



L2 Writing Anxiety of Japanese High School Learners

Naomi Sugahara

Kanda University of International Studies

Reference Data:

Sugahara, N. (2023). L2 writing anxiety of Japanese high school learners. In P. Ferguson, B. Lacy, & R. Derrah (Eds.), *Learning from Students, Educating Teachers—Research and Practice*. JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2022-22>

With the increased emphasis on writing in the new course of study (MEXT, 2018), there is a need for classroom-based research in secondary schools, especially that which takes into account learners' perspectives at different stages of the writing process. The purpose of this study is to explore the kinds of anxiety that second-year Japanese high school learners of English ($n=150$) exhibited over a semester and at various points throughout the writing process in a course employing task-based instructional methods. Results from a survey utilizing the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI; Cheng, 2004) and open-ended questions indicated that students' L2 writing anxiety decreased over the term and that they perceived their writing abilities as improving. However, students' responses to items about L2 writing habits revealed a tendency toward avoidance strategies. Moreover, students perceived more anxiety during post-writing discussions and peer editing, suggesting a need for scaffolding during peer correction.

新学習指導要領(文部科学省, 2018)ではライティング指導がより重視され、中学・高等学校における授業研究、特に書くプロセスの様々な段階における学習者の視点を考慮した研究が求められている。本研究では、日本の高校二年生の英語学習者($n=150$)が、タスクベースの指導において、一学期中、および書くプロセスの様々な段階で示した不安の程度と種類を調査した。第二言語ライティング不安尺度(Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory: SLWAI; Cheng, 2004)、ならびに書くプロセスに関する調査や自由記述のデータから、本調査の参加者は学期が進むにつれ書くことへの不安が軽減し、第二言語で書く能力が向上したと認識したことが明らかになった。しかし、書くことの習慣に関する調査項目の回答は、回避行動の傾向を示した。加えて、書く前のタスクやメインタスクよりも、書いた後のディスカッションやピア・エディティングに不安を感じていることから、校正の場面における足場架けが必要であると分かった。

As an English teacher at a private senior high school in Japan, I have observed firsthand my students' struggles with English composition. Over the years, I have attempted to scaffold the writing process by employing principles of task-based language teaching (TBLT) including an emphasis on pre-task planning. However, I have often observed that my students lack confidence when writing. Similar observations are also made in research, which has found that L2 anxiety can be a major obstacle for learners (Aida, 1994; Cheng, 2002; Horwitz, 2001; Horwitz et al., 1986; Rezaei & Jafari, 2014; Shang, 2013). Learners with high levels of writing anxiety are more likely to have difficulty generating ideas, creating longer sentences, and applying rules of usage and mechanics (Reeves, 1997). Because of their low confidence in writing and fear of evaluation, it is often argued that L2 learners need instruction on writing strategies, such as generating ideas, to reduce their anxiety levels (Rezaei & Jafari, 2014; Wolfersberger, 2003).

High school EFL students in Japan are now facing more writing challenges as the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) increases its standards for writing instruction through a new high school course, Logic and Expression, which requires greater emphasis on L2 writing. This new course replaces the previous course, English Expression (MEXT, 2010), and stipulates more frequent use of authentic communicative tasks (MEXT, 2018). Students are also expected to engage in L2 writing through brainstorming, note-taking, making brief outlines, and self/peer editing (MEXT, 2018).

In order to support my students in this increased focus on literacy in the new curriculum and help to reduce their writing anxiety, it is necessary to gain a more in-depth understanding of the sources of their anxiety. In this paper, I report findings from an action research study of 2nd-year Japanese high school learners of English, specifically the characteristics of their anxiety, as well as levels of anxiety over the semester and at specific points in the writing process.



