



Castledown

 OPEN ACCESS

Language Education & Assessment

ISSN 2209-3591

<https://www.castledown.com/journals/lea/>

Language Education & Assessment, 3(2), 58–84 (2020)

<https://doi.org/10.29140/lea.v3n2.357>

English writing anxiety and preservice teacher' written corrective feedback



QIN XIE ^a

JUNTING YUAN ^b

^a *The Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*
qxie@eduhk.hk

^b *The Education University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*
s1117806@s.eduhk.hk

Abstract

This study investigated the English writing anxiety experienced by preservice English as second/foreign language teachers in Hong Kong, and its impact on their written corrective feedback (WCF). A total of 34 highly proficient preservice teachers responded to the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (Cheng, 2004), which measured writing anxiety in three dimensions (i.e., cognitive, somatic and avoidance anxiety). Ten were selected to provide WCF to a sample student writing and receive an individual interview immediately afterwards. Over half of the 34 participants were found suffering from moderate or high levels of writing anxiety, especially in the cognitive dimension. Compared to their less apprehensive peers who adopted more indirect feedback, highly anxious student teachers had a clear preference to direct and comprehensive feedback. Their WCF practices were found affected by five factors, including their conception of English writing, concerns of teacher professional credibility and work ethics, concerns of student cognition and motivation, confidence in students' ability, and their feedback experience as students and student teacher during teaching practicum. These factors were synthesized into a grounded-theory model of four internal forces that drive student teachers towards either a focus-on-form, direct, comprehensive approach to WCF or a broad-based, indirect and selective approach. Suggestions were made for further research.

Keywords: second language writing anxiety, ESL pre-service teacher, written corrective feedback

Introduction

Learning to write in a second or foreign language (S/FL) is challenging, which involves complex cognitive, metacognitive, and affective processes. Research into language learners' writing anxiety or apprehension and its impact on their performance is abundant (e.g., Al-Sawalha and Chow, 2012; Daud, Daud & Kassim, 2016), but studies focusing the writing anxiety of language teachers remain in paucity. Amongst the few available research studies, Ada and Campoy (2004) investigated teachers suffering

Copyright: © 2020 Qin Xie and Junting Yuan. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within this paper.

from writing apprehension and found evidence that writing apprehension had a debilitating impact on their teaching behaviors, including, for instance, ineffective instructional strategies and anxiety-generating responses to students' work. Understanding preservice teachers' extent of writing anxiety and alleviating it before they enter the classroom to teach is thus important. This study investigated S/FL preservice English teachers' degrees of English writing anxiety, its impact on their written corrective feedback (WCF) and the factors explaining the links between ESL writing anxiety and teachers' feedback practices.

Literature Review

Second/foreign language learners' writing anxiety

Second/foreign language (S/FL) learners face multiple challenges, including those of linguistic, rhetorical, strategic, and cultural barriers, which could lead to their feelings of uneasiness, distress, confusion or anxiety (Zhang & Zhong, 2002). S/FL writing anxiety is described as a mixture of feelings, attitudes or behaviors that interfere with one's ability to perform a writing task that s/he is actually capable of doing (Al-Sawalha & Chow, 2012). Cheng (2004) operationalized L2 writing anxiety in terms of three dimensions including somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior. Somatic anxiety entails trembling, perspiring and other physiological arousals; cognitive anxiety describes negative perceptions towards writing, including pessimistic expectations and over-concern about others' comments; avoidance behavior refers to the tendency to avoid situations involving composing or writing.

Several factors have been identified that could lead to writing anxiety. Cognitive and linguistic factors, such as learners' inadequate development of vocabulary knowledge, language structure and content (Daud & Kassim, 2016), lack of writing practice (Rabadi & Rabadi, 2020), were found to generate anxiety and inhibit composition performance. Affective factors such as insufficient confidence in the target language (or negative writing self-efficacy), averseness towards writing, apprehension of criticism and fear of being evaluated were also observed among anxious writers (Cheng, Howtitz, & Cshallert, 1999; Vanhile, Gregory, & Corser, 2017; Rabadi & Rabadi, 2020). Meanwhile, factors of individual difference, such as age, gender and socio-economic status were also found to associate with different levels of writing anxiety (Huwari & Aziz, 2011). In addition, contextual factors associated with teachers, instructional practices and peers, including discouraging or harsh teaching styles, uninterested writing topics and unfamiliar formats, and overtly negative or inadequate teacher feedback, could also trigger writing anxiety (Liu & Ni, 2015). Finally, factors at the individual level are likely to interact with contextual features and learning environment (e.g., family and parental influence, school teacher impact), leading to various types and degrees of writing and foreign language anxiety (Güneyli, 2016; Yan & Horwitz, 2008).

Such writing anxiety could initiate a pessimistic attitude towards and beliefs of writing that could also lead to learners' low expectations of and little confidence in their own works, and a failure to consider writing as functional or artistic. Hassan (2001) studied EFL Egyptian tertiary students and found that those with high writing anxiety viewed writing as unrewarding and traumatic. Both Ada and Campoy (2004) and MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) observed negative impact of writing anxiety on EFL learners' writing processes, including behavioral symptoms such as avoidance, hesitation and procrastination.

A large number of studies, such as Book (1976), Erkan and Saban (2011), Kitano (2001), Liu and Ni (2015), Onwuegbuzie *et al.* (1999), and Sabti *et al.* (2019), investigated the link between writing anxiety and performance and found a negative association consistently. Apprehensive writers' works tend to have a lower quality and more errors; they are less developed, shorter and syntactically

incomplete, whilst writers with low anxiety wrote better with fewer errors and produced more paragraphs and words. Sanders-Reio *et al.* (2014) identified apprehension of grammar, a sub-construct of writing anxiety and also associated with poorer writing performance.

More recently, researchers (i.e., Abdullah *et al.*, 2018; Arindra & Ardi, 2020; Erdogan, 2017; Jeon, 2018) started to experiment with various teaching and learning methods to reduce EFL learners' writing anxiety, such as familiarizing them with assessment rubrics ahead of writing, providing feedback via computer supported learning system, and making writing instruction more learner-centered and collaborative.

Compared with the above-mentioned extensive research into learners' writing anxiety, there is very little research regarding S/FL teachers' own writing anxiety and how it could affect their writing instruction.

S/FL teachers' writing anxiety

Although S/FL teachers are usually advanced learners highly proficient in the language they teach, therefore, are less likely to suffer from writing anxiety, existing studies (e.g., Daly, Vangelisti & Witte, 1988; Zerey, 2013) found writing apprehension among pre- and in-service teachers in both L1 and S/FL settings.

Investigation into the links between teachers' writing anxiety and writing instruction, however, was largely restricted to L1 contexts and mostly conducted in the 80s. For instance, Bizzaro & Toler (1986) noticed that apprehensive writing teachers tended to avoid conferences with students about their composition and discourage their students from making discoveries in their writings, which were disadvantageous for students to learn to write and develop a willingness to write. Daly, Vangelisti & Witte (1988) found that highly apprehensive instructors tended to highlight mechanical structures, while teachers with little anxiety placed more value on students' creativity.

Within the S/FL contexts, there is a paucity of research along this line of investigation (Zerey, 2013). Our systematic search in three scholarly databases—ERIC, Scopus, and Google Scholar—with combinations of key words (i.e., teacher, writing anxiety, writing instruction) only identified four studies focusing on teachers' writing anxiety. Tracking the references of these studies did not turn out more research focusing on this topic. Atay and Kurt (2006) studied preservice Turkish English teachers and found the majority suffered from a moderate to high degree of writing anxiety with the somatic dimension being the most severe. Their highly anxious participants reported their anxiety stemming primarily from the product-oriented writing instruction and inadequate past experience with writing. Similarly, Zerey (2013) found the majority of his participants experienced high or moderate level of writing anxiety and very few did not feel anxious about writing. The reasons underlying their anxiety were rather similar to those reviewed in the previous section. Erdogan (2017) experimented with cooperative writing activities to evaluate their effects in reducing the writing anxiety of preservice school teachers and found the intervention effective. Kurt and Atay (2007) investigated prospective Turkish teachers' writing anxiety and its relation with the type of feedback they received. Participants receiving peer feedback were found to have experienced much less anxiety than those receiving feedback from teachers.

