

**Writing Apprehension And Performance Of Iraqi Efl Students
According To Their Academic Locus Of Control Orientation
Ph.D. Asst.Prof. Salam Hamid Abbas
University of Baghdad /Collage of Education /Ibn Rushd**

Abstract:

This study aims at investigating Iraqi EFL students' level of writing apprehension, writing performance, and locus of control orientation. It also seeks to find out the correlation between these three variables according to the academic locus of control orientation (internal and external). The instruments of the study are administered to (160) participants who are randomly selected from two departments of English in the University of Baghdad. The statistical manipulation of the data collected indicates that the participants show external orientation of academic locus of control, high level of writing apprehension, and low level of writing performance. The study also reveals that academic locus of control orientation (including both internal and external) does not correlate with writing apprehension, while, writing performance correlate negatively with external orientation of academic locus of control and positively with the internal orientation. Finally writing apprehension and writing performance are found to negatively correlate in both cases of academic locus of control orientation.

Key words: writing performance, Iraqi EFL students', English Language

**كتابة تخوف وأداء الطلاب العراقيين في إفل وفقا لموقعهم
الأكاديمي من توجيه السيطرة
أ.م.د. سلام حامد عباس
جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الانسانية**

المخلص:

ترمي الدراسة الحالية الى تقصي مستوى قلق الكتابة ، الاداء الكتابي ، وموقع الضبط للطلبة العراقيين دارسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية. كما تهدف الدراسة الى ايجاد العلاقة بين هذه المتغيرات الثلاثة وحسب موقع الضبط الاكاديمي (داخلي و خارجي). تم تطبيق ادوات الدراسة على ١٦٠ مشاركا، تم اختيارهم بصورة عشوائية من قسمين للغة الانكليزية في جامعة بغداد. وبعد استخدام الوسائل الاحصائية المناسبة، اظهرت النتائج بان افراد العينة لديهم توجه خارجي في موقع الضبط و مستوى عال من قلق الكتابة فضلاً عن مستوى منخفض من الاداء الكتابي. كما اظهرت النتائج ايضا بان موقع الضبط الاكاديمي داخليا كان ام خارجيا لا يرتبط بمستوى قلق الكتابة، بينما يرتبط الاداء الكتابي سلبيا بموقع الضبط الاكاديمي الخارجي وايجابيا بموقع الضبط الاكاديمي الداخلي. واخيرا ظهر بان قلق الكتابة والاداء الكتابي يرتبطان سلبيا في كلا الحالتين موقع الضبط الاكاديمي الداخلية والخارجية. وفي ضوء النتائج التي توصلت اليها الرسالة تقديم عدد من الاستنتاجات والمقترحات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأداء الكتابي، الطلبة العراقيين، اللغة الانكليزية.

Section One: Introduction:**The Problem of the Study:**

Writing is an important skill that might affect EFL students' communication in, and learning of, English language. In addition to the fact that writing courses and activities form a bulk component in mostly all EFL teaching programs, EFL writing plays a central role in today's schools as well as colleges as the main media through which EFL students' academic success is measured.

Several academic studies report that Iraqi EFL students, in general, show poor writing performance and weak achievement in writing courses (AlKarkhi, 1999), (Abid& Abdul Ridha, 2011), (Hamza, 2012), (Reishaan, 2013), and (Muslim, 2014), . Such studies mostly suggest remedial actions or teaching techniques and programs to develop students' writing performance with no, or little, reference to the affective factors influencing EFL students' writing performance.

Writing apprehension is one of the affective factors that is reported to have a debilitating effect on EFL students' writing performance, willingness to write, and development of positive attitude toward writing (Pimsarn, 2013:101). On the other hand, academic locus of control is also among the variables that are globally reported to affect academic performance in general (Kutains et al, 2011: 114) yet, only scant attention has been given to studying it in the EFL education context with special reference to writing skill. And most of the studies conducted in this area investigate its relationship to EFL students' achievement (Nodoushan, 2012:126). The present study is intended to investigate Iraqi students' writing apprehension and performance according to their locus of control orientation as an attempt to contribute to this area of research.

Aims:

The study aims at finding out;

1. Iraqi EFL students' orientation of locus of control, level of writing apprehension, and level of writing performance.
2. the correlation between Iraqi EFL students' orientation of locus of control, level of writing apprehension, and level of writing performance according to the locus of control orientation ;internal and external.

Limits:

The study is limited to Iraqi university EFL students in the departments of English of the two colleges of education in the University of Baghdad; College of Education for Human Sciences/Ibn Rushd and College of Education for Women during the academic year 2015-2016.

