this paper.

Index Terms—low writing anxiety, writing test anxiety, writing performance, EFL writing

I. INTRODUCTION

Anxiety has been a concern for many years in language teaching and applied linguistics. In Advanced American English Longman(2005) anxiety is defined as a feeling of being very worried about something that may happen or may have happened, so that you think about it all the time or is a feeling of wanting to do something very much, but being very worried that you will not succeed. It is associated with feelings of uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, apprehension, or worry (Scovels, 1978). According to different studies in the realm of language teaching, anxiety has a relation with foreign language mastery. According to Field (2004) general anxiety is one of several affective factors which can influence attention and hence lead to deterioration in language performance.

Anxiety can have both positive and negative effects on performance (Alpert & Haber, 1960; Lehrer, Goldman, & Strommen, 1990). It plays an important role in the writing ability of EFL learners and too much of it has been one of the main problems in language teaching, but sometimes a little anxiety is needed for more concentration and accuracy of the students on their writing performance. Some laymen in EFL teaching think that anxiety should be prevented at any cost, but according to different studies such as Brown (2007), a little stress about a matter or task at hand is going to be facilitative. So, being so soft on the students may have a debilitative effect on the students, because they may be carefree and have no anxiety or concentration. Writing skill is an exacting job which needs too much time to master it skillfully. Some students who pass different courses about writing complain about some of their teachers who weren't strict enough to make them write accurately or do something for them for increasing their concentration.

There has also been a good amount of research which considers the relevance of writing anxiety in language learners from the foreign language perspective. By and large, these researchers try to discover the extent to which anxiety can affect the learning performance of students. These studies had attempted to explore the effects of anxiety on foreign language learners by taking a writing course and helpful solutions to this issue such as the ones done by Worde (2003) and Rollinson (2005).

The present study tries to investigate the relation between the students' anxiety and test anxiety and their writing performance. In the present study we're going to discuss: 1) The effect of writing anxiety on the students' writing performance; 2) The extent to which test anxiety affects the students' writing performance and; 3) The possibility which low writing anxiety may be more debilitative than the test anxiety on the students' writing performance.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Foreign Language Anxiety

Cope and Horwitz(1986) provided an explanation which described anxiety concerning foreign language anxiety as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (p.128). They recognized three kinds of anxieties as the constituents of foreign language anxiety: The fear of negative evaluation (the image which the others have about the speaker), test anxiety (the apprehension for tests, exams, pop quizzes), communication apprehension (the apprehension of speaking in a foreign language). Harwitz (2001) argued that FLA is a kind of anxiety which is situation-specific irrespective of the other kinds of anxiety but with a strong relation with language-learning context.

B. Foreign Language Anxiety Relation with Learning Variables

Foreign Language anxiety has been a real area of concern for fieldworkers because too much of it has been found harmful as it may block student's mind from thinking clearly, so there have been lots of researchers who try to avoid this, because of its negative effect on the students' performance. MacIntyre (1999), Cohen and Norst, (1989) emphasized on its traumatic effect, some others such as MacIntyre and Gardner (1994), identified it as cognitive block-blocking the students' understanding. Others found out about its influence on social context, for example, less communication in a social context (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a, 1991b; MacIntyre & Charos, 1995).

In 1992, Ryan defined anxiety as an emotional sign often reported by dyslexics. In an FL class when learners are supposed to produce the foreign language while they lack proficiency, foreign language anxiety is produced (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). Gardner et al. (1993) defined foreign language anxiety as the overall anxiety associated with the individual. Despite this definition, anxiety is viewed by some as something brought about by the class environment for achieving second language proficiency. Horwitz et al. (1986), sees language anxiety as distinguished complex of behaviors, feelings, beliefs and self-perceptions associated with class atmosphere raised from the distinct characteristic of FL learning.

C. Reasons for Having Foreign Language Anxiety

The research on foreign language anxiety suggests that roughly one-third of students experience some sort of anxiety when they are engaged in learning a foreign language (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Some foreign language researchers such as Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) observed the relation between perfectionism and foreign language anxiety. They figured out that anxious language learners and perfectionists may have some features in common such as being more anxious for their mistakes, being more self-conscious about the other's presence, more desire toward postponing their actions.