However, none of the studies within S/FL contexts extended their investigation to examine the impact of teachers' writing anxiety on their teaching, or specific pedagogic or assessment decisions they made, such as the written correct feedback they gave to students.

Research on teacher written corrective feedback

Existing research on teachers' written corrective feedback (WCF) (e.g., Bruton, 2009; Furneaux *et al.*, 2007; Guenette, 2012; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Lee, 2008; Ferris, 2003) investigated their feedback practices and the effects on students' learning. Findings of this line of research revealed that writing instructors, both pre- and in-service teachers from multiple education contexts, tended to adopt comprehensive correction, overuse direct correction and over-emphasize lexical elements in their WCF (e.g., Furneaux, Paran & Fairfax, 2007; Lee, 2008). The comprehensive approach to error correction was found to be labor intensive, ineffective, and above all, harmful to learners' English language development (Guenette, 2012; Lee, 2008). Direct error correction was also found to shun students from active engagement in the error correction process.

Based on the research evidence, writing teachers are recommended to view L2 writing as instances of language learners' exploration and application of language rules, to exercise tolerance to surface errors in student writing, to adopt indirect over direct error correction to engage students in problem solving and developing editing skills (Bruton, 2009; Ferris, 2003), to shift from a form-focused to a meaning-centred approach with balanced coverage of feedback on content, structure, style and other crucial constitutions of writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), and to balance positive and negative comments (Xie & Lei, 2019).

Factors affecting teachers' WCF practices and their innovative attempts to adopt research-based feedback principles were also explored. Lee's investigation in Hong Kong secondary schools (2008), for instance, found teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards writing could be a determinant of their feedback strategies. Another factor she labeled as "accountability" (p.79) was also found crucial. As she described, because teachers' written feedback was regularly inspected and evaluated by school administrators, they had to be careful to protect themselves from criticisms. This "accountability" factor generated in teachers a mixture of fear, bitterness and a sense of disempowerment reminiscent of the cognitive anxiety in Cheng (2004). The fear of being evaluated and criticized, over-concern of others' views conditioned their feedback to conform to existing feedback practices in schools that focus on linguistic accuracy and favored detailed and exhaustive corrections.

At the institution level, teachers' determination to take up the new feedback approach, their knowledge about alternative assessment and feedback strategies, shared beliefs and collaborative efforts among teachers, and the support of school leaders were found to be facilitative, whereas their inadequate understanding of feedback, lack of assessment competence and professional collaboration, inadequate school support, conflicting beliefs between teachers and school administrators about assessment purposes, and school policies that demanded detailed and comprehensive error feedback were found to inhibit teachers from adopting research-based feedback principles.

The above-mentioned studies revealed an extensive range of cognitive and macro context factors affecting teacher feedback practices, but the affective factors, such as teachers' own anxiety of writing in English, was scarcely researched. Nor did the research draw on insights from second language acquisition (especially research on emotions) to understand the impact of negative emotion on teacher WCF.

We argue that exploring how teachers' writing anxiety influences their WCF holds both practical and theoretical significance. Teachers play an important role in molding students' perceptions of writing. A number of research had found students' writing anxiety was associated with teachers' feedback practice (e.g., Tsao *et al.*, 2017; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Di Loreto & Kim, 2013), attesting to the significance of further investigation into teachers' writing anxiety and its impact on their written

feedback. Research along this line could inform teacher education so that preventative measures and support could be made available to those in need in a timely manner. Such investigation could also be of theoretical interest to extend our understanding of the mechanism of writing anxiety and its far-reaching impact on students through their S/FL teachers.

In light of the gap in the literature and its importance, the present research attempted to draw on insights from the two lines of research (on writing anxiety and on WCF) to investigate the anxiety status of preservice English language teachers and how their anxiety levels and other individual factors may influence their feedback practices.

To start investigating this scarcely researched focus, we attempted to answer three exploratory research questions:

1. To what extent do preservice teachers experience ESL writing anxiety? Which type of writing anxiety is the most severe?
2. What are the differences, if any, between the high- and low-anxious teachers in their WCF practices?
3. What are the other factors contributing to their differences in giving feedback?

Methodology

A mixed-method approach was employed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data sequentially. The quantitative data was collected with a questionnaire to assess participants' levels of writing anxiety (RQ1) and an evaluative task to assess their WCF practices (RQ2). The qualitative data collected via interviews were used to explore the factors contributing to the differences in the feedback between teachers with high and low degrees of writing anxiety (RQ3). With the explanatory design of mixed-method research, the quantitative data provided a general picture of the research problem, while the subsequent qualitative data provided explanations underlying the observed differences (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018).

Participants

The researchers recruited 34 student teachers, including 31 (91.76%) females and three (8.82%) males who had just completed one semester (20 weeks) of teaching practicum in secondary schools in Hong Kong. They were young adults aged between 20 and 24 years old ($M = 22.65$). All participants, except one, had Chinese (Cantonese or Mandarin) as their mother tongue; the exception had Japanese as his first language. Participants had at least 15 years of English learning ($M=18.15$) but had never stayed in English-speaking countries for more than one year. The majority (88%) had taken a formal English proficiency test (IELTS) and attained high scores (i.e., Band 7 and above). They reported having practical experience of giving written feedback on students' writing and having learned how to provide written feedback from their school mentors during the teaching practicum. They also declared not receiving any formal instruction on writing feedback.

Data collection

A questionnaire was given at the beginning of the spring term in 2020 to the participants. Based on their anxiety scores, we selected ten participants, including five highly apprehensive and five least anxious ones (Table 1). The ten participants provided written feedback to a sample student writing and received an interview individually immediately after completing the feedback task. Each interview lasted for 20-25 minutes and was conducted in the interviewees' preferred language to render naturalness, accuracy and explicitness.

Table 1 Selected participants

Participant code	Gender	Age	L1	Years of learning English	IELTS score	SLWAI score
H1	Female	23	Mandarin	18	7.5	88
H2	Female	22	Mandarin	18	8	81
H3	Female	23	Cantonese	18	7.5	87
H4	Female	22	Cantonese	17	7.5	84
H5	Female	23	Mandarin	16	7	82
L1	Female	22	Mandarin	17	8	44
L2	Male	22	Cantonese	20	8	38
L3	Female	23	Cantonese	21	N/A	39
L4	Female	22	Cantonese	21	8	37
L5	Female	24	Mandarin	18	7	45

Instrumentation

Three instruments were employed. The first was the questionnaire (in Appendix 1) modified from Cheng's (2004) Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) to survey participants' background information and assessed their levels of writing anxiety. The second was a WCF task (Appendix 2), which required the participants to provide written feedback to a sample student work. The final instrument was a set of questions used during the semi-structured interviews (Appendix 3).

Questionnaire

SLWAI was chosen to assess participants' extent of SL writing anxiety because it had a high internal consistency (i.e., an overall Cronbach alpha coefficient of .91) and had been adopted by a number of research (e.g., Abdullah *et al.*, 2018; Arindra & Ardi, 2020; Atay & Kurt, 2006; Kurt & Atay, 2007; Rabadi & Rabadi, 2020; Sabti *et al.*, 2019; Zerey, 2013). The instrument has 22 items on a five-point Likert scale from *strongly agree* (5) to *strongly disagree* (1). Minor modifications were applied to the wording of the items from SLWAI so as to accommodate the context of the study. For instance, we adjusted the title to be *English Writing Anxiety Inventory* and added a section to solicit participants' demographic information and scores on formal English proficiency tests. We replaced the word *composition(s)* with *essay(s)* because the latter is a more familiar term in our context, which corresponds to the most frequent type of academic assignments they encountered in university. We also removed one item from the pool, that is, "I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions." Because essay writing was obligatory in our context, its avoidance did not seem to be relevant. Finally, we prepared a bilingual version of the questionnaire for our participants.