Value:

The present study is hoped to provide beneficial data for Iraqi EFL students and teachers about two important affective variables in the EFL educational context in general, and in the area of EFL writing in particular in addition to the level of students' writing performance. Such data is likely to promote EFL classroom teachers' awareness and knowledge of the significance, effects, and correlations of the investigated variables. This may help them find effective procedures to minimize the negative effects of these variables which may

ultimately contribute to the development of students' language skills in general with special reference to writing. The present study is also intended to investigate the correlation of students' writing apprehension and writing performance according to their academic locus of control orientation which is, to the best knowledge of the researcher, has not been investigated before.

Section Two: Theoretical Background:

FL Writing Apprehension:

Writing apprehension (hence forth WA) is a prominent effective factor that is found to debilitate the promotion of EFL students' writing performance (Huwari& Aziz ,2011: 191). WA is defined as a " situation and subject specific individual difference associated with a person's tendencies to approach or avoid situations perceived to potentially require writing accompanied by some amount of perceived evaluation" (Daly and Wilson, 1983:327). The interest in WA is ignited by Daly and Miller in 1975 when they introduce the concept and develop the first WA test.

Apprehension vs. Anxiety:

Daly (1985:65) suggests two categories for FL writing perception; dispositional which refers to a constant state such as writing attitude and motivation, and situational which refers to a situation-specific state such as writing anxiety and self-efficacy. He elaborates that writing apprehension is not the same as writing anxiety, for the former falls in the dispositional category while the latter is one component of the situational one.

Another perspective views writing anxiety as the result of different cognitive, linguistic, and affective factors and WA as one of the affective factors that may lead to writing anxiety. In this regard, WA may be provoked and enhanced by such other factors as students' low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, or negative attitude toward writing (Sadeghi, 2010: 4).

However, sometimes writing apprehension and writing anxiety are interchangeably used. The definition of WA as "the anxiety about writing" suggested by Lee and Krashen (2002:535) is a clear example in this regard. Yet, writing apprehension versus speaking anxiety gain popularity in the recent related literature (Cheng et al., 1999: 422).

Sources of WA:

Writing is viewed as the transformation of one's thoughts, ideas, and feelings into written language and, so, incorporates different interrelated components. It is a demanding process in which students are required to use high thinking skills, organize ideas efficiently, and utilize appropriate language structures and writing mechanics (Erkan & Saban, 2011: 164). Literature has not been decisive concerning the real causes of writing apprehension. Writing in general , and EFL writing in particular, is reflected by teachers and students alike to be a sophisticated and difficult-to-master language skill (Salem, 2007: 31). Accordingly, the complexity of performance in writing may involve a greater amount of apprehension than other language skills. Moreover, the idea that writing is a productive skill in which students usually work individually with no, or little, help, support, and encouragement from the teacher and peers is likely to

cause students' stress and apprehension associated with writing tasks and activities (Mohseniasl, 2014: 811).

The causes of WA, as provided by literature, can be summarized and classified to relate to both students and classroom teachers. Concerning FL students, both cognitive and metacognitive factors may affect the level of WA they experience. WA may be attributed to students' linguistic deficiency, for WA is argued to be experienced by students more in the early stages of FL learning than in the later stages. In addition, weak students and unskilled or poor writers are seen to more experience WA (Hadaway, 1987: 22). Yet, Horwitz (2000: 257) argues that WA may be experienced by FL students during any stage of language skill development and by no means limited to any level of language mastery. (Erkan and Saban, 2011: 171).

On the other hand, students' writing strategy used, fear of teacher's evaluation and feedback of their writing performance, negative attitudes, demotivation, low level of self-esteem and writing self-efficacy, and poor practice of writing are argued to be among the main student-related causes of WA (Hilleson, 1996: 251).

With respect to FL classroom teachers, the overemphasis on the accuracy of form and writing mechanics, adoption of a product, rather than process, approach to teaching writing, and negative comments or unwise feedback and correction procedures are regarded as important causes of FL students' WA (Abu Shawish & Atea, 2010).

WA and Writing Performance:

Related studies and literature indicate that WA is found to have a negative correlation with students' writing performance as well as quality (Singh & Rajalingam, 2012: 42).

Highly apprehensive students are indicated to produce less quality writing performance, avoid writing activities and tasks, and show a noticeable level of procrastination (Hanna, 2010: 43). They are also reported to, whenever possible, avoid writing classes, writing less frequently, use a prosaic language, have difficulty in deciding on what to write about, state ideas incompletely, and show weak knowledge and usage of language structures and punctuation marks (Faigley et. al., 1991: 11-12). Generally speaking, highly apprehensive students' writing is noticed to be "lifeless, mechanical, and full of grammatical errors, repeated concepts, and unsupported organization" (Hettich, 194: 375).