Oxford (1999) emphasized the role of teaching and learning styles and believed they may be the source of stress, in other words; the teaching styles of the teacher and the learning styles of the students maybe on the contrary. In Saito and Samimy (1996) study the role of FLA became more prominent when the levels of instructions increased. In their study the lowest score of anxiety was for the intermediate students, advanced students obtained the highest score of anxiety and for the beginners the score was between these two. Furthermore, language testing can be the reason for FL anxiety (Young, 1991; Daly, 1991). For instance, the tests which don't fit the teacher's instructions or unknown instructions of tests can lead to anxiety.

D. Writing Skill Anxiety and Test Anxiety

There had been lots of researchers who were fascinated in second language writing anxiety in this decade (Hasan, 2001; Cheng, 2002; Atay & Kurt, 2007). Cheng's (2002) ascertained two purposes for language anxiety and the skill of writing: to discover links between L2 writing anxiety and assorted individual differences and to determine whether L2 anxiety was associated with other types of anxiety, especially mother tongue writing anxiety. Cheng's 165 English majors were studying in Taiwan University; at different years (freshmen, sophomores, and juniors).These people were found to have different amounts of anxiety in L1 and L2 writing, FL language class and L1 speaking anxiety. At the end, it was concluded that L2 writing anxiety, seemed to be strongly correlated to L2 speaking anxiety, but no empirically significant correlation was found between Chinese writing anxiety and English writing. There seemed to be a much stronger relationship between anxieties experienced in different communication modes in one language than in variable languages. Writing Language anxiety in the first language did not seem to be correlated to writing anxiety in the second language, the researcher admitted that there was insignificant and low correlation between L1 and L2 writing anxiety. This fact demonstrated that these two anxiety concepts are unlike each other. Speaking anxiety was found to be negatively related with self-confidence (McCroskey et al., 1977), and also showed no relevance to writing anxiety (Klopf & Cambra, 1979).

In recent years, language field workers have assessed the influence of anxiety on foreign language skills. Late researches have demonstrated that foreign language anxiety is a general type of language anxiety which the most part is concerned with speaking. However, recent researches have proved anxiety intertwined with different language skills such as speaking, listening, reading, and writing. In a report by Spielberger and Vagg (1995) test anxiety was found situation-trait which the unlikeness of the participants in proficiency was a menace. In a report by Spielberger's (1966) 'ego threat' concept suggests a broad outline of anxiety by involving menaces to self-confidence and the outcomes of accomplishments or failing, as well as, possible disparaging assessment by others.

In 1998, Zeidner identifies three kinds of test anxiety constituents: affective: the one's assessment about his/her physiological condition (e.g. shaking, sweating, having a headache, stomachache, depression etc.); cognitive: belittling self-expressions and ideas on the part of learner such as" if I can't make it through this exam, I'll have nothing to depend on anymore" and the anxiety about some past experiences which can have a preventing effect on the student's accomplishments (e.g. some performance slips in reading as understanding the text and its questions); and behavioral: low proficiency in learning a language, dodging and delaying of a task.

E. Facilitative and Debilitative Anxiety

The important distinction that has been made between two subclasses of anxiety in different researches is between debilitative and facilitative anxiety. Debilitative anxiety is the harmful anxiety that affects the people's performance in a bad way. This kind of anxiety may stop EFL learners from trying to express themselves in both writing and speaking. In different FL studies debilitative and facilitative anxieties have been distinguished (Alpert & Haber, 1960; Kleinmann, 1977; Scovel, 1978). As the names suggest debilitative one impedes 'learning and achievements' while facilitative one improves these two.

Scovel, (1978) in his "common sense viewpoint" suggested that facilitative and debilitative anxiety can work as best as possible together. Normally these two sorts of anxiety, can function well together in 1978, Scovel claimed that in spite of the debilitative effect of anxiety, it can be facilitative according to Alpert and Haber (1960) who invented the Achievement Anxiety Test for understanding the degree of facilitative and debilitative anxiety a participant is experiencing. He believes that facilitative anxiety is used for better coping with a new task and prepares the learner emotionally for that. In contrast, the debilitative anxiety make the learner skip the new learning task. So he emphasized the debilitative anxiety causes the learner to have a kind of avoidance behavior. Twenge (2002) asserts that emotions are adjustive, so they had a kind of application for survival purposes for the one's anxiety or fear initially lead to the possible danger and physiological and psychological reactions.