WCF evaluation task

The sample writing, on which the participants commented and provided written feedback, has 150 words and contains problems in language, content and organization (see Appendix 2). Participants were invited to offer any written feedback they considered appropriate and helpful to the writer (a pseudo secondary student) in 15 minutes. 15-minute was found in our pilot testing to be sufficient for performing this task. Setting a time limit could help reduce the variance of resultant WCF due to participants spending too little or too much time on the task. All participants in the main study spent close to 15 minutes on the task and no one requested for more time. A detailed explanation was also given to help them understand the writing requirements to fulfil which the sample work was produced. Participants were also allowed to access any supporting information necessary for performing the task (e.g., access to the Internet or English dictionaries). This allowance was to simulate a real-life condition

within which teachers work on students' writing samples. Because the research was conducted during COVID-19 quarantine period (Jan-Mar 2020), the participants performed the feedback task and received an interview via an online conference application (i.e., Zoom). The second author observed each participant's entire feedback processes, took notes and video-recorded the whole processes.

Semi-structured interviews

The interview guide (Appendix 3) enabled the interviewer to gather information from fixated yet communicative and conversational interactions with each interviewee (Magnusson & Marecek, 2015). During the interview, the participants were asked to recall their own experience with English writing and the feedback they received and to clarify and justify the feedback strategies they adopted in performing the WCF task.

Data analysis

Analysis of questionnaire data

Statistical analysis was conducted on the data from SLWAI to answer RQ1. To start with, we evaluated the reliability of the measure via Cronbach's alpha for the whole scale and the three subscales. The overall internal consistency ($\alpha = .94$), and that of the subscales are excellent. Cronbach alpha was .89 for the cognitive anxiety (including eight items of 1, 3, 6, 8, 13, 16, 19, and 20), .88 for the somatic anxiety (including seven items of 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, and 18) and .85 for the avoidance dimension (including six items of 4, 9, 11, 15, 17, and 21).

To enable comparison with previous research adopting SLWAI, we rescaled the total anxiety score from 105 (with 21 items) to 110 (with 22 items). We then computed descriptive statistics (i.e., means, standard deviations and percentages) of participants' total anxiety scores and subscale scores. Normalized subscale scores (i.e., averaged aggregated scores for all items in each scale) were compared to identify the most severe dimension of anxiety.

Afterwards, we computed the distribution of high, medium and low anxiety participants according to the cut-off scores set by the two previous studies¹. Atay and Kurt (2006) used one SD below and one above the mean as their cut-off scores (which are 58 and 83 respectively) for deciding low vs. high anxiety levels; Zerey (2013) used the cut-offs scores of 57 and 75 to decide the low and high anxiety levels. His cut-off score for the lower end was similar to Atay and Kurt but that for the higher end was much lower (75 vs. 83). Following the two research, we selected ten participants whose total anxiety scores were below or above the mean by one standard deviation to represent participants with low or high ESL writing anxiety.

Paired t-test was adopted to identify the most dominant anxiety type among the three subscales.

Analysis of text data: WCF practices

The participants' WCF practices were analyzed to answer RQ2. Textual analysis was based on feedback points identified at the outset according to Hyland (2003). A feedback point was defined as any comment, underlining, circling or correction made on students' written products. Lee (2008) elaborated that feedback offered to a written mistake or a comment that constitutes a meaningful unit is one feedback point. All feedback points were then categorized in terms of their *focus* (on form, content or organization), *type of corrective strategies* (direct correction, indirect coded or indirect uncoded correction) and scope of correction (comprehensive or selective marking).

Feedback points focusing on form refer to corrections of linguistic errors on tense, sentence structure, vocabulary/spelling, and mechanics. Feedback focus on content concerns task fulfillment, that is, the writing has covered all required content in the instruction. For instance, one teacher commented “*lack of important information (see the special remarks on online selling)*” to indicate that the sample writing did not provide required information concerns online selling; another feedback concerning content was, “*The writing has a lot of good content. You have given lots of details about the event.*” Feedback focus on organization refers to error corrections or comments concerning logic development of ideas and cohesion. For instance, the remark “*you’d better move it to another paragraph,*” and the one, “*the coherence could be improved through using more connectives or linking words.*” were both considered feedback on the organization. Participants’ correction scope (comprehensive vs. selective) was decided both in terms of the exhaustiveness of their error correction and according to their responses in the interview. Only the participants who explicitly stated that they intentionally provided feedback selectively were considered adopting the selective approach. This consideration was to exclude those who adopted the comprehensive approach but skipped some errors unintentionally.

Coding of the feedback points was conducted by two researchers independently after a thorough discussion of the coding framework. Their coding agreements were computed as Kappa coefficients ($M = .96$; range = .79 to 1.00), which reached an excellent level of agreement. Raw counts of feedback points were normalized as the percentages of their total feedback points before being compared across the two groups. Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to compare frequency counts of different categories of feedback points across the two anxiety groups.

Analysis of interview data

The interview data was transcribed fully and coded thematically (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015) to respond to RQ3. Specifically, two researchers first read and re-read the transcripts, identified words and phrases relevant to the research focus, and assigned codes to them. Afterwards, they worked together to examine the codes, simplify and merge similar ones, resolve differences, and combined recurring codes into themes.

Results

Results will be presented to address the research questions in turn, starting with questionnaire results of participants’ English writing anxiety to address RQ1, followed by textual analysis of participants’ WCF practices (RQ2), and finally, the interview results regarding other factors affecting their feedback practices (RQ3).

RQ1. To what extent do preservice teacher experience ESL writing anxiety? Which type of writing anxiety is the most severe?

Descriptive statistics show that our participants had a wide range of anxiety levels with total scores ranged from 39.80 to 98.50 (on the adjusted scale of 110), a mean score of 63.68 and a standard deviation (SD) of 14.97. Table 2 presents two distributions of our participants based on the cut-off scores of Atay and Kurt (2006) and Zerey (2013). Both distributions suggest that over half of our participants had medium or high levels of writing anxiety.

Table 2 Comparative analysis of total anxiety scores

Anxiety levels	Based on the cut-off scores of Atay & Kurt (2006)	Based on the cut-off scores of Zerey (2013)
High	14.7%	17.6%
Medium	44%	50%
Low	41%	32.4%

Table 3 presents the results comparing statistics of the three dimensions of writing anxiety. Their scores on the somatic and the avoidance dimensions were rather similar, i.e., somatic anxiety ($M=2.73$; $SD=0.46$) and avoidance behavior ($M=2.69$; $SD=0.52$); the scores on the cognitive dimension ($M=3.20$; $SD=0.43$) were significantly higher than the other two ($p<.001$ in both paired t-tests). The cognitive dimension was clearly the most dominant anxiety type among our participants. Two of the eight items in the cognitive subscale, item 16 (worry of being judged) and item 20 (fear of being rated poorly) received the highest rating of all; both refer to the apprehension of evaluation.

Table 3 Dimensions of ESL writing anxiety

Dimension of ESL writing anxiety	Number of items	Min	Max	M	SD
Cognitive Anxiety	8	2.47	3.65	3.20	0.43
Somatic Anxiety	7	2.18	3.50	2.73	0.46
Avoidance behavior	6	2.12	3.29	2.69	0.52

RQ2. What are the differences, if any, between the high- and low-anxious teachers in their WCF practices?

A total of 342 feedback points were collected, 54 of which were written comments, and 269 were error feedback in the forms of underlining, circling and error codes. The high-anxious group had a total of 185 feedback points while the low anxious one 157 points. Our analysis found the participants' feedback satisfactory because they were able to offer accurate error corrections and informative comments. They indicated both the strengths and the weaknesses in the writing sample, and provided examples and explanations to make their feedback easily understandable. In the following, we present the results of our analyses, comparing the two groups in terms of their focus of feedback, error correction practice, scope of correction, and qualitative features of written comments.