Highly apprehensive students are reported also to have lower expectations of their scores and be less willing to engage in writing courses. Less apprehensive students, in contrast, are noticed to write significantly more paragraphs when they are asked to write, and more words per paragraph. They are found also to be willing to take additional and more advanced courses in writing. (Daly & Miller, 1975: 255).

However, WA has an inverse correlation with self-esteem. Students' writing apprehension and performance are noticed to influence, and be influenced by, the way they feel about themselves (Hanna, 2010: 42). WA is also found to be negatively correlated with academic motivation, i.e., a high level of WA may

seriously minimize students' motivation in writing. This is, in turn, reported to negatively affect students' attitude toward writing (Gere, 1987: 29).

Locus of Control:

Generally speaking, individuals tend to impute the events they experience throughout their lives to two main causative sources; internal and external. The point where these imputations lie is known as locus of control (Rotter, 1990:489). Individuals who believe that their success and failure are merely results of their own abilities and efforts are described to have internal locus of control. While those who attribute such events in their lives to sources beyond their control such as luck, fate, chance, or other people involvement are called to have external locus of control (Oluwakemi, 2015: 30).

The concept of locus of control (henceforth LOC), however, is first introduced by Julian Rotter (1966) within the scope of his social learning theory. He defines it as a cognitive behavioral psychological attribute describing the extent to which an individual perceive control over the events or outcomes in his/her life. According to Rotter, locus of control is not a dichotomous concept. It simply has two ends with internal locus of control at the first one and external locus of control at the other (Rasekhet all, 2012: 36). However, locus of control is viewed as the predictor of individuals' academic and social behaviors (Tell & Adika, 2008: 123) .

Academic LOC:

Academic Locus of Control (hence forth ALOC) refers to a student's perception about whether his/her academic achievement is really determined by his/her own efforts and actions or by some other factors beyond his/her control (Trice, 1985 as cited in Arslan & Akin, 2014:34).

ALOC concept is one of the important variables affecting learning in general, performance, and attitude formation and change (Kutains et al, 2011: 114). ALOC underling principles, possible influences, and outcomes have been increasingly integrated into the educational settings. Many varied related studies correlate students' ALOC to their academic achievement (Toussi and Ghanizadeh, 2012: 2364). These studies find that students with internal ALOC are likely to impute the results they achieve (good or bad) to their own abilities, efforts, and performance. On the other hand, external ALOC students tend to relate their failure or success to such factors as difficulty of tasks, luck, chance, fate, unfair examination system, or even teachers' prejudice (Rasekhet all, 2012: 36).

Internal vs. External LOC:

Related studies conclude that students who are internally oriented in their ALOC perform much better in their academic tasks and, ultimately, get better achievement than those who are found to be externally oriented (Yates, 2009: 68). Since internally oriented students believe that success and high grades reflect the result of their own efforts, those students are likely to constantly keep on attending classes, studying hard, and staying on tasks. Moreover, they are reported to be convinced that their teachers are not bias or unjust. While, students with external ALOC, generally speaking, have the tendency to believe that class attendance and studiousness are not very important and that their teachers are

biased and unfair. Unfortunately, this is clearly reflected in their feeling of helplessness over academic situations. (Hasan & Khalid, 2014: 22).

Related literature also reports that there is a kind of association between internal ALOC and emotional experiences. According to internal ALOC students, success is usually associated with feelings of pride, confidence, and/or responsibility, while failure is associated with one or more of negative emotions such as disappointment or distress. In other words, they feel very proud of their academic achievement and they feel ashamed when they experience failure or slumping achievement. (Mearns, 2009:1538). External ALOC students, on the other hand, are reported to be less sensitive in both cases, i.e., no clear association is reported between the outcome they achieve (success or failure) and strong positive or negative emotions. This, unfortunately, provides no impulse for the pursuit of success and excellence (Phares, 1976:114).

External ALOC is also reported to positively correlate with academic procrastination which, in turn, found to associate with negative qualities such as poor habits of study, frequent off-tasks, missed deadlines, low achievement grades, and low self-esteem. Since internally oriented students relate good and bad achievements to their own actions, they are found to procrastinate much less than externally oriented students (Kader, 2014: 2).

Different studies also associate internal academic ALOC with high motivation and strong insistence to persuade the learning tasks and activities (Hasan & Khalid, 2014:25). Research results indicate also that internal ALOC students, generally speaking, employ different cognitive and/or metacognitive strategies more frequently than external ALOC students do. Consequently, they become more successful in developing their knowledge and skills (Yesilyurt, 2014:1946). Moreover, in EFL learning setting, internal academic ALOC students show a high level of language learning aptitude and act with high levels of intelligence and competence to achieve success (Hemmat and Rahimi, 2012:8387).