Anxiety has been defined as one of the affective variables relevant to second language learning achievement (Krashen, 1982). According to Krashen (1982), "Low anxiety appears to be conducive to second language acquisition, whether measured as personal or classroom anxiety". In addition, he emphasizes the existence of the consistent relationship between all sorts of anxiety and language proficiency in both formal and informal conditions.

F. Trait Anxiety VS. State Anxiety

The research on anxiety suggests that like self-esteem, anxiety can be experienced at various levels (oxford 1999). At the deepest, or global, people are predictably and generally anxious about many things which are called their trait anxiety. At a more momentary, or situational level, state anxiety is experienced in relation to some particular event or act. As we learned in the case of self-esteem, then, it is important in a classroom for a teacher to try to determine whether a student's anxiety stems from a more global trait or whether it comes from a particular situation at the moment. According to, Spielberger (1983), state anxiety reflects a "transitory emotional state or condition of the human organism that is characterized by subjective, consciously perceived feelings of tension and apprehension, and heightened autonomic nervous system activity". In this study we mostly deal with the state anxieties, by using Cheng Inventory (2004), that the students experience in their two FL writing performances in different points in time.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

A total of 27 intermediate and advanced English majors were drawn out of 75 by TOFEL proficiency test to be the participants in this study. This research was conducted at Sistan & Baluchestan University in Iran. The participants were English students majoring in English translation or English literature and the mejority of them were juniors and seniors. It should be noted that this heterogeneity was believed to work better because of giving a clearer picture of the relation between the students' writing performance and their levels of anxiety. Both groups of English majors (literature and translation) participated a course as "Advanced Writing Composition" one time a week. The teacher instructed the students how to write essays in English language. Each session lasted for one and half an hour. Students' ages almost ranged from 18 to 26 with the average of 20. The participants' population was mostly dominated by female students, with a male-female ratio of 8 to 19 (see Table 1).

TABLE 1:
THE PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Year	Participants	Male	Female
Juniors	20	3	15
Seniors	7	3	4

B. Instrumentation

Two most significant instruments applied in this research were: the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) (Cheng, 2004) and an open-ended questionnaire with four questions. This questionnaire measures the degree

to which a person has stress when writing in L2 and involves 22-items which all of them are answered on a five-point Likert Scale, ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. SLWAI has good internal consistency, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient reported of .91(Cheng, 2004). The Cronbach alpha cooefficient for the present study for low anxiety environment and test anxiety environment were as .70 and .74 respectively. TOFEL test was also given to draw 27 intermediate and advanced English majors out of 75 to be the participants in this study.

There were lots of investigations on second language writing anxiety. Among these, the Daly–Miller Writing Apprehension Test (WAT; Daly & Miller, 1975) was the most common measurement instrument used for second language writing anxiety (e.g., Cheng et al., 1999; Lee, 2001). All in all it might be not suitable to use the Daly–Miller WAT, although it has been proved to be an instrument of adequate internal consistency reliability besides concurrent and predictive validity, it sounds to be needed for more area of research for further development for using the WAT in future researches of second language writing.

At first, the WAT was mainly invented for the first language writing anxiety, especially English native speakers. So it is maybe insufficient for the most essential dimensions of second language writing anxiety. Besides, some researchers have questioned the real validity of the WAT. McKain(1991) brought up questions about the genuine feature of the WAT as a real measure of writing anxiety. One of them was that 9 of the 26 WAT items are about the persons' self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectancies, in addition, he commented that the WAT could be determined as ''a measure of writing self-esteem just as much as a measure of writing apprehension'' (McKain 1991p. 25). McKain's comment has been supported objectively by Cheng et al.'s (1999) principal components analysis of an L2 version of the WAT. Shaver (1990) believed that opposite to Daly and Miller's (1975) who suggested one-dimensional structure, the WAT suggests a multidimensional construct, involving three aspects of L1 learners' standpoints toward writing.