Focus of Feedback: Form, content or organization

Table 4 presents the distribution of the feedback points in terms of their foci. Both groups were found focusing on form; the highly anxious group had 80% of their feedback on form slightly higher than the least anxious group (78.34%). Both groups had much fewer feedback points on content and organization. This result is similar to the findings about school teachers' WCF practices in Hong Kong (e.g., Lee, 2008; Xie & Lei, 2019). It is perhaps not surprising because almost all participants attributed their WCF techniques to their school mentors in teaching practicum.

The highly anxious group had slightly less feedback on content and organization (13.51%; 6.49%) than their peers with low anxiety (14.01%; 7.64%). However, Chi-square test of independence found the differences not significant, $\chi^2(2)=0.21 < CV: 5.99, p>0.05$. Therefore, we did not find a significant relationship between the anxiety levels and focus of feedback.

Table 4 Focus of written feedback

	Form	Content	Organization
High anxiety	80.00% (148)	13.51% (25)	6.49% (12)
Low anxiety	78.34% (123)	14.01% (22)	7.64% (12)

Table 5 presents the distribution of feedback points focusing on various form-related aspects with examples extracted from our data. Both groups had the highest percentages of feedback on the aspect of sentence structure, which was followed by mechanics and vocabulary. Because the participants worked on the same writing sample, the similarity in the distribution of their form-focused corrections was expected, though it is interesting to notice that the highly anxious group provided more feedback to almost all sub-categories that are closely associated with form (tense, sentence structure and mechanics) and had slightly fewer feedback on vocabulary and others (e.g., style or tone). Chi-square test of independence, however, found the differences insignificant, $\chi^2(4)=2.688$, $CV=9.488$, $p>0.05$, that is, anxiety levels did not seem to affect participants' attention to different aspects of form.

Table 5 Distribution of feedback on form

Type of error on Form	Examples	Percentage (frequency)	
		High anxiety N=148	Low anxiety N=123
Sentence structure	We <u>should</u> do some good things in there? These activities are <u>so meaningful activities are really.</u> "	35.81% (53)	30.89% (38)
Mechanics (punctuation, spelling, capitalization)	It is on the Saturday 10 October <u>Q</u> from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. so the <u>entrance</u> feel free.	29.73% (44)	26.83% (33)
Vocabulary	<u>parth</u> what do you mean? <u>inafirm</u>	24.32% (36)	30.89% (38)

Error correction practice: Direct vs. indirect correction

Table 6 presents the results of our analysis on the direction of error correction; direct correction accounts for 61.59% of the total, slightly higher than indirect correction (38.50%). The latter includes 20.29% of uncoded feedback (i.e., only indicating where the mistakes are) and 18.21% of coded feedback (e.g., locating errors and signposting error categories).

Direct correction takes up the highest portion of WCF for both groups. The highly anxious group adopted a much higher percentage of direct correction than indirect ones (78.91% vs. 21.08%), while the low anxiety group adopted more indirect feedback than direct correction (58.14% vs. 41.96%). In

comparison, the low anxiety group had more indirect feedback than the highly anxious group in both coded (26.36% vs. 10.88%) and uncoded forms (31.78% vs. 10.20%) and had fewer direct corrections (41.86% vs. 78.91%).

Chi-square test of independence found there was a significant association between level of anxiety and their error correction orientation, $\chi^2(2)=40.16$, $CV=5.99$, $p<0.05$. That is, there are indeed differences between the low and high anxiety groups on their use of error correction techniques.

Table 6 *Error correction techniques*

Types	Overall percentage (N)	High anxiety	Low anxiety
Direct correction	61.59% (170)	78.91% (116)	41.86% (54)
Indirect uncoded feedback	20.29% (56)	10.20% (15)	31.78% (41)
Indirect coded feedback	18.21% (50)	10.88% (16)	26.36% (34)

Scope of error correction: Comprehensive vs. selective

Eight out of the ten student teachers were found adopting a comprehensive approach to error correction, marking all errors, including the minor and repetitive ones. This included all five high and three least anxious ones. Only two participants chose to adopt a selective approach to error correction, where they paid a close attention to the linguistics features that they considered to be most important for the task (i.e., writing a leaflet to promote a charity event), such as the use of future tense, imperatives and subheadings, while ignoring less important errors (such as plural/singular nouns or spelling). The two teachers justified their decision during the interviews (to be reported in the following section).

Features of written comments

The comments written by the two groups of novice teachers appear to differ in the length, focus and writing styles. The highly anxious ones tended to offer longer and more detailed and comprehensive comments, whereas the low anxious ones appeared to be more selective; they wrote shorter and more concise comments. Although both groups commented on language errors, highly anxious ones wrote more and covered various aspects, such as incorrect tense, limited vocabulary, and wrong spelling and punctuation, whereas the low anxious ones appeared to be more selective.

Table 7 presents two sample comments from a highly anxious (H5) and a low anxious student teacher (L3); both are informative and generally well written. H5 wrote in bullet-points a much longer comment on content (point 1-3) and language (point 4-6). She also gave an example to substantiate her suggestion in point 3. Her comments on language were informative and generic. L3 were far more concise and her comments move from content to organization and language. When she commented on specific aspects of language, she only mentioned two features associated with this specific text type. L3 appears to be more selective; her writing style also sounds more informal than H5.

Table 7 Sample comments

<i>Highly anxious</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You used lots of creative examples <i>such as the VR experience and yummy food provided in the food stall to catch the interest audience.</i> • You showed the detailed information of the swap party in a clear way. • You might better (sic) explain how this swap party help to protect the environment. For example, “sharing old books helps to save paper.” • Use the connectives more carefully to show the cause-effect relationship among different matters. • Always use the future tense to describe something that will happen in the future. • Always remember to use plural form when you want to describe something that more than one (sic).
(H5)	
<i>Low anxious</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your writing has a lot of good content. You have given lots of details about the event. However, you need to be careful of the organization and language of this text type. Since it is a leaflet, the subheadings should be nouns and the tense should be present or future tense.
(L3)	

RQ3. What are the other factors contributing to their differences in giving feedback?

The last research question probed into the factors influencing the participants' feedback practices. Through constant comparisons between the interview transcripts of the two groups, we identified five major factors.

Factor 1. Conception of English writing: narrow vs. broad conceptualization

All highly anxious participants considered the attainment of perfect language accuracy to be the prime objective of English writing. This view seemed to resonate with their own difficulties in writing English compositions. When asked about the challenges they had while writing in English, they put stress on linguistics difficulties, such as grammar accuracy and word choice (see Extract 1 and 2).

(1) H1: *I am always worried about my grammatical correctness. I am not sure whether my language is accurate or not.*

(2) H5: *Writing in English emphasizes organizing structure, syntax and other, while writing in Chinese stresses meaning. In other words, English writing highlights grammar. Therefore, I must guarantee that my grammar is correct... Hence, I write slowly and often feel I am incompetent.*

Their anxiety towards language accuracy might play a role in their feedback practices. Three highly anxious writers acknowledged that they paid the most attention to linguistic accuracy while giving feedback to the sample writing.

(3) H1: *For me, language is of utmost importance in English writing, as it shows a learner's English competency.*

- (4) H2: *If there are grammatical errors or wrong words, it definitely influences the comprehensibility and quality of the written output.*
- (5) H3: *The primary purpose of English writing assignment is to practice the grammar and vocabulary they learned. That's why I pay 100% attention to his language errors.*

In contrast, their least anxious peers expressed a broader conceptualization of English writing, who considered it as “creating” or presenting ideas (Extract 6), “demonstrate what you learned,” “understand the topic, requirements and assessment criteria.” This broader perception of English writing might have influenced them to consider broader aspects of writing beyond linguistic forms (Extract 7).