Writing and LOC:

To the researcher's best knowledge, no study has tackled directly the relationship between students' orientation of ALOC and their WA and/or writing performance. Yet, generally speaking, high level of academic anxiety is found to correlate more with external, rather than internal, LOC orientation (Wlikinson & Chamove, 1992: 71). Writing performance is noticed to negatively correlate with test anxiety which, just like WA, involves students' fear of evaluation (Nemati, 2012: 98). And a high level of language anxiety is adduced to have a debilitating effect on FL students' writing performance (Cheng et al., 1999: 418). Accordingly, finding out the direct correlation between these two variables can be viewed as a contribution to this area of research.

Section Three: Methodology:

Population and Sample:

The population of the present study consists of (800) Iraqi EFL students in the departments of English College of Education for Human Sciences/ Ibn Rushd and College of Education for Women in the University of Baghdad. The sample, on the other hand, includes 160 students who are randomly selected from the 3rd and 4th years of study in the above-mentioned departments according to their

ratio in the population. The sample represents 20% of the total population. (See *Table1*).

Table 1.The Sample of the Study

Department of English	3 rd year	4 th year	Total
College of Education/ Ibn Rushd	50	50	100
College of Education for Women	35	25	60
Total	85	75	160

The rationale behind excluding 1st and 2nd year students of the from the sample is related to the idea that their language mastery is not yet sufficient enough to enable them understand the items of the instruments of this study, and they do not yet practice composition, essay, or free writing so, they may not be able to give accurate responses. Moreover, their writing skill is not yet developed enough to take the same writing test with 3rd and 4th year students.

Instruments of the Study:

To collect the data required for this study, three instruments are used; the EFL Writing Apprehension (WA) Scale and, the Academic Locus of Control (ALOC) Scale for College Students, and a writing performance test.

ALOC Scale:

This 28 items scale is designed by Trice, A. D. (1985) to investigate university students ALOC variable as varying between internal and external ALOC. The scores that can be achieved in this scale range between 28-140 with high scores referring to stronger tendency toward external ALOC and vices versa.(Appendix I)

WA Scale:

It is developed to by Alnyfaie M. (2013) based on Daly and Miller's writing apprehension test and Cheng's second language writing apprehension inventory. It is designed particularly to be administered on a sample of Arab EFL students at the university level. It has 22 items which are equally divided, but randomly sequenced, to indicate positive and negative loading of WA. The scores to be achieved on this scale can range between 22-110 with high scores reflecting high levels of WA.(Appendix II)

Writing Performance Test:

To evaluate the participants' WP, a writing test is conducted in which participants are asked to write three paragraphs of at least 250 words on one of three topics. These topics are suggested by the participants themselves. The scoring of this test is done according to an analytical scheme designed by Brown (2007). In this scheme, the writing performance is evaluated according to five aspects, these are; content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics. The scores achieved in this test can range between 10-40. (Appendix III)

Face Validity:

In order to check the face validity of the two scales, they are exposed to a jury of 16 experts and specialists in ELT methodology (8), educational psychology (6), and educational statistics (2), while the writing test is exposed to the jury members who are specialist in ELT methodology and educational statistics to judge its scoring rubric face validity. The jurors are requested to check the

suitability of the instruments to measure the studied variables in the Iraqi university EFL education and indicate whether, or not, the items of the instruments are clear and appropriate. The jurors show 100% agreement on the suitability of the two instruments and writing test scoring rubric to measure the intended variables.

The jurors mostly agree also on the suitability and clearness of the items of the WA and ALOC scales, except for items 5 (At least once, I have taken a course because it was easy to get good grade at) and 8 (Some students, such as student leaders and athletes, get free rides in college) in the ALOC scale which are recommended by (75%) and (81%) of the jurors respectively to be restated as being unsuitable to the Iraqi university academic setting. Both items are replaced by new statements that reflect the same general meaning and they are approved by all of the jurors.

The scoring scheme of the writing test is also exposed to the jurors specialized in ELT and educational statistics to judge its suitability for evaluating WP of the sample involved in this study. The scoring scheme is 100% approved by the jury.

Pilot Administration of Instruments:

Thirty students are randomly selected from the departments of English in the College of Education/Ibn Rushd for the sake of conducting a pilot administration of the two scales and the writing test. This sample of students is excluded from the main sample of the study. The pilot administration has been done in order to check the clarity of the items and compute the reliability of the questionnaire. Fortunately, no serious ambiguity is found concerning the scales items.

Construct Validity:

To ensure the construct validity of the two scales, items are statistically analyzed by checking the patterns of correlations within the scores achieved by a sample of subjects responding to the scale items (Trochim et al., 2015:159).

Statistical Analysis:

The two scales of the study are administered to 100 students randomly selected from the departments of English in the College of Education/Ibn Rushd and College of Languages as a statistical analysis sample. The subjects in this sample are excluded from the main sample of this study. This procedure is carried out to check item discrimination power and item-total correlation of the scales which are reliable indicators of construct validity.