Certainly, the outcomes of careful factor analyses suggest that dealing with the WAT as a particular measure of writing anxiety may be troublesome. It will be concluded that one potential solution to this deficiency is to develop in instrument for measuring writing anxiety which doesn't limit writing anxiety with self-confidence or beliefs in a person's writing. For this purpose, SLWI was found to be an improvement over WAT by having three kinds of validity: criterion, convergent, and discriminant-related validity. The items in SLWAI were applied concerning second language learners' comments of writing anxiety experiences in two kinds of environments-low anxiety environment, test anxiety environment- besides the other related anxiety assessments.

Open-ended questionnaire was comprised of four questions for the purpose of examining students self-reports of second writing anxiety experiences in the above-mentioned L2 writing environments. This questionnaire was used for the purpose of comparing the anxiety provoking situations caused by these two different kinds of L2 writing environments for suggesting student's own voices. To be more precise, students were supposed to answer these questions: 1. Name the situations and people connected with your anxiety while writing this essay (if there was any anxiety)? 2. What kind of physiological and psychological changes occurred while you were writing this essay? 3. Did you have any anxiety while writing this essay? Yes or no? Explain why in any case? 4. What will be the effect of this high or low anxiety on your writing in your future? (Will this writing have a bad effect on your future?)

C. Procedure

As mentioned above, this study focuses on the amount of correlation which exists between low writing anxiety and writing test anxiety as well as the relationship which exist between these two variables and the writing scores of English foreign language learners. For this purpose, 27 intermediate and advanced English majors were drawn out of 75 by TOFEL proficiency test to be the participants in this study. This research was conducted at Sistan & Baluchestan University in Iran. The participants were English students majoring in English translation or English literature. The students were participating in the writing English course in this semester. During their course, teacher tried to decrease the students' general writing anxiety by being supportive to them, and assigning them some writing compositions at home and gathering their papers in the next session. Without referring to anyone's name she read the papers by chance and explained the points essential for improving their writing. In their last session, students were told to write a composition about a specified topic by assuring them that this exam would have no role for their final mark and is just for the purpose of a research. These students also took the final writing test held two weeks after this test.

After each of their writing performance, they were given both the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) (Cheng, 2004) and an open-ended questionnaire with four questions to rate their levels of anxiety after each writing performance.

Three raters marked participants' L2 writing performances in two different kinds of environments at different points at a time, one was in the low anxiety environment which they were told that the results wouldn't be taken into account and the other one was in their final writing test. This research is a correlation one which looks for the amount of correlation between "low writing anxiety and test writing anxiety" and the writing performance of students, and also compares the first variables by taking account the degrees of their anxiety by descriptive statistics. In addition, this research uses the outcomes of the observed data to find out the nature of the relationship among these variables.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The SLWAIs for both writing performances were analyzed by calculating the frequencies statistics of the subjects' ratings to each item of the 22-items. In addition to, SLWAL items, the frequencies statistics of both of students' writing scores were analyzed. Some statements of the SLWAI negatively mentioned, their responses were reversed and registered, so that in all cases, a high score suggest high anxiety. T-Test was used for contrasting two English writing tests scores and the degrees of anxiety of the same students in two different environments named "low anxiety environment and final test anxiety environment". The scoring of their writing performance was carried out by using a version of analytic scoring methods of Yuji Nakamura (2004). Data collected from the open-ended questionnaires were analyzed by means of pattern coding as suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994).

Results of the inventory: As it was predicted, participants' mean score for SLWAI 22 items were lower in "low anxiety environment"- when they were told that there's no kind of evaluation- than their final "writing test". This fact gave rise to judging these participants in two environments, namely "low anxiety environment" with the lower mean score of 2.3300 and "writing test anxiety" with the higher mean score of 2.8081. A closer look at the results showed that students demonstrated highest anxiety for item '9. If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade' by the mean scores of 3.0370 and 3.5926 for "low anxiety environment" and "writing test anxiety" respectively. This was when the highest mean score for physical symptoms were for number 19 with 2.0000 and 2.6667 as the above mentioned order, while the lowest mean scores for the physical symptoms were 1.7407, and 2.6296 for item 2 according to the previously-mentioned order in these two writing situations. Item 19 was about student's feelings of body tenseness or rigidness, while number 2 was about feeling heart pounding under time constraint. It was also discovered that the highest rating for skewness was also for item 19 with 1.686 and 1.067 in the same order for these writing performances as already mentioned.