- (6) L3: *For me, English writing is about creating. I present my ideas in a creative way and by adopting a distinctive language.*
- (7) L2: *All three areas [of writing] are important, and they need to be in a balance in English writing. If a student's work only exhibits excellent language but no content, it is worthless, and if it contains comprehensive content but with poor language, it affects understanding. The organization also determines the quality of the product.*

Unlike the other four, one highly apprehensive writer did not prioritize his feedback on language form because he believed that form was over-emphasized in the curriculum, but little attention had been given to content and organization, which, therefore, should be given more emphasis by teachers while evaluating students' writing (Extract 8).

- (8) H5: *I think content and logic are important. In daily English lessons, students have adequate language exercises, but in each unit, they only need to write two passages, which could not provide enough opportunities to cover a range of content and organization. So teachers should guide students more on content and organization (in their writing). Language is indeed important, but I reckon in today's curriculum, we have overemphasized forms but fail to develop students' ability in constructing writing and organization. That's why I will lay emphasis on content and organization.*

Factor 2. Confidence in students' ability

The reason that high anxious teachers preferred comprehensive corrective strategy and direct correction seems to be associated with their concerns of students' (lack of) ability and skills as indicated by the following two extracts.

- (9) H4: *I chose to mark comprehensively and explicitly because I am concerned that if I don't locate every mistake, the ones that I miss out would still be there [next time the student write]. It would form a bad cycle, that is, the same mistakes appear again and again.*
- (10) H5: *I chose to give the correct answers directly. If I just circle the mistakes, they might not understand it. They won't know if it is a wrong*

use of tense or other errors. Sometimes, they have difficulty in understanding it. Also, when they revise, it is possibly they apply other incorrect forms, and they will memorize the wrong answers. They will keep the wrong use...I seldom give them the hints, because I think error codes are difficult for them to comprehend...

In comparison, the low anxious group appeared to have more confidence in students' ability when they justified using indirect coded feedback for their potential benefits to generate independent and autonomous learning (Extract 11, 12).

(11) L3: *Students could benefit from coded feedback. It is actually an efficacious way for students to be aware of their mistakes; they could use the codes to classify their mistakes and make for themselves a checklist of their most frequent problems, such as article, tense or punctuation. This can improve not only their subsequent pieces of writing but also their knowledge of English.*

(12) L5: *I hope students could discover the mistakes by themselves with (indirect) coded feedback... If I implement direct corrections, they just copy my answer mechanically, and they absolutely couldn't learn from it. Gradually, they become dependent on the teacher as they know what I will always give them the answers.*

Factor 3. Concerns of student cognition and motivation

When justifying their selective approach to error correction, the two low-anxiety teachers mentioned potential psychological impact of their feedback on students. While making this decision, they considered students' cognition (i.e., attention in Extract 13, memory in Extract 14), as well as confidence and motivation to learn (Extract 14).

(13) L2: *The key is **one thing at a time**. If I indicate each and every mistake, he won't handle all of them successfully. Therefore, I choose to go one-by-one, for example, this time I focus on tense. I emphasized the use of the future tense in a promotion leaflet (for a coming event). In the following writing task, I may guide him to focus on other problems. Such method will enables him to process and intake the knowledge faster.*

(14) L5: *I chose to indicate mistakes selectively because I understand that even I mark comprehensively, students are **unable to remember** them all. A marked paper full of red corrections gives a very negative impression, which is likely to threaten student's **confidence and motivation** (to write).*

Factor 4. Concerns of teacher professional credibility and work ethics

Three participants with a low degree of English writing anxiety adopted the comprehensive error correction approach. During the interview, they revealed that they valued the selective approach and understood its benefits, yet they were concerned about teachers' professional credibility and worried that if they did not exhaust students' errors in their correction, they would be viewed as incompetent or lazy.

- (15) L3: *I understand the benefits of selective marking in theory. However, from a macro perspective, comprehensive marking might actually be better for teachers, because if (you adopt) the selective process, the mistakes you chose to skip could threaten your credibility (as a teacher), and you are unlikely to know this...What I mean is that, for instance, in the selective marking, you skip a mistake, like a spelling error, because you know it is due to carelessness. But when the student gets his work back, he might think, "I made a mistake there, but the teacher did not notice it..." He will then question your ability or competence. So it is an issue of professional credibility.*
- (16) L4: *Theoretically, selective feedback is better for highlighting particular knowledge. But being a teacher, you need to be responsible for both the students and the parents. You should correct all mistakes (in students' work) so as not to be viewed as being lazy or be complained by parents.*

Factor 5. Feedback experience as students and during teaching practicum

The participants' experience with written feedback from their former teachers and professors also affected their WCF practices. In general, they reported adopting practices that they found useful as students and avoiding those that they considered problematic and unhelpful. The impact of these experience, however, did not seem to direct them to a particular type or approach of feedback, and appeared to be rather idiosyncratic and varied according to personal preferences. Some participants reported their feedback practices being influenced by their school mentors, with whom they worked closely during the four-month teaching practicum that they had just completed.

- (17) H3: *In the past, "unclear expression" has been the most frequent comment I received (from my teachers). Consequently, in my own essay writing and when I assess a student's written product, I prone to examining word choice, is the wording correct? Does it express the meaning correctly and clearly?*
- (18) H2: *I don't like implicit marking. In Year 1, a professor just jotted down "syntax" on my essay. This is too broad and vague. I was frustrated. Consequently, I remind myself when I mark any student's work, my feedback must be direct, comprehensible and supportive.*

Discussion

Pre-service teachers' writing anxiety: Levels and dominant type

The present research found about a quarter of participants suffered from a high level of English writing anxiety and almost half had a moderate level of anxiety. To put the anxiety levels of our participants in perspective, we compared our results with findings about preservice teachers in another education context. Two recent research Atay & Kurt (2006) and Zerey (2013) were chosen for the comparison, because they had a focus closest to ours. They involved preservice EFL teachers and also adopted SLWAI to measure writing anxiety. Both studies were conducted in Turkey: Atay & Kurt studied 85 fourth-year preservice English teachers (Mean age =21.34), who had 8-10 years of English learning experience; Zerey investigated a younger group (N=63; Mean age=19) enrolled in prep-classes for an English teacher education program. Atay & Kurt's participants were more similar to ours (Mean

age=22.65), though our participants had much longer years of English learning ($M=18.1$) and probably higher English proficiency.

Comparing with those in Atay and Kurt (2006) and Zerey (2013), our participants had a lower level of anxiety. The mean anxiety score of our participants are lower than those in the two Turkish studies (63.68 vs. 70.5 and 70.95); we have much fewer highly anxious writers (14.7%/17.6% vs. 32% and 34.9%), fewer moderately anxious ones (44%/50% vs. 49% and 58.7%), and much more writers with low anxiety (41%/32.4% vs. 19% and 6.3%). Nonetheless, there are still over half of our participants with moderate or high levels of writing anxiety, and the difference between those at the high and the low end of the anxiety scale was much greater among our participants. The results, though more positive than those in Atay & Kurt (2006) and Zerey's (2013), was unsettling, considering the fact that our participants had a high level of English proficiency.

Differing from Atay and Kurt (2006) in Turkey and Arindra and Ardi (2020) in Indonesia whose participants experienced the somatic anxiety -associated with physiological arousal as their dominant type, our study found cognitive anxiety the most severe. This means that when performing a writing task, our student teachers tended to over-concern others' judgement and have low expectations towards their writing (Cheng, 2004). Similar result was found in Jordan with first-year medical students of intermediate English proficiency (Rabadi & Rabadi, 2020) and in Korea with a mixed-proficiency group of university students (Jeon, 2018). In both contexts, cognitive anxiety was found the dominant type. Jeon's experiment with a learner-centered EFL writing instruction significantly reduced participants' somatic anxiety but was not able to do so for the other two dimensions. He associated the dominant cognitive anxiety among his participants with Korean Confucian culture that Koreans considered it always necessary to be aware of other people's views so that one will not risk losing face. Since Hong Kong is also a Confucian-heritage society, this explanation could also be applied to our Chinese participants.