Discrimination Power:

The statistical sample subjects' scores in each of the two scales are arranged from the highest score to the lowest scores. Accordingly, scores achieved in each scale are divided into an upper and a lower groups. Checking the discrimination power of items is done by utilizing t-test for two independent samples to check the difference between the mean scores of each item in the upper and lower groups of each scale. This statistical procedure yields t-values ranging between 2.89-8.40 and 3.32-8.22 respectively for the WA and ALOC scales. Since these values are higher than the critical t-value 1.98 at 0.05 level of significance and under the degree of freedom 98, the items are considered acceptable (*see table 2*).

Table 2. Ranges of T-values of Items in the Two Scales

Scale	Range of t-values	Critical t value	Level of Significance	Degree of Freedom
WA Scale	2.89-8.40	1.98	0.05	98
ALOC Scale	3.32 –8.22			

Item-Total Correlation:

To compute the correlation between each item's score and the total one in each scale, Pearson correlation formula is utilized. The results achieved reveal coefficients ranging between 0.32-0.49 and 0.21-0.38 for the WA, and ALOC scales respectively. Since these coefficients are higher than the critical value of Pearson correlation coefficient 0.196 at 0.05 level of significance and degree of freedom 98, all items are found acceptable (*see table 3*).

Table 3. Ranges of Pearson Correlation Coefficient of Items in the Two Scales

Scale	Range of correlation coefficients	Critical Pearson correlation value	Level of Significance	Degree of Freedom
WA Scale	0.32-0.49	0.196	0.05	98
ALOC Scale	0.21-0.38			

Reliability:

To determine the reliability of the instruments of the study, the same pilot sample is asked to respond again to the scales after two weeks. The data obtained from the two administrations of WA and ALOC scales is statistically manipulated by using two ways. Pearson Correlation Formula which yields 0.790 and 0.837 correlations, and by Alpha Cronbach Formula which results 0.822 and 0.852 respectively for the two scales. All of the achieved coefficients are regarded acceptable according to Nunnally (1978:245).

Final Administration of Instruments:

The two scales are administered to the sample of the study at the same time. While the writing performance test is given to them in a different session due to the fact that it is difficult for the participants to respond to the three instruments all together and that the writing performance test is usually time-consuming.

Section Four: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations:

The results achieved in this study are indicated and discussed according to the aims of the study.

Results According to the First Aim:

To find out participants' ALOC orientation, WA level, WP level, the data collected from the application of the three instruments of the study is arithmetically and statistically manipulated. As shown in table (4), the arithmetic mean of participants' scores achieved in each scale is calculated. To judge the statistical significance of the difference between the arithmetic mean of participants' scores and the theoretical mean of each scale, one sample t-test is used.

Table 4. Participants ALOC Orientation, WA Level, and WP Level

Variable	N	Arithmetic Mean	S.D	Theoretical Mean	T-test Value		L.S	D.F
					computed	critical		
ALOC	160	91.11	23.22	84	3.87	1.96	0.05	159
WA		74.48	13.82	66	7.76			
WP		21.67	6.77	25	6.20			

ALOC Orientation:

The arithmetic mean is 91.11 which is higher than the theoretical one 84. The computed t-test value is 3.87 which is also higher than the critical one 1.96. The difference between the two means is, then, statistically significant and in favor of the arithmetic one. Since the ALOC scale used in this study is a dichotomous one with the highest scores referring to a stronger orientation toward external ALOC, it can be said, then, that the participants' , in general, are externally oriented in their ALOC.

Writing Apprehension:

With respect to the WA scale, the mean of participants' scores is 74.48 which are higher than the theoretical mean 66.0. T-test results a computed value 7.76 which is again higher than the critical one. The difference between the two means is statistically significant in favor of the arithmetic one. Accordingly, participants are judged to have a high level of WA.

Writing Performance:

In the WP test, participants achieve an arithmetic mean 21.67 which is lower than the theoretical one 25.0. T-test yields a computed value 6.20. The difference between the two means is also significant but this time in favor of the theoretical one. Participants can be reported, then, to have a low level of WP.

Results According to the Second Aim:

The 2nd aim of this study is to find out the correlation between ALOC, WA, and WP according to participants' ALOC orientations (internal and external). To find out participants' ALOC orientations, two cut points in the participants' scores in the ALOC scales are to be determined since, as mention earlier, this scale is a dichotomous one with the highest scores referring to a stronger orientation toward external ALOC. These two cut points include a higher one representing the lower limit of externally oriented participants' scores and a lower cut point standing for the upper limit of internally oriented participants' scores.