T-test results revealed that among all 27 participants, anxiety levels for low anxiety environment increased .4781 points for final writing test. The standard deviations for these two writing performances anxiety levels reveal that subjects were more variable with respect to their "low anxiety environment" than final "writing test". Pearson correlation between these above-mentioned variables is, .733 almost a good correlation. Since the significance value for change in anxiety levels is less than 0.05, we can conclude that the increase of .733 points of participants' anxiety levels in their final writing test is not due to chance variation, and can be attributed to different levels of anxiety for the same participants of study. To be more specific refer to Table 2.

TABLE 2: T-TEST
PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total Low Anxiety Mean Score	2.3300	22	.39905	.08508
Total Test Anxiety Mean Score	2.8081	22	.33297	.07099

TABLE 3:
PAIRED SAMPLES CORRELATIONS

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Total low anxiety mean score & Total Test Anxiety Mean Score	22	.733	.000

TABLE 4: T-TEST
PAIRED SAMPLES STATISTICS

| | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Total low anxiety mean score – Total Test Anxiety Score	-.47812	.27430	.05848	-.59973	-.35650	-8.176	21	.000

Results of the questionnaire: The first question aimed at observing the difficulties faced by the participants while writing in L2 in these two different L2 writing situations. Descriptive statistics presented in Table 3 suggest that there are differences among the participants' understanding of problems during these two L2 writing processes. Although "No anxiety-provoking factor" with the number of 13 was the most common answer in "Low Anxiety Environment", this answer was just 1 in "writing test anxiety". The following represents the details.

TABLE 5:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTION 1

No anxiety-provoking factor	Low Anxiety Environment 13	writing test anxiety 1
My grade	1	7
Being panic for time constraint	3	6
Not liking the protractor	0	4
Competitiveness in handing their papers	1	3

In the second question, the students were asked about their physiological and psychological reactions to their L2 writing experiences. Participants' comments about sweating and shaking stomachache for L2 writing process in Low Anxiety Environment was 0 and 0, while for the other writing process was 3 and 2 respectively. These comments were while being scared was predominantly mentioned with the ratio of 14 to 1 for final writing test and low anxiety environment.

TABLE 6:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTION 2

Sweating	Low Anxiety Environment 0	Writing test anxiety 3
Shaking stomachache	0	2
No changes	15	1
Happy	4	2
A bit shaking	3	2
Scared	1	14

The third question dealt with whether students were anxious during their writing process or not, and if yes, explain their reasons? Table 7 suggests that the highest rate of answers were for 'no anxiety' in low anxiety environment with the number of 8, while the answers were 3 for this comment in final writing test. One of the conspicuous things of this table was the number of 6 answers for 'Time limit' in final writing situation, whereas this number was just 1 in low anxiety environment.

TABLE 7:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTION 3

No anxiety	Low Anxiety Environment test anxiety 8	Writing 3
Relaxed for not being evaluated	5	0
Just natural stress	5	1
Being weak bothered me	3	5
Time limit	1	6
Yes because of scaring of bad grades	1	5
No because of having good concentration	2	4
No because of being familiar with the topic	0	3

The last question dealt with the future effects of that writing process on their future, if any. As can be seen in Table 8, 'no effect' has received the highest scores in low anxiety environment ,when being effective and improving themselves for their future got the highest scores in writing test situation.

TABLE 8:
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTION 4

No effect	Low Anxiety Environment 8	Writing test anxiety 4
Because of low anxiety not a bad effect	4	1
Effective for preparing us for future exams	6	8
Good for improving ourselves	5	8
This degree of anxiety improves concentration	2	4

Writing Scores Results: Table 9 gives a breakdown of different scores for writing parts in low anxiety environment. This table suggests the lowest mean score for content (2.0556), while the highest one is for Vocabulary (2.4722). It is conspicuous that organization has the highest variance rating, with the most extreme value of 4 among these writing parts. Although the difference of sum between Grammar and Cohesion is about 2 points, this difference is 5 for Vocabulary and Organization.