Cognitive anxiety was found responsible for poor writing performance (Cheng, 2004); it was often evoked in evaluative situations such as writing for assessment or test (Arinda & Ardi, 2020). Although we were unable to track the differential effects of the three dimensions of writing anxiety in this study, both Lee (2008)'s finding of the accountability issue in teacher WCF and Factor 4 (concerns of teacher professional credibility and work ethics) in the present research suggest that cognitive anxiety probably the most important determinant of the three in shaping and conditioning their WCF practices.

How writing anxiety and other factors affect teachers WCF: A grounded-theory model

Our research identified five factors alongside writing anxiety that could explain participants' feedback practices. Following previous research (Yan & Horwitz, 2008), we synthesized our findings as a grounded-theory model of the internal forces affecting teacher approaches to WCF in Figure 1. The paths of influence of the four internal forces are mapped based on the findings of the present research.

Along the first dimension (D1) of English writing anxiety in the model, our study observed that anxiety seemed to affect their feedback direction (direct vs. indirect) and scope because the highly anxious writers had a clear preference to direct and comprehensive error correction. Highly anxious writers also tended to have lower confidence in students' ability (D2) and narrower conception regarding the purpose of English writing (D3), which prioritizes linguistic accuracy over other aspects of writing. In our study, although both high and low anxiety groups gave more focus to linguistic accuracy, the high anxiety group showed a slightly stronger tendency to focus on grammar, a finding was similarly reported in a study conducted in an L1 writing context (Bizzaro & Toler, 1986). In contrast, participants with low writing anxiety showed more confidence in student ability and often expressed a broader

conception of English writing, they were more willing to adopt systematic indirect (coded and uncoded) error corrections.




Figure 1 Dimensions of internal forces affecting teacher WCF: A grounded-theory model

The fourth dimension of forces (D4) combines the third and the fourth factors of concerns of teacher professional credibility and work ethics and concerns of student learning autonomy, cognition and motivation to learn, because our findings indicated the two factors worked along the same dimension but towards opposite directions. Specifically, those with greater concern about teachers' professional image tended to prefer the prevailing practice of direct and comprehensive error correction, while those placing greater consideration on learning would adopt a systematic indirect and selective approach to error correction.

Dimension 1 to 3 seemed to work hand in hand, because those with low anxiety expressed a broader conception of English writing and higher confidence in their students, whereas all highly apprehensive participants had a narrow conception of English writing and expressed worries about students' (in)ability to follow error codes or hints. Probably relating to their narrow conception, these highly anxious student teachers paid greater attention to ensure error-free language both in their own writing and in that of their students.

Dimension 4 (Teacher credibility vs. Student cognition and motivation), on the other hand, appeared to affect WCF independent of the other three because it affected both high and low anxiety teachers. In our study, three teachers with low anxiety chose a comprehensive approach to marking primarily because of their concern over teacher credibility (i.e., the ability to identify all errors in students' work) and work ethics (i.e., work diligently and not sparing any errors), which appeared to push them towards to the comprehensive approach, even though they were aware of its potential negative impact on students. Only two teachers adopted the selective approach because of their concern that the opposite would overwhelm learners cognitively (Extract 13) and harm their confidence and motivation to learn (Extract 14). Although all participants seemed to be aware of the issues associated with both approaches, those who concerned more about the teaching end would incline to a comprehensive approach.

Not included in the model is Factor 5, the influence from own feedback experience and teaching

practicum, which, we found, is different from the other four internal factors in that this factor does not direct teachers to a particular feedback orientation. Both positive and negative feedback experience seemed to have affected the participants' own feedback practice (Extract 18-20) towards either approach, and the impact could be rather idiosyncratic. In addition, this factor was more of an external force hence differing from the other four factors that are more of the internal nature. For the sake of conceptual clarity, this factor is not included in the model that intentionally confines itself to the internal forces affecting teacher WCF. The exclusion of external contextual factors is by no means indicating they are of less importance. On the contrary, existing research into feedback as reviewed earlier had found abundant evidence of the force of macro contextual factors (at school and society level), which exert considerable influences on teachers' feedback. It is necessary to acknowledge that the model in Figure 1 is not meant to include all potential factors influencing teachers' WCF behavior but is limited to and contains only the internal factors observed in our study. Because these internal forces have received much less attention in the L2 writing literature and remained untheorized, this grounded-theory model could be considered a useful contribution to the field.

Conclusion

Albeit its small scale, this research found evidence that a large portion of highly proficient preservice English writing teachers suffered from high or moderate levels of writing anxiety, and the evidence that their anxiety, alongside conceptions, concerns and feedback experiences, jointly influenced their feedback practices. Based on our findings as well as insights drawn from the literature, we proposed a grounded-theory model of the various internal forces to provide a direction for future research on the nexus of teacher writing anxiety and WCF.

At the practical level, we would like to make the following suggestions for preservice teacher education based on our findings and insights from the literature. Firstly, writing anxiety has seldom being acknowledged, formally or informally, in language teacher preparation program. Our findings suggest it is necessary to recognize writing anxiety as a problem to be overcome even among highly proficient English learners, especially if they were to become teachers. Moreover, our research suggests that writing anxiety is associated with particular conceptions (of English writing) and concerns (of professional credibility and work ethics) and knowledge about students (e.g., confidence in their ability). While it could be argued that writing anxiety is a personality trait that is not easy to change, the latter factors could be moderated through teacher education. Purposive training of preservice teachers to overcome their writing anxiety seems to be a mute area in the literature of L2 writing and teacher education, though efforts to reduce learner writing anxiety have appeared in recent years (e.g., Arindra & Ardi, 2020; Abdullah *et al.*, 2018, Erdogan, 2017; Jeon, 2018). These useful attempts could shed light on ways to help anxious student teachers as well.

Along this line of thought, we concur with L2 writing researchers (e.g., Lee, 2008; Mak, 2019; Xie & Lei, 2019) that feedback principles and strategies should be formally and systematically incorporated in L2 teachers' method course. Before they embark on a teaching career, it is necessary to equip preservice teachers with effective techniques, tactics, research-based feedback principles and the ability to critically reflect on existing practices. Such training seemed to have reduced the impact of ESL writing anxiety on our participants' feedback practices.

While it was not our intention to generalize the findings, researchers need to apply certain caution in extending our findings to other contexts. In addition to our earlier suggestions for further research into L2 writing anxiety in teacher education, those interested in pursuing this line of investigation could consider constructing a questionnaire to measure all four dimensions of influence to estimate their respective impact on teacher feedback statistically and model their interactions.

References

- Ada, A.F., & Campoy, F.I. (2004). *Authors in the classroom: A transformative education process*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Al-Sawalha, A.M.S., & Chow, T.V.V. (2012). The effects of writing apprehension in English on the writing process of Jordanian EFL students at Yarmouk University. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(1), 6–14.
- Arindra, M.Y., & Ardi, P. (2020). The correlation between students' writing anxiety and the use of writing assessment rubrics. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 13 (1), 76–93.
- Abdullah, M.Y., Hussin, S., & Shakir, M. (2018). The effect of peers' and teacher's E-feedback on writing anxiety level through CMC applications. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13 (11), pp. 196–207.
- Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 100–118.
- Bizzaro, P., & Toler, H. (1986). The effects of writing apprehension on the teaching behaviors of writing center tutors. *The Writing Center Journal*, 7(1), 37–43.
- Book, V. (1976). *Some effects of apprehension on writing performance*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Business Communication Association, December 28–30, San Diego, CA.
- Bruton, A. (2009). Improving accuracy is not the only reason for writing, and even if it were.... *System*, 37(4), 600–613.
- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E.K., & Schallert, D. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49, 417–446.
- Cheng, Y.S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 313–335.
- Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Daly, J.A., Vangelisti, A., & Witte, S.P. (1988). Writing apprehension in the classroom context. In B.A. Rafoth & D.L. Rubin (Eds.), *The social construction of written communication* (pp. 147–171). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
- Daud, N.S.M., Daud, N.M., & Kassim, N.L.A. (2016). Second language writing anxiety: Cause or effect? *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 1(1), 1–19.
- Di Loreto, S., & McDonough, K. (2014). The relationship between instructor feedback and ESL student anxiety. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(1), 20–41.
- Erdogan, O. (2017). The effect of cooperative writing activities on writing anxieties of prospective primary school teachers. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 3(2), 560–570.
- Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL, *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 164–192.
- Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45, 69–94.
- Guénette, D. (2012). The pedagogy of error correction: Surviving the written corrective feedback challenge. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(1), 117–126.
- Güneyli, A. (2016). Analyzing writing anxiety level of Turkish Cypriot students. *Egitim ve*

Bilim, 41(183).