L2 Writing Anxiety

As noted above, foreign language anxiety can be detrimental to linguistic performance (Aida, 1994; Cheng, 2002; Horwitz, 2001; Horwitz et al., 1986; Shang, 2013), and L2 writing researchers have attempted to clarify what factors cause anxiety and how to help mitigate it. Second language writing anxiety has been measured using the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI; Cheng, 2004), which is a 22-item scale consisting of three subscales: somatic anxiety (i.e., increased physiological reactions, such as heart pounding), cognitive anxiety (i.e., perception of arousal and worry or fear of negative evaluation), and avoidance behavior. Several studies have applied this inventory to classify L2 writing anxiety. In Chiang's (2012) study, the participants showed higher levels of cognitive anxiety and avoidance behavior than somatic anxiety, while other researchers found avoidance behavior to be more prevalent (Xiao & Wong, 2014). There has been no research I am aware of on L2 writing anxiety using the above inventory among Japanese high school learners of English.

Second language writers may feel anxiety for a variety of reasons. Rezaei and Jafari (2014) reported that Iranian learners of English were afraid of making mistakes while showing little confidence in expressing their thoughts and ideas in the target language. Students also felt writing anxiety due to fear of evaluation from the teacher, a lack of self-confidence, and poor L2 knowledge. One study by Wolfersberger (2003) emphasized the importance of strategy training in order to reduce L2 writing anxiety levels. The study found that L2 writers needed to learn methods to transfer L1 techniques to L2 writing, such as mapping and organizing their thoughts during the L2 writing process. Another study by Atay and Kurt (2006) showed that prospective English teachers in Turkey felt more apprehensive about organizing their thoughts and generating ideas than their lack of L2 vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. The key to L2 writing instruction therefore is not only to enhance students' confidence in writing (Rezaei & Jafari, 2014), but also to help them utilize strategies during the writing process, such as generating and organizing their ideas (Machida & Dalsky, 2014). In short, it is important for teachers to be aware of the impact of learners' writing anxiety and provide strategy training to help them cope while writing.

Task-Based Language Teaching and Writing Instruction

Some studies show that L2 instruction involving pre-task planning can help teachers implement writing tasks while reducing learner anxiety (Machida & Dalsky, 2014). Pre-task planning, such as *strategic planning*, in which students have time to consider what

they want to say and how to say it, and *task repetition*, where learners carry out the same task with different content, play a vital role in alleviating learners' anxiety (Kawashima, 2019; Machida & Dalsky, 2014). In reviewing the research, however, I found few studies directly related to the kinds of anxiety that my high school learners seemed to be experiencing and how writing instruction could mitigate their apprehension.

One approach that has been used to build writers' competence is task-based language teaching (TBLT; Abrams, 2019; Abrams & Byrd, 2016; Nitta & Baba, 2014; Ojima, 2006). Tasks conducted before the main writing activities (pre-tasks) can help learners develop cognitive and linguistic skills. Hyland (2019) pointed out that L2 writing tasks can assist writers with integrating background knowledge and new information from a text. Students' schemata for a new topic can also be activated through paired speaking/writing tasks to consolidate their prior knowledge with output activities after the main writing task (Hyland, 2019). In addition, Abrams and Byrd (2016) examined the effectiveness of pre-task planning on L2 writing, such as mind-mapping and chronological sequencing. According to the authors, the strategies developed in pre-task planning helped L2 German learners improve their writing scores, and the more they used this method, the better their output was. Furthermore, Nitta and Baba (2014) suggested that L2 learners can benefit from task repetition in writing tasks over an extended rather than a short period of time. If students repeat the same task type with different content, they are able to improve the lexical and grammatical aspects of L2 writing (Nitta & Baba, 2014).

To sum up, pre-tasks in L2 writing can play an integral role in helping students gather ideas and successfully produce written products. Moreover, task repetition can help students to improve accuracy. However, the kinds of anxiety that students have, and at what point in the writing process they feel anxiety, varies from context to context, so I wanted to get a clearer picture of the specific characteristics of anxiety throughout the writing process and how they varied over time. Focusing on the high school students in my teaching context, the research questions for this study are:

RQ1: How did writers' perceptions of their anxiety change from the beginning to the end of the semester?

RQ2: At what stage of the writing process did students report feeling most anxious?

Methodology

Research Context

The study was conducted in mandatory 2nd-year English Communication classes at a private high school where I worked as a full-time teacher. The 2nd-year cohort was



divided into two sections according to academic ability, and I was in charge of the more advanced of the two sections, with 150 students in total (ages 16-17). Students' English abilities varied (CEFR-level English proficiency as of July 2022: B1, $n = 9$; A2, $n = 78$; A1, $n = 63$), but they seemed generally motivated to improve, according to a needs analysis conducted at the beginning of April. Fifty-minute classes for second-year students were conducted four times a week. One of the lessons was team-taught with a full-time native English-speaking teacher from the UK.