TABLE 9:
PARTICIPANTS' WRITING SCORES FOR LOW ANXIETY ENVIRONMENT

	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Grammar	Cohesion	Total Score
N Valid	27	27	27	27	27	27
Mean	2.0556	2.2870	2.4722	2.1852	2.1204	11.1944
Std. Error of Mean	.14393	.14415	.14268	.13250	.13302	.58369
Std. Deviation	.74786	.74905	.74140	.68848	.69119	3.03294
Variance	.559	.561	.550	.474	.478	9.199
Minimum	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	5.00
Maximum	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	16.25
Sum	55.50	61.75	66.75	59.00	57.25	302.25

Table 10 demonstrates frequencies of different parts of writing scores in Test Anxiety Environment. This table indicates the lowest mean score for grammar (2.2963), while vocabulary mean score is the highest one (3.0648) in final

writing test. In addition to mean score, the lowest rating for the most extreme score is for the grammar. Though the highest Variance is for content (.381), the lowest one is for vocabulary (.210). While the difference between grammar and vocabulary sums, is the most significant one 20.75 points, this difference is just 1.75 in the case of grammar and cohesion.

TABLE 10:
PARTICIPANTS' WRITING SCORES IN THE CASE OF BEING IN TEST ANXIETY ENVIRONMENT

	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Grammar	Cohesion	Total Score
N Valid	27	27	27	27	27	27
Mean	2.6481	2.7130	3.0648	2.2963	2.3611	13.0833
Std. Error of Mean	.11880	.11299	.08810	.09152	.10015	.37387
Std. Deviation	.61730	.58714	.45780	.47554	.52042	1.94269
Variance	.381	.345	.210	.226	.271	3.774
Minimum	1.50	1.75	2.50	1.00	1.00	8.00
Maximum	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	17.00
Sum	71.50	73.25	82.75	62.00	63.75	353.25

Table 11 gives information about t-test results concerning writing scores of participants in Low Anxiety Environment and Final Writing Test. T-test demonstrates significant difference between these two writing scores. Among all 27 participants, their writing mean score for final writing test had an increase of 1.8889 points in comparison with low anxiety environment. Pearson correlation of two different previously-mentioned writing scores was .623, an almost medium correlation. Because of the significant value for change is .000 less than 0.05, it is concluded that an increase of 1.8889 points in final writing scores can't be by chance alone, but can prove different L2 writing scores for the same participants of study in the above mentioned L2 writing situations. To be more specific refer to table 11.

TABLE 11:
T-TEST FOR WRITING SCORES IN LOW ANXIETY ENVIRONMENT AND FINALWRITING TEST

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Low Anxiety Writing score	11.1944	27	3.03294	.58369
Test Anxiety Writing Score	13.0833	27	1.94269	.37387

TABLE 12:
PAIRED SAMPLES CORRELATIONS

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Low Anxiety Writing Score & Test Anxiety Writing Score	27	.623	.001

TABLE 13:
PAIRED SAMPLE T-TEST

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	T	df	
Low Anxiety Writing Score - Test Anxiety Writing Score	-1.88889	2.37407	.45689	-2.82804	-.94974	-4.134	26	.000

V. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to see the effect of the facilitative anxiety on the writing ability of the EFL learners. This research was to prove that by taking advantage of the facilitative aspect of anxiety (here final test writing anxiety), students can improve their concentration and finally writing performance. For this purpose, this study measured the degree of students' anxiety levels in two L2 writing situations namely "low writing anxiety" and "writing test anxiety". As it was expected, students experienced less anxiety in their low writing anxiety environment _ when they were told that there's no evaluation for them_ than their final writing test. Results of inventory also revealed that in both "low anxiety environment" and "writing test anxiety environment" participants indicated highest anxiety for getting a poor grade. By achieving this unplanned result, it is concluded that telling participants that they wouldn't be graded in their first L2 writing performance was a good reason for reducing their anxiety and categorizing their writing environment as "low anxiety writing environment".