- 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.
- Huwari, I.F., & Aziz, N.H. (2011). Writing apprehension in English among Jordanian postgraduate students at Universitiutara Malaysia (UUM). *Academic Research International*, 1(2), 190–198.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31, 217–230.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). State-of-the-art review on “Feedback in second language students’ writing.” *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101
- Jeon, E.Y. (2018). The effect of learner-centered EFL writing instruction on Korean university students' writing anxiety and perception. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(3), 100–112.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 549–566.
- 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.
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers’ written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69–85.
- Liu, M., & Ni, H. (2015). Chinese university EFL learners’ foreign language writing anxiety: Pattern, effect and causes. *English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 46–58.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283–305.
- Magnusson, E., & Marecek, J. (2015). *Doing interview-based qualitative research: A learner's guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mak, P. (2019). From traditional to alternative feedback: What do L2 elementary students think? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 109–129.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C.E. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 20, 217–239.
- Rabadi, R.I., & Rabadi, A.D. (2020) Do medical students experience writing anxiety while learning English as a foreign language? *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 13, 883–893.
- Rose, M. (2009). *Writer's block: The cognitive dimension*. Carbondale, IL: SIU Press.
- Sabti, A.A., Md Rashid, S., Nimehchisalem, V., & Darmi, R. (2019). The Impact of writing anxiety, writing achievement motivation, and writing self-efficacy on writing performance: A correlational study of Iraqi tertiary EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, 9(4), 2158244019894289.
- Tsao, J.J., Tseng, W.T., & Wang, C. (2017). The effects of writing anxiety and motivation on EFL college students’ self-evaluative judgments of corrective feedback. *Psychological reports*, 120(2), 219–241.
- Vanhille, J., Gregory, B., & Corser, G. (2017). The effects of mood on writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and writing performance. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 22(3), 220–230.
- Xie, Q., & Lei, Y. (2019). Implementing formative assessment in primary English writing classrooms: A case study from Hong Kong. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 23(5), 55–95.
- Yan, J.X., & Horwitz, E.K. (2008). Learners' perceptions of how anxiety interacts with personal and instructional factors to influence their achievement in English: A qualitative analysis of EFL learners in China. *Language learning*, 58(1), 151–183.
- Zerey, Ö.G. (2013). Preservice EFL teachers’ foreign language writing anxiety: Some associated factors. *Dil Dergisi*, (160), 42–65.
- Zhang, R., & Zhong, J. (2012). The hindrance of doubt: Causes of language anxiety. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(3), 27.

Author biodata

Dr Qin Xie is Assistant Professor at The Education University of Hong Kong. Her primary research area is in language testing and assessment. She is interested in topics, such as washback of high-stakes examination, test validation, formative and diagnostic assessment in L2 writing, and teacher assessment literacy education. Dr. Xie is editor of the book review section, *Journal of Asia TEFL*, and editorial board member of the journals of *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *Language Education and Assessment*, and *rEFLECTIONS*.

Miss Junting Yuan has a Bachelor of Education degree in English Language Education from The Education University of Hong Kong. She is currently pursuing a Master of Arts degree in Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages at the University of Hong Kong.

Appendixes

Appendix 1

Survey of ESL writing anxiety

Part 1. Background Information Questionnaire 背景資料問卷

1. Age (年齡):
 2. Gender (性別):
 3. First language (母語):
 4. Years of learning English (英文學習時間): _____ years/年
 5. Have you stayed in English-speaking countries? If yes, how long (你是否曾經在英文國家生活過，如果是，多久): _____ moths/月
 6. Have you ever taken any formal English competence test? If yes, what is the test and score? (你曾否參加正式的英文能力測試，如果是，請寫下測試名稱和測試分數)
- Name of the test (測試名稱): _____ Score(分數): _____ (write the most recent one 最近參加的測試)

Part 2. English Writing Anxiety Inventory 英文寫作焦慮量表

There are 21 items in this inventory and all of them concern your English writing experience and your feelings towards English writing. Read the following statement **carefully** and indicate your degree of agreement/disagreement by your intuition and choose (✓) the appropriate number that represent your answers. I strongly disagree =1; I disagree =2; I have no strong feelings either way =3; I agree =4; I strongly agree =5

以下共 21 道敘述，大部分涉及您英語寫作的經歷與你對英語學寫作的感受。請在仔細認真閱讀每一項敘述后，并依直覺反應回答每一條敘述，并且在符合你選擇的答案的格子里打勾（✓）非常不同意=1，不同意=2，不確定=3，同意=4，非常同意=5

1. While writing in English, I am not nervous at all. 寫英文論文時，我一點也不緊張。
2. I feel my heart pounding when I write English essays under time constraint. 在有時間限制的情況下寫英文論文時，我會感覺心跳得厲害。
3. While writing English essays, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated. 當我的英文論文

要被批閱評分時，我感到擔憂不安。

4. I often choose to write down my thoughts in English. 我經常用英文寫下我的想法。
5. My mind often goes blank when I start to work on an English essay. 每當開始寫英文論文時，我的大腦會一片空白。
6. I don't worry that my English essays are a lot worse than others. 我一點都不擔心我的英文論文會比別人差很多。
7. I tremble or perspire when I write English essays under time pressure. 在規定時間內寫英文論文時，我會緊張得發抖或冒冷汗。
8. If my English essay is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade. 當我的英文作文要被批閱評分時，我會擔心得到一個很低的分數。
9. I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English. 我盡可能避免要寫英文的活動場合。
10. My thoughts become jumbled when I write English essays under time constraint. 在規定時間內寫英文論文時，我的思路變得很混亂。
11. Unless I have no choice, I would not write in English. 除非是別無選擇，否則我一般不會用英文寫作。
12. I often feel panic when I write English essays under time constraint. 在規定時間內寫英文論文時，我經常感覺到恐慌。
13. I am afraid that the other students would deride my English essays if they read it. 我很擔心其他同學看到我寫的英文論文時會嘲笑我。
14. I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English essays. 在毫無準備的情況下被要求寫英文論文時，我的大腦就不轉了。
15. I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English essays. 當我被要求寫英文時，我都會盡量找藉口不寫。
16. I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English essays. 我絲毫不擔心別人會如何評價我的英語論文。
17. I usually seek every possible chance to write English essays outside of class. 我在課外總是尋找任何可能的機會練習英文論文寫作。
18. I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when write English essays. 寫英文論文時，我會覺得自己全身變得僵硬、緊張。
19. I am afraid of my English essays being chosen as a sample for discussion in class. 我害怕自己的英文論文會選選作課堂討論或評講例文。
20. I am not afraid at all that my English essays would be rated as very poor. 我絲毫不擔心自己的英文作文得分會很低。

21. Whenever possible, I would use English to write. 只要有機會，我都會用英文寫作。

Appendix 2

Written Corrective Feedback Task

You will assess and give feedback, including corrections and comments, to a sample writing of a **Form 2** student at the **pre-intermediate level in response to a writing** task, which requires him to create a leaflet to promote a swap meet and to include in their work key information about the event as in the following.