Materials

In addition to the required textbook, *My Way English Communication II* (2018), supplementary course materials were used, including the Japan Times Publishing, Ltd. and Logoport's (2020) writing textbook, where the focus was on developing learners' argumentative writing using a variety of topics relevant to students' daily lives (e.g., "Is it necessary for students to do homework?" and "Do you think it is better to study alone or study in a group?"). This book also aimed to improve learners' argumentative essay writing, which was aligned with the goals of English Communication (MEXT, 2018).

Information-Gap Task and Main Writing Task

The use of TBLT involved pre-task and main-task phases. The pre-task stage aimed "to prepare students to perform the task in ways that will promote acquisition." (Ellis, 2006, p. 21). Students completed an information-gap task, which gave them opportunities for production through interaction (Ellis, 2019). The reason for adopting information-gap as a pre-task was that the task could be used to elicit L2 learners' language production mainly through interaction (Doughty & Pica, 1986), and I wanted students to use language productively at the pre-task stage to prepare them to focus on writing.

In a typical pre-task activity, students worked in pairs and received information about the pros or cons of studying abroad in preparation to answer the question "Do you think it is good for students to study abroad?" They first decided their roles (i.e., reading the pro or con part) through rock paper scissors. Students read the assigned section about the topic individually while taking notes for approximately 3 minutes and then shared information in their own words. Thus, one student gathered information about the pros while the other focused on the cons. A sample handout is shown in Appendix A.

Students then moved on to the main task. They were given a situation as a prompt for the writing task stating that the principal was considering whether the school

should introduce a new course that required each student to study abroad for a year. They discussed the topic and decided which position to take, similar to a debate, and individually wrote argumentative essays after the discussion.

Measurement of L2 Writing Anxiety

Second language writing anxiety was measured using the SLWAI (Cheng, 2004) at the beginning and end of the semester. The participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with the question items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Seven items (i.e., Items 1, 4, 7, 17, 18, 21, 22) were negatively worded and required reverse scoring before being calculated to yield total scores. A higher score indicated a higher level of L2 writing anxiety, or more specifically, a higher degree of physiological reaction, avoidance tendencies, and fear/worry associated with L2 writing. The participants took the same questionnaire at the end of the semester with the questions in a different order in order to reduce the effect of a repeated measurement.

While taking the survey on writing anxiety for the second time, students also answered a questionnaire about which stages of the writing process gave them anxiety. The questions used a five-point scale and open-ended questions about L2 writing learning were also included. The parts of the writing process that the questionnaire focused on were the pre-writing stages (i.e., generating ideas with mind-mapping), the main-writing stage, self-editing, post-writing discussion to share ideas, and peer-editing. Finally, one open-ended question, which asked students to express their impressions about the writing process, was used to check students' perceptions about the experience of the L2 writing task. I used a version of the SLWAI that I had translated into Japanese; questions about the writing process were also in Japanese.

Ethical Considerations

Before implementing this study, I obtained permission from the school to conduct the study. All participants received an information sheet that described the purpose and procedure of the study and a set of questions during the class. All participants were informed their participation was voluntary, they could withdraw at any time, their responses were for research only and would have no bearing on their grades, and no personal information would be used. This study met all the ethical standards of the school.



Data Analysis

For all scales, mean scores were calculated by averaging responses across items. A 5-point Likert scale (1-5) was used for both the SLWAI and items on anxiety levels during the writing process. Averages of 3 or higher on the 5-point scale were considered moderate to high levels of anxiety. In contrast, a mean score below 3 indicated a low level of anxiety. Inferential statistics were not used in this study, as its purpose was not to generalize to other populations but to learn more about my students' feelings of anxiety during the writing process.

Questionnaire Responses

As stated previously, RQ1 is concerned with the extent to which writers' perceptions of their anxiety changed from the beginning to the end of the semester. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the SLWAI and its subscales for both the pre- and post-instruction phases.