To achieve this, participants' scores are ranked from the highest score to the lowest one. These scores are found to range between 129-43. The two cut points are determined as follows:

The higher cut point = Mean + standard deviation

The lower cut point = Mean – standard deviation

Accordingly, the participants who score 114 or more, the total number of whom is 37, are considered externally oriented. While those who score 69 or less, the total number of whom is 31, are considered to have internal orientation. The 92 participants who get scores ranging between the above mentioned two cut

points are considered fluctuating in their ALOC orientation and, thus, excluded from the statistical manipulation related to this aim.

ALOC and WA:

As illustrated in table (6) below, the coefficient of the correlation between internal ALOC and WA is 0.002, while that of the correlation between external ALOC and WA is 0.148. The computed t-test values for these coefficients are 0.011 and 0.886 respectively, which are both lower than the critical values 2.045 and 2.021 respectively. Accordingly, this correlation, in both cases, is not statistically significant.

Table 6. The Correlation of Internal and External ALOC with WA

Variable	N	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	T-test Value		L.S	D.F
			computed	critical		
Internal ALOC & WA	31	0.002	0.011	2.045	0.05	29
External ALOC & WA	37	0.148	0.886	2.021		35

ALOC and WP:

The correlation coefficient of internal ALOC and WP is 0.409 and that of the correlation between external ALOC and WP is -0.339. T-test yields computed values 2.42 and 2.13 for these correlations respectively. Both computed t-values are higher than the related critical ones 2.045 and 2.021. Internal ALOC, then, correlates positively with WP, while external ALOC is found in negative correlation with WP. (*See table 7*).

Table 7. The Correlation of Internal and External ALOC with WP

Variable	N	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	T-test Value		L.S	D.F
			computed	critical		
Internal ALOC & WP	31	0.409	2.42	2.045	0.05	29
External ALOC & WP	37	-0.339	2.13	2.021		35

WA and WP:

As shown in table 8, computing the correlation between WA and WP of internal ALOC participants yields a coefficient -0.684. With respect to externally oriented participants, the correlation coefficient of these two variables is -0.428. T-test yields computed values of 5.07 and 2.81 respectively both of which are higher than the critical t-values. The correlations in both cases, then, are negative and statistically significant.

Table 8. The Correlation of WA and WP of Internal and External ALOC Students

Variable	N	Correlation Coefficient	T-test Value		L.S	D.F
			computed	critical		
WA&WP in Internal ALOC	31	-0.684	5.07	2.045	0.05	29
WA&WP in External ALOC	37	-0.428	2.81	2.021		35

Conclusions

1. Iraqi EFL university students have external orientation of ALOC, high level of WA, low level of WP.
2. There is no correlation between ALOC orientation (including both internal and external) and the level of WA of students.
3. Students' WP correlates positively with internal ALOC orientation, and negatively with external orientation.
4. Students' WA and WP of both internal and external ALOC students are in negative correlation.

Recommendations

According to the results achieved, it is recommended that EFL writing teachers;

1. be aware of how to enable their students decrease or , at least, control their WA which may seriously debilitate the promotion of their writing skill.
2. identify the possible classroom-related sources of their students' writing apprehension and do the best to minimize their effects.
3. encourage students to frequently practice writing and do not evaluate every writing performance. This is likely to help reduce the effect of students' low level of writing self-efficacy , fear of evaluation, and lack of sufficient writing practice being among the main causes of WA.
4. encourage and train students to self-correct their writing performance errors and mistakes so as to overcome any negative emotions toward teacher correction and feedback which may also provoke students' WA.
5. teach writing as a process, rather than a product, in which all phases of writing (pre writing- writing- post writing) are given the due attention , and not only the product.
6. use a variety of interesting writing activities to encourage students to freely write about interesting topics to help them develop positive attitude toward writing and reinforce their motivation to write which are also regarded as possible influencing variables in students WA.
7. encourage group and pair writing to create a non-threatening environment in which students work with, support, and encourage each other, and ultimately learn from each other.
8. develop their theoretical and practical knowledge about the best ways of dealing with externally and internally oriented students in their ALOC and how to reduce the negative effects associated with external orientation of ALOC.

References:

1. Abid, Rana& Abdul Ridha, Nada (2011). *A study of coherence in the writings of EFL advanced Iraqi learners*. University of Basrah Studies in English, Vol.16, pp.281-302.
2. Abu Shawish, J., &Atea, M. (2010). *An Investigation of Palestinian EFL Majors' Writing Apprehension: Causes and Remedies. Proceedings of the First National Conference on: Improving TEFL Methods & Practices at Palestinian Universities*. ED512894. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED512894>.