T-test results suggested significant difference among the participants' writing anxiety levels in these two different kinds of situations namely "low anxiety environment" and "writing test anxiety" by demonstrating the increase of 4781 points for final writing test. By indicating more variability concerning "low anxiety environment" than final "writing test" it can be understood that students' anxiety experiences were less in common in low anxiety environment than final writing test. In addition, because of the significant value of .000 is less than 0.05, it will be perceived that the increase of anxiety levels in participant's final writing test is not by chance.

Regarding L2 writing parts scores, the lowest mean score for different writing parts is for content (2.0556) in low anxiety environment, while the lowest one is for grammar (2.2963) in writing test situation. It suggests that under lower pressure of anxiety, students don't take the content as seriously as they should. This was when vocabulary mean score was the highest in both above-mentioned writing performances. It was also found out that when students had less anxiety-in low anxiety environment- they had the highest variance for their organization and the lowest one for grammar. This was while, students highest and lowest variability were for content and vocabulary respectively in L2 final writing situation.

In respect of L2 total writing scores, significant increase of 1.8889 points was found in participants Final Writing Test in contrast with their first writing performance in low anxiety environment. By achieving the significant change value of .000, validity of this increase of points was proved.

Finally, from the above-mentioned results, it will be perceived that when students experienced higher levels of L2 writing anxiety in their final writing test achieved higher scores in comparison with their first writing performance in low anxiety environment with much lower levels of anxiety.

VI. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated whether or not writing performance amongst Iranian EFL learners in Sistan & Baluchestan university is relevant to low writing anxiety and test writing anxiety, and to discover the relation between these different degrees of anxiety to see which of them are more facilitative to their L2 writing performance. It was found out that the students writing marks were higher in the case of having higher anxiety in the final writing test compared to their writing performance in the case of having low writing anxiety .When students were experiencing higher anxiety in their final exam their marks weren't just better in one part of their writing but in all parts.

Anxiety similar to a lot of abstract mental concepts, the more care is devoted to, the more questions will be risen. Study by Dave Putwain (2008) suggests that some highly test-anxious students try more than low test-anxious students as a compensatory factor; and some have sufficient study skills, while some do not. It may be concluded that most of the students need some degree of anxiety and suggest that writing requires some kind of concentration that happens by some amount of that facilitative anxiety. Scholars and teachers should know that some students become highly anxious about L2 writing, and this is associated with the class environment and their teacher. So It is essential that they look for pedagogic ways of lessening it in a way in which doesn't make students so carefree that they don't even concentrate on their tasks, especially in the case of their L2 writing.

One of the questionable aspects of this study was deleting the listening part of a general proficiency test seen as something irrelevant to the writing performance but the results might have been different if I had used an overall proficiency test for participants' selection.

In summary, this study suggests that if teachers know how to deal with their students' anxiety, giving the test to them can improve their concentration and finally their writing performance in English. The proper control of anxiety by teachers in the case of taking L2 writing test can't be debilitative but even facilitative for their writing performance.

REFERENCES

[1] Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (2nd edition).(2005). Cambrige University Press, Cambridge.
[2] Alpert, R., & Haber, R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61*(2), 207-215.
[3] Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5th edition). White Plains, NY:Pearson.
[4] Cheng, Y.-S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*, 647–656.
[5] Cheng, Y.-S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 313-335
[6] Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 417-446.
[7] Cohen, Y. & Norst, M. J. (1989). Fear, dependence, and loss of self-esteem: Affective barriers in among adults. *RELC Journal, 20*, 61-77.
[8] Daly, J. (1991). Understanding communication apprehension: An introduction for language educators. *In Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*, edited by E.K. Horwitz and D.J. Young, pp. 3-13. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
[9] Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument of writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 9*, 242–249
[10] Field, J. (2004). Psycholinguistics: the key concepts. Routleldge, Taylor & Francis Books Ltd.
[11] Gardner, RC. & MacIntyre, P.D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*, 2, 157-194
[12] Gregersen, T.S. & Horwitz, E.K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 562-570.
[13] Hassan, B. (2001). The Relationship of Writing Apprehension and Self-Esteem to the Writing Quality and Quantity of EFL University Students. *Mansoura Faculty of Education Journal, 39*, 1-36.
[14] Horwitz, E.K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 559-562