Pre-Instruction Phase

As shown in Table 1, writing anxiety scores at the pre-instructional phase were slightly above the mean of 3 ($M = 3.08$). Regarding the three dimensions of writing anxiety, the means of subscales measuring cognitive anxiety and avoidance behavior ($M = 3.11$ and 3.13 , respectively) were slightly higher than that of somatic anxiety ($M = 3.01$).

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of the SLWAI and its Subscales in Pre-/Post-Instruction Phase

Variable	Pre-Instruction		Post-Instruction		(Pre) - (Post)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Overall Writing Anxiety	3.08	(1.22)	3.01	(1.25)	-0.07
Somatic Anxiety	3.01	(1.24)	2.91	(1.26)	-0.10
Cognitive Anxiety	3.11	(1.23)	3.02	(1.28)	-0.09
Avoidance Behavior	3.13	(1.18)	3.09	(1.20)	-0.04

More fine-grained information about responses to items within the three subscales is provided in the appendices (see Appendix B for somatic, Appendix C for cognitive, and Appendix D for behavioral sub-scale means and standard deviations of item responses). These results can be summarized as follows. Regarding the somatic anxiety subscale (Appendix B), Item 2 (“I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraints”) was the highest ($M = 3.69$). Second, items involving evaluation (e.g., Item 9, “If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade”) were the highest ($M = 3.38$) in the cognitive anxiety subscale (Appendix C). Third, as for avoidance behavior, items such as Item 4, “I often choose to write down my thoughts in English”; $M = 3.63$) and Item 18, “I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class”; $M = 3.50$) involving habitual aspects of L2 writing were highest in the avoidance behavior category (Appendix D).

Post-Instruction Phase

At the end of the semester, during which, as mentioned previously, the class made extensive use of task-based writing, students took the SLWAI with questions in a different order. As shown in Table 1, overall L2 writing anxiety scores were slightly lower than in the pre-instructional stage ($M = 3.01$). Scores in each category decreased among three subscales from pre-instruction scores, and students' perceptions of somatic and cognitive anxiety ($M = 2.91$ and 3.02 , respectively) decreased more than avoidance behavior did ($M = 3.09$).

Regarding the specific question items (Appendices B-D), several patterns can be noted. Compared to the pre-instructional phase, this group of students felt lower levels of somatic anxiety, a decrease of 0.47 ($M = 3.22$; see Appendix B). However, there was little change in items related to cognitive anxiety, including Item 1 (“While writing in English, I'm not nervous at all”; $M = 3.18$). However, students' responses regarding anxiety about being evaluated on their written performance (Item 3) decreased by 0.59 points (“While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated”; $M = 2.79$), as shown in Appendix C. Finally, students' perceptions of avoidance behavior did not change much compared to the other two categories. However, their perception of avoidance of writing in English decreased by 0.24 points at the end of the semester, as shown in Item 5 (“I usually do my best to avoid writing in English”; $M = 2.92$; see Appendix D).



Anxiety Levels During the Writing Process

The second research question is concerned with the stages of the writing process during which students reported feeling most anxious. Questionnaire results are shown in Table 2. Regarding the initial stages of writing, from gathering ideas to self-editing, students reported moderate levels of anxiety ($M = 2.83, 3.02, \text{ and } 2.73$, respectively). In contrast, the discussion stage and peer-editing stages of the writing process were associated with greater anxiety ($M = 3.09$ and 3.19 , respectively). In other words, these students seemed to feel more anxiety at the post-writing stage rather than the pre- and main-writing phases.