3. Ali, Shurooq (2012). *An Analysis of Iraqi EFL Learners' Errors in Paragraph Writing*. Al Ustath Journal , Vol.22, pp. 440-461.
4. AlKarkhi, Anam Yousif (1999). *Difficulties Faced by Iraqi EFL College Students in Writing English Composition*. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Baghdad.
5. Alnufaie, Mohammad & Grenfell, Michael (2013). *EFL Writing Apprehension: The Macro or the Micro?*. Journal of Arts and Humanities (JAH), Vol. 2, No.3, pp.79-89.
6. Arslan, Serhat, and Akin, Ahmet (2014). *Metacognition: As a Predictor of One's Academic Locus of Control*. Journal of Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, Vol. 14, No.1, pp.33-39.
7. Brown, J. D. (2007). *Multiple views of L1 writing score reliability*. Second Language Studies, 25(2), 1-31.
8. Cheng, Y. S. ,Horwitz, E. K., &Schallert, D. (1999). *Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components*. Language Learning, Vol.49, pp. 417-46.
9. Daly, J. A. & Wilson, D. A. (1983). *Writing apprehension , self-esteem, and personality*. Research in the Teaching of English, Vol.17, No.4, pp.327-341.
10. Daly, J. A. (1985). *Writing apprehension*. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a Writer Can't Write: Studies in Writer's Block and other Composing-process Problems*. New York: Guilford Press.
11. Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). *Further studies on writing apprehension: SAT scores, success, expectations, willingness to take advanced courses and sex differences*, Research in the Teaching of English, Vol.9, pp. 250-56.
12. Erkan, D. Y. & Saban, A. I. (2011). *Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL*. Asian EFL Journal, Vol.5, No.4, pp.164-92.
13. Faigley, L., Daly, J., & Witte, S. T. (1991). *The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence*. Journal of Education Research, Vol.71, No.1, pp.17-20.
14. Gere, A. R. (1987). *Writing Groups: History, Theory, and Implications*. Carbondale: Illinois UP.
15. Hadaway, N. (1987). *Writing apprehension among second language learners*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Texas A&M University.
16. Hamza, Ahmed (2012). *Evaluating the performance of Iraqi EFL undergraduates in Writing Reading Comprehension Précis*. Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, Vol.4 , No.3 , pp.11-22.
17. Hanna, K. J. (2010). *Students' perception of teacher comments: Relationships between specific aspects of teacher comments and writing apprehension*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of North Dakota.
18. Hasan ,Syeda , and Khalid , Ruhi(2014). *Academic Locus of Control of High and Low Achieving Students*. Journal of Research and Reflections in Education, Vol.8, No.1, pp 22 -33.
19. Hemmat, Talebi, and Rahimi, Ali (2012). *The interplay of locus of control and Iranian EFL high school learner's language achievement*. Elixir Psychology, Vol. 46 ,pp. 8386-8394.
20. Hettich, R. L. (1994). *Writing apprehension: A critique*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Purdue University.
21. Hilleson, M. (1996). *An Introspective Study of Second Language Anxiety in an English Medium School*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

22. Horwitz, E. K. (2000). *It ain't over till it's over: On foreign language anxiety, first language deficits, and the confounding of variables*. Modern Language Journal, Vol.8, No.2, pp.256-59.
23. Huwari, I. & Aziz, N. (2011). *Writing apprehension in English among Jordanian postgraduate students at UUM*. Academic Research International, Vol.1, No.2., pp.190-98.
24. Kader, Ahmed A. (2014). *Locus of control, student motivation, and achievement in principles of microeconomics*. American International Journal of Contemporary Research, Vol.4, No.9, pp.1-11.
25. Konan, Necdet (2013). *Relationship between Locus of Control and Problem-Solving Skills of High School Administrators*. International J. Soc. Sci. & Education, Vol. 3, No.3, pp.786-794.
26. Kutanis, Rana, Mesci, Muammer, and Ovdur, Zeyneb (2011). *The Effects of Locus of Control on Learning Performance: A Case of an Academic Organization*. Journal of Economic and Social Studies, Col.1, No.2, pp.113-136.
27. Lee, S. & Krashen, S. (2002). *Predictors of success in writing in English as a foreign language: Reading, revision behavior, apprehension, and writing*. College Students Journal, Vol.36, No.4, pp. 532-43.
28. Mohseniasl, F. (2014). *Examining the effect of strategy instruction on writing apprehension and writing achievement of EFL learners*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol.4, No.4, pp.811-17.
29. Muslim, Iman (2014). *Helping EFL Students Improve their Writing*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp.105-112.
30. Nemati, A. (2012). *On the dimensions of test anxiety and foreign language learners*. International journal of English and Literature, Vol.3, No.4, pp.97-102.
31. Nodoushan, Ali (2012). *The Impact of control on Language Achievement*. International Journal of Language Studies, Vol.6, No.2, pp. 123-136.
32. Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
33. Oluwakemi, Aladenusi (2015). *Academic Locus of Control and Social Support as Predictor of Research Help-Seeking Behavior Among Nigerian Undergraduates*. American Journal of Psychology and Cognitive Science, Vol.1, No.2, pp.29-36.
34. Phares, E. J. (1976). *Locus of Control on Personality*. Morris : General Learning Press.
35. Pimsarn, Pratin (2013). *EFL students' writing apprehension*. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, Vol.6, No.4, pp.99-109.
36. Rasekh, Abbas Eslami ,Rezaei, Omid , and Davoudi, Sajad (2012). *The Exploration of the Associations between Locus of Control & High School Students' Language Achievement*. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp.35-48.
37. Reishaan ,Abdul-Hussein (2013). *The use of tenses in the Iraqi advanced EFL learners' writing: An error analysis*. Journal of the University of Braşov, Vol.6, No.55, pp.99-116.
38. Rotter, J. B. (1990). *Internal versus external control of reinforcement*. American Psychologist, Vol.45, No.4, pp.489-493.
39. Rotter, J.B. (1966). *"Generalized expectancies of internal versus external control of reinforcements"*. Psychological Monographs. , Vol.80, Whole No. 609.
40. Sadeghi, Bahareh (2014). *The relationship between writing apprehension, personality traits, strategy use, and writing accuracy across proficiency levels*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Massey University.