[15]   Horwitz, E.K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21,* 112-126
[16]   Horwitz, E.K., Horwitz, M.B. & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*, 125-132.
[17]   Kleinmann, H. (1977). Avoidance behaviour in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 27*, 93-107.
[18]   Klopf, D. W., & Cambra, R.E. (1979). Communication apprehension among college students in America, Australia, Japan, and Korea. *Journal of Psychology, 102*, 27-31
[19]   Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Pergamon Press.
[20]   Kurt, G., & Atay, D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL, *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 3*(1)*,* 12-23.
[21]   Lee, S.-Y. (2001). The relationship of writing apprehension to the revision process and topic preference: A student perspective. In P.-H. Chen & Y.-N. Leung (Eds.), *Selected papers from the tenth international symposium on English teaching* (pp. 504–516). Taipei, Taiwan: Crane.
[22]   Lehrer, P. M., Goldman, N. S & Strommen, E. F. (1990). A principle components assessment of performance anxiety among musicians. *Medical Problems of Performing Artists*, 5(1), 12-18
[23]   MacIntyre, P.D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24–45). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
[24]   MacIntyre, P.D. & Charos, C. (1995). Personality, motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of second language communication. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Psychological Association, Charlottetown PEI.
[25]   MacIntyre, P.D. & Gardner, R.C. (1991a). Methods and results in the study of anxiety in language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, *41*, 85-117.
[26]   MacIntyre, P.D. & Gardner, R.C. (1991b). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused essay technique. *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 296-304.
[27]   McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: a summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Resarch*, *4* (1), 78-96.
[28]   McKain, T. L. (1991). Cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors in writing anxiety. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
[29]   Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
[30]   Oxford, R. (1999). "Style wars" as a source of anxiety in language classrooms. In *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere,* edited by D.J. Young, pp. 216 237. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill College.
[31]   Nakamura, Yuji, (2004). A comparison of holistic and analytic scoring methods in the assessment of writing. Retrieved March 30, 2009, from http://jalt.org/pansig/2004/HTML/Nakamura.htm
[32]   Putwain, D.W. (2008a). Deconstructing test anxiety. *Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties, 13*, 141–155.
[33]   Spielberger, C.D. (1966). Theory and research on anxiety. In C.D. Spielberger (Ed.) *Anxiety and behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
[34]   Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30.
[35]   Saito, Y. & Samimy, K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29*, 239-251.
[36]   Scovel, T. 1978. The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning, 28* (1), 129-141.
[37]   Shaver, J.P. (1990). Reliability and validity of measures of attitudes toward writing and toward writing with the computer. *Written Communication, 7*, 375–392.
[38]   Spielberger, C. D. (1966). Theory and research on anxiety. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.). *Anxiety and behavior* (pp. 3-20). New York: Academic Press.
[39]   Spielberger, C.D. & Vagg, R.P. (1995). Test anxiety. Bristol: Taylor & Francis.
[40]   Wörde von R. (2003). Students' perspectives on foreign language anxiety. *Inquiry, 8* (1), 21-40.
[41]   Young, D.J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does the anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 426-439.
[42]   Zeidner, M. (1998). Test anxiety: The state of the art. New York: Plenum.

Giti Mousapour Negari is an Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics in University of Sistan & Baluchestan.

She received her BA in English Language teaching, University of Sistan & Baluchestan in 1992. She then got her MA in TEFL from Tehran University in 1996. She received her doctoral degree in Applied Linguistics from Isfahan University, Iran, in 2006.

She has published in Iranian as well as International professional journals in different fields such as psycholinguistics, English language skills, English Teaching methods, strategy instruction and lexical acquisition. Dr Mousapour has presented papers in International conferences such as CamTESOL Conference on English Language Teaching 2012, TESOL Asia & Asian EFL Journal International TESOL Conference 2011. In addition, she has authored books in related fields.

Omid Talebi Rezaabadi is an MA student studying TEFL in the University of Sistan and Baluchestan.

He got his BA in TEFL in Bahonar University. He has taught English language to the students at different levels for at least 6 years in Language Institutes.