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Anxiety Levels During the Writing Process

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gathering Ideas	2.83	(1.17)
Writing Composition	3.02	(1.27)
Self-Editing	2.73	(1.16)
Idea Sharing with Peers	3.09	(1.37)
Peer-Editing	3.19	(1.24)

Impressions of L2 Writing Throughout the Semester

In their responses to the final open-ended question of the questionnaire (“What did you learn from the writing tasks throughout the semester?”), the participants described their feelings about the writing tasks they had completed during the course. Some students expressed a sense of accomplishment through writing opinions and participating in post-writing discussions with peers. The following quotes have been translated from Japanese into English. “It was a great time for me to share ideas and thoughts about my writing with my peers. I was able to notice what I wouldn’t have realized by myself.” Others indicated they perceived some improvement in conveying their messages in writing. Focusing on strategies to help them convey a message in their own way seems to have allowed them to feel more comfortable with the tasks, which may have also mitigated writing anxiety: “I felt that I was getting better at writing and conveying my opinions in my own words throughout the semester,” and “I became more

comfortable putting my thoughts into English, which allowed me to deal with a larger number of words (to write in English).” In contrast, a few students stated that they still had trouble expressing their ideas in English and did not feel a sense of improvement: “Nothing has changed from last year based on my experience. I could not get good grades in writing tasks in class or on exams.”

To summarize, students’ comments suggested that many of them felt that their writing abilities had improved, particularly their ability to develop ideas through writing while interacting with peers. However, a few of them did not perceive any improvement and were dissatisfied with their evaluation.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to evaluate the results of my attempt to address high school students’ L2 writing anxiety using task-based instructional methods.

Regarding the first research question, there was a slight decrease in overall L2 writing anxiety from the beginning to the end of the semester. Students felt more anxious at the beginning of the semester with respect to all subscales: somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety, and avoidance behavior. Of the three subscales, students showed the strongest tendency toward avoidance behavior, which was a finding that aligned with Xiao and Wong’s (2014) results. Students’ reports of cognitive anxiety indicated that they felt anxious about others evaluating their writing.

Following instruction, however, the students reported lower levels of writing anxiety for each subscale. This suggests that regular instruction on writing may lower anxiety, including physical reactions, such as heart pounding. Also, repetition of writing tasks might help mitigate students’ negative responses to evaluation. However, avoidance levels did not change much and remained the highest among the three subscales throughout the semester. More research is needed to clarify how L2 writing instruction could allay learners’ avoidance behaviors.

With reference to the second research question, the survey of students’ perceptions of anxiety during the writing process suggested that anxiety levels peaked in the post-writing stages, which contrasts with Atay and Kurt’s (2006) finding of high rates of anxiety at the idea generation stage for prospective L2 teachers. There were also higher anxiety levels in the items involving evaluation in the cognitive anxiety subscale during peer interaction activities. For these students, sharing their writing and peer editing involved other students and feedback on their writing. The post-writing stage could, therefore, lead to more anxiety in the post-writing phase than in the pre- and main-writing phases.



Nevertheless, as students' comments indicated, the writing tasks that were used during the course seem to have mitigated their anxiety at least somewhat. Their writing improvement and expanded facility with a range of English expressions might have played a role in this. However, there remained some learners who did not feel a sense of achievement over the semester and needed more successful experiences in the tasks and examinations, which indicates further issues to be resolved.

In summary, the results suggest that L2 writing anxiety went down over the term, and students perceived their writing abilities as improving (RQ1). However, they tended to show avoidance strategies when writing, as the scores for avoidance behaviors did not change much and remained the highest of the three. In addition, students felt more anxious during the post-writing discussion and peer-editing stages instead of the main writing and pre-writing stages (RQ2). Some students may also require more scaffolding for writing tasks and tests to feel a sense of achievement in writing.

Pedagogical Implications

One implication of this study is that it may be necessary for teachers to provide explicit instruction on how to give peer feedback so as to alleviate students' anxiety during post-writing tasks such as idea sharing and peer editing. As Saito and Fujita (2004) pointed out, L2 learners are more likely to focus on checking surface sentence-level features than genre structures and ideas. Conversely, students can benefit from instruction and opportunities for collaborative editing and peer feedback on their writing (Kurihara, 2014; Storch, 2019). It would thus be useful for teachers to provide tips for peer editing, such as being specific with comments and conscientious of what writers are trying to convey (Hyland, 2019).

Second, students can benefit from opportunities for informal writing that is not revised and eventually evaluated, such as journals and diaries. These activities would be helpful for students with high anxiety who worry about evaluation and making mistakes and may also help teachers to address learners' problematic writing habits, especially avoidance strategies. These tasks can also provide an alternative form of assessment that can help teachers track students' improvement in writing done in a notebook or on a device and help mitigate L2 writing anxiety while encouraging them to write more.