41. Salem, M. S. (2007). *The effect of journal writing on written performance, writing apprehension, and attitudes of Egyptian English Majors*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.
42. Singh, Termit&Rajalingam, Saravana (2012). *The relationship of writing apprehension level and self-efficacy beliefs on writing proficiency level among pre-university students*. English Language Teaching, Vol.5, No.7, pp.42-52.
43. Tella, A., &Adika, L.O. (2008). *Self-efficacy and locus of control as predictors of academic achievement among secondary school students in Osun State Unity Schools*. IFEP sychologyIA, Vol.16. No.2, pp.120-130.
44. Toussi, Mohammad , and Ghanizadeh, Afsaneh (2012). *A Study of EFL Teachers' Locus of Control and Self-regulation and the Moderating Role of Self-efficacy*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 2, No. 11, pp. 2363-2371.
45. Trice , A. D. (1985) *An Academic Locus of Control Scale for college students*. Perceptual& Motor Skills, Vol.61, pp.1043-1046.
46. Trochim, William , Donnelly, James P., and Arora, Kanika (2015). *Research Methods: The Essential Knowledge Base*. Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning
47. Wilkinson, E. J. &Chamove, A. S. (1992). *Anxiety and desire for Control*. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, Vol.21, pp.71-73.
48. Yates, R. (2009). *Locus of control and academic achievement: a study of gender and grade level differences among low-income African-American students in a middle school*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Southern Illinois State University.
49. Yesilyurt, Etem (1014). *Academic Locus of Control, Tendencies towards Academic Dishonesty and Test Anxiety Levels as the Predictors of Academic Self-efficacy*. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, Vol.14, No. 5, pp.1945-1956.

APPENDIX I
Academic Locus of Control Scale for College Students

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	College grades most often reflect the effort you put into classes.					
2	I came to college because it was expected of me.					
3	I have largely determined my own career goals.					
4	Some people have a knack for writing, while others will never write so well no matter how hard they try.					
5	If I am allowed to select the courses I attend, I would select those at which I can easily get good grades.					
6	Professors sometimes make an early impression of you and then no matter what you do, you cannot change that impression.					
7	There are some subjects in which I could never do well.					
8	Some students get unfair grades due to their special status in the college or relationship to professors.					
9	I sometimes feel that there is nothing I can do to improve my situation.					
10	I never feel really hopeless - there is always something I can do to improve my situation.					
11	I would never allow social activities to affect my studies.					
12	There are many more important things for me than getting good grades.					
13	Studying every day is important.					
14	For some courses it is not important to go to class.					
15	I consider myself highly motivated to achieve success in life.					
16	I am a good writer.					
17	Doing work on time is always important to me.					
18	What I learn is more determined by college and course requirements than by what I want to learn.					
19	I have been known to spend a lot of time making decisions which others do not take seriously.					
20	I am easily distracted.					
21	I can be easily talked out of studying.					
22	I get depressed sometimes and then there is no way I can accomplish what I know I should be doing.					
23	Things will probably go wrong for me some time in the near future.					
24	I keep changing my mind about my career goals.					
25	I feel I will someday make a real contribution to the world if I work hard at it.					
26	There has been at least one instance in school where social activity impaired my academic performance.					
27	I would like to graduate from college, but there are more important things in my life.					
28	I plan well and I stick to my plans.					

APPENDIX II
EFL Writing Apprehension Scale

No.	Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	It relaxes me to plan my ideas first before starting to write.					
2	I feel nervous when I have to change my ideas.