The charity Club's swap meet

- Date: Saturday, 10 October
 - Time: 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.
 - Venue: outdoor playground
 - Entrance fee: free
 - Types of products: fashion, toys, and games, books, electronics
 - Others: food stalls (burgers, hot dogs, noodles and ice cream)
- Special remarks:
 - Participants can decide if they want to sell or give their items away for free
 - Unsold items will be listed on the Charity Club's online shop for one week (payment methods – credit card or cash upon collection at school)

< the lovely and happy swap meet >

It's time to save the world.

Do you want to do some charity activities? We should do some good things in there? What's better than getting something you need for nothing? You can also do charitable activities and get gifts. It's such a good activity. Let's save the world quickly.

When. Where is the swap inafuyun.

The charity event was hold in the outdoor playground.

It is on the Saturday 10 October. from 11 a.m to 3 p.m

Because it's in the outdoor playground. so it's Entrance feel free.

What can you get there.

You can get many old thing in there, for example.

Something donated toy cars, puppets, models You can

also collect some old toys and help the earth to protect the environment.

You can enjoy the park.

You can enjoy lot of food at the food stalls. for

example Swiss cheese chicken wings, spaghetti Bolognese, bacon

sandwich, sushi (salmon, crab sushi, sushi roll), barbecue (meat,

pork, beef) and udon noodles. There is also a VR experience

event (Some polluted oceans)

Special remarks,

You can decide if you want to sell or give your items

away for free: Come on, so meaningful activities are

really. It's really wasted if you don't come.

Appendix 3

Interview guide

Research focus	Main questions
English writing anxiety	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do you feel when writing in English? 2. Do you have any difficulty in writing in English? If yes, what are they? 3. Do you think your feeling about writing in English have affected your writing? if so, in what way?
Responding to students' works	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did you feel while you were writing corrective feedback? 2. How did you mark the sample writing? why 3. What areas did you focus on in your corrective feedback? Why? 4. Do you mark errors selectively or comprehensively? Why? Can you also describe and explain your preferred error feedback strategies? 5. Did you write comments? What do you usually write, and why?

Appendix 4

Original scripts of the quoted extracts

- (1) H1: 我總是很擔心自己語法正不正確，就是我不確定我的語言對不對。
- (2) H5: 寫英語的東西就肯定比中文更註重行文結構，句式等，但寫中文就更註重怎麼表達他的意思，但是英語要注意語法，以防自己寫錯，所以可能就不僅僅是去想內容要寫什麼，還要向每句話的句式，要變化什麼的。我就感覺自己寫得好慢，就感覺自己還是水平不夠。
- (3) H1: 對我而言，在英文寫作，語言當然是最重要的因為它展現一個學生的語言能力。
- (4) H2: 在一篇文章裏，如果有很多語法錯誤，用錯詞，這肯定會影響我對這篇東西的理解，當然這篇文章的質量也不會好。
- (5) H3: 英文作文功課就是為了讓學生練習學過的語法和詞語，所以我改他們作文的時候，會針對他們的語言問題。
- (6) L3: 我認為，寫英文作文是一個創作的過程。我用跟別人不一樣的方法和詞匯來呈現我的想法。
- (7) L2: 三個方面都很重要，所以學生要取得三方面的平衡，就比如說，如果一個學生寫出來的東西只有很華麗的文字，沒什麼內容，那其實根本沒什麼意義。另一方面來說，如果他的作文，所有內容都有，但語言不行，那其實也影響理解。還有 organization 也決定了這個東西的好壞。
- (8) H5: 我覺得內容第一，邏輯第二，語言第三。因為前面兩個比較重要，因為語言在平常的課堂上有很多的涉及，語言的練習是很多的，比較普遍。但在英語學習里，一個單元就寫兩個文章，它涉及的內容組織，就比較少一點，所以在這個方面，老師應該多給點提示。語言其實是重要，但是我覺得我們現在的練習設置中，過分關注語言了，而沒有去開發他們關於內容設定，行文結構方面的訓練，那些方面比較少。所以我在改的時候會註重那些。
- (9) H4: 那當然是全部都改。他這裡寫錯就說明他不明白，沒有掌握。所以就算給個 code 來提示他，他也理解不了，也就不可能錯誤糾正過來。
- (10) H5: 我選擇給正確答案，因為如果我只是圈起來，第一他們看不懂 instruction，不知道我圈出來的是時態錯了還是因為什麼錯了，有時他們就不懂，第二，他們改錯的話，他們有可能把錯誤的改正記住，他們就會一直錯下去...我少用給提示，因為我覺得這些是高於他們水平的，他們理解不了。
- (11) L3: 我是覺得 coded feedback 能幫學生更多吧。這種方法其實很有效地讓學生意識到自己的錯誤，通過 code 把錯誤歸類。那他們接著就可以弄一個 checklist 來找到自己最常出現的錯，就比如 article, tense, 標點符號那些。這種方法應該可以提高他們下一篇作文，也能幫助提高他們英文知識吧。
- (12) L5: 我是希望學生依靠 coded feedback 來發現自己的錯誤...如果我單純用直接的方法，直接把正確答案寫出來，那在謄文的時候，他們也只是機械性地抄一遍，不會經腦子，那他們肯定什麼都沒學到。而且，慢慢地，他們就會依賴老師，因為他們知道我會直接把答案給他們。
- (13) L2: 我認為最重要的是 one thing at a time。如果我一下子把全部錯誤都指出來，他是不可能一次掌握完的。所以，我會選擇 one-by-one 這種方式吧，就是說我一次處理一種類型錯誤，就好像這次我 focus 在

tense, 那我在改這個篇作文, 這個 promotional leaflet 的時候, 我會強調用 future tense。然後後續的作文, 我會帶他看其他問題。這種方式方法讓學生可以更好更快地吸收和理解那些重點難點吧。

- (14)L5: 我會更傾向於 selective 地去看去改因為我明白就算我把所有的錯都標出來, 學生也很難一次理解和记住。第二點就是, 你看到一個有太多紅筆圈畫的作文也覺得很 negative 吧, 這對學生學習信心和學習動機也不好。
- (15)L3: 我其實也知道 selective marking 比較好。但是, 你還是要考慮老師這個身份, 從宏觀角度講, comprehensive marking 這種反饋方式在實操上更好。因為如果是 selective marking, 你在 select 的時候, 你選擇省略不批改的錯誤可能會影響你的公信力, 但這個結果你不一定會知道...我的意思是, 就好像說, 在 selective marking 裡面, 你會選擇跳過一些粗心導致的錯誤, 對吧。但當學生拿回自己的作文的時候, 他看到你的批改他可能會說:「我這裡寫錯了, 但老師沒給我改出來。」他就很可能認為你能力不足, 資歷不夠, 這就會導致公信力問題。
- (16)L4: 我知道理論上 selective feedback 當然更好一點, 因為可以 highlight 某個特點的知識點。但其實, 作為老師, 你要對學生和家長負責。也就是說, 為了防止被認為是懶老師, 或者被家長投訴, 我們老師還是要把學生作文裡所有錯改出來。
- (17)H3: unclear expression, 表達表述不清晰是我以前經常收到的 comment。所以我在自己寫 essay 的時候, 還有我改作文的時候, 我會更留意 language choice 這一方面, 這個對不對? 這樣寫有沒有把意思清晰直接地表達出來?
- (18)H2: 我自己不是很喜歡那種很模糊, 不直接的反饋。就像我讀大一時, 有個 professor 就在我的 essay 寫「syntax」, 他這樣寫讓我很茫然, 因為這樣寫好含糊, 這個概念也太大了。所以後面當我改學生作文的時候, 我就會經常跟自己說, 我給的 feedback 要直接, 詳細和 supportive 一點。

¹The two studies are chosen as our primary reference from the seven prior studies that adopted SLWAI because 1) they involved participants similar to ours (i.e., pre-service ESL teachers) and 2) they reported cut-off scores, total anxiety scores and standard deviations, which make it possible to compare. Kurt and Atay (2007) fulfilled the first criterion but not the second. More about the two studies is reported in the discussion section.