To conclude, this study investigated the degree and type of Japanese high school learners' L2 writing anxiety throughout the semester so as to determine when they felt the most anxious during the writing process. The paper hopefully paves the way for more research on L2 writing anxiety of Japanese high school learners of English.

Bio Data

Naomi Sugahara is a graduate student in the Kanda University of International Studies MA TESOL Program and a teacher of English at a private high school in Chiba Prefecture. His interests include professional development strategies in L2 writing instruction and task-based language teaching (TBLT) in Japanese secondary school contexts. He is also interested in language teacher cognition and teacher training. <5211101@kuis.ac.jp>

References

- Abrams, Z. I. (2019). The effects of integrated writing on linguistic complexity in L2 writing and task-complexity. *System*, *81*, 110-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.009>
- Abrams, Z. I., & Byrd, D. R. (2016). The effects of pre-task planning on L2 writing: Mind-mapping and chronological sequencing in a 1st-year German class. *System*, *63*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.08.011>
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*, 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02026.x>
- Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(4), 100-118. http://asian-efl-journal.com/December_2006_EBook.pdf
- Cheng, Y. S. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, *35*(6), 647-656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb01903.x>
- Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(4), 313-335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001>
- Chiang, Y. N. (2012). Perfectionism and EFL writing anxiety in mathematics-and-science-gifted senior high school girls. *English Teaching & Learning*, *36*(1), 53-83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6330/2fETL.2012.36.1.02>
- Doughty, C., & Pica, T. (1986). "Information gap" tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition?. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(2), 305-325. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586546>
- Ellis, R. (2006). The methodology of task-based teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3), 19-45. https://asian-efl-journal.com/September_2006_EBook_editions.pdf#page=19
- Ellis, R. (2019). *Introducing task-based language teaching*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21832/9781788925877-008>
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 112-126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000071>



- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kawashima, H. (2019). Effects of pre-task planning on speaking anxiety of Japanese EFL learners. *ARELE: Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 30, 145-160. https://doi.org/10.20581/arele.30.0_145
- Kurihara, N. (2014). Adoption of the process-oriented writing approach in a Japanese high school classroom. *The Language Teacher*, 38(5), 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT38.5-9>
- Machida, N., & Dalsky, D. J. (2014). The effect of concept mapping on L2 writing performance: Examining possible effects of trait-level writing anxiety. *English Language Teaching*, 7(9), 28-35. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n9p28>
- MEXT. (2010). 高等学校学習指導要領 解説、外国語編・英語編 [Senior-high school course of study guide: Foreign language & English]. Retrieved December 27, 2021, from https://www.mext.go.jp/component/a_menu/education/micro_detail/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2010/01/29/1282000_9.pdf
- MEXT. (2018). 高等学校学習指導要領 (平成30年告示) 解説、外国語編・英語編 [Senior-high school course of study (announced in 2018) guide: Foreign language & English]. Retrieved December 26, 2021, from https://www.mext.go.jp/content/1407073_09_1_2.pdf.
- My Way English Communication II*. (2018). Sanseido.
- Nitta, R., & Baba, K. (2014). Task repetition and L2 writing development. In H. Byrnes & R. M. Manchón (Eds.), *Task-based language learning: Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp. 107-136). <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.7.05nit>
- Ojima, M. (2006). Concept mapping as pre-task planning: A case study of three Japanese ESL writers. *System*, 34(4), 566-585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.08.003>
- Reeves, L. L. (1997). Minimizing writing apprehension in the learner-centered classroom. *English Journal*, 86(6), 38-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/820367>
- Rezaei, M., & Jafari, M. (2014). Investigating the levels, types, and causes of writing anxiety among Iranian EFL students: A mixed method design. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1545-1554. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.577>
- Saito, H., & Fujita, T. (2004). Characteristics and user acceptance of peer rating in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 31-54. <https://doi.org/10.1191/2F1362168804lr133oa>
- Shang, H. F. (2013). Factors associated with English as a foreign language university students' writing anxiety. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1-12. <https://www.eajournals.org/journals/international-journal-of-english-language-teaching-ijelt/vol-1-issue-1-september-2013/factors-associated-with-english-as-a-foreign-language-university-students-writing-anxiety/>
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing as peer feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 143-161). Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.010>
- The Japan Times Publishing, Ltd., & Logoport. (2020). 最短合格! 英検準2級ライティング完全制覇 [The fastest way to pass Eiken Grade pre-2 Test. Complete mastery of writing]. The Japan Times Publishing. <https://bookclub.japantimes.co.jp/book/b550302.html>
- Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *TESL-EJ*, 7(2), 1-12. <http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume7/ej26/ej26a6/>
- Xiao, Y., & Wong, K. F. (2014). Exploring heritage language anxiety: A study of Chinese heritage language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(2), 589-611. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12085>



Appendix A

Sample Handout for an Information-Gap Pre-Task Activity

English Communication II

TOPIC

Do you think it is good for students to study abroad?

Positive

- By meeting people who have cultures different from yours, you can get a wider view of the world.
 - When you are in foreign countries, you have to live using a foreign language. It improves your foreign language skills a lot.
 - Studying abroad will be helpful in the future. Many companies look for people who have international experience.
1. Take notes while reading the passage.
 2. Fold your sheets in half & tell your partner about what information you got from the reading.
*You must not go back to the top page! You can depend only on the above notes.
 3. Listen to your partner and take notes about what you think is important.

Note. Adapted from the Japan Times Publishing, Ltd., & Logoport: Chapter 2 “Education” (The Japan Times Publishing, Ltd. & Logoport, 2020, pp. 60–61).

Appendix B

Means and Standard Deviations of Somatic Anxiety Subscales

Items	M (SD)		(Pre) - (Post)
	Pre-Instruction	Post-Instruction	
2. <i>I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraints.</i>	3.69 (1.07)	3.22 (1.13)	-0.47
6. <i>My mind often goes blank when I start to work on English composition.</i>	3.03 (1.17)	2.85 (1.24)	-0.18
8. <i>I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.</i>	2.41 (1.20)	2.41 (1.21)	0.00
11. <i>My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraints.</i>	3.51 (1.14)	3.53 (1.20)	+0.02
13. <i>I often feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraints.</i>	2.89 (1.20)	2.87 (1.23)	-0.02
15. <i>I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.</i>	3.27 (1.19)	3.26 (1.26)	-0.01
19. <i>I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.</i>	2.27 (0.98)	2.25 (1.06)	-0.02



Appendix C

Means and Standard Deviations of Cognitive Anxiety Subscales

Items	M (SD)		(Pre) - (Post)
	Pre-Instruction	Post-Instruction	
1. While writing in English, I'm not nervous at all. (R)	2.79 (1.15)	3.18 (1.19)	+0.39
3. While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.	3.38 (1.21)	2.79 (1.25)	-0.59
7. I don't worry that my English compositions are a lot worse than others. (R)	3.37 (1.18)	3.37 (1.25)	0.00
9. If my English composition is to be evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor grade.	3.38 (1.23)	3.25 (1.25)	-0.13
14. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.	2.42 (1.23)	2.52 (1.26)	+0.10
17. I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions. (R)	3.11 (1.18)	2.96 (1.26)	-0.15
20. I'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.	3.17 (1.22)	3.06 (1.30)	-0.11
21. I'm not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor. (R)	3.29 (1.10)	3.19 (1.24)	-0.10

Appendix D

Means and Standard Deviations of Avoidance Behavior Subscales

Items	M (SD)		(Pre) - (Post)
	Pre-Instruction	Post-Instruction	
4. I often choose to write down my thoughts in English. (R)	3.63 (0.96)	3.52 (1.05)	-0.11
5. I usually do my best to avoid writing in English.	3.16 (1.08)	2.92 (1.14)	-0.24
10. I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.	2.98 (1.16)	2.90 (1.09)	-0.08
12. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.	3.37 (1.13)	3.35 (1.22)	-0.02
16. I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.	2.31 (1.06)	2.18 (1.03)	-0.13
18. I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class. (R)	3.50 (1.06)	3.55 (1.04)	+0.05
22. Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions. (R)	2.96 (1.24)	3.17 (1.22)	+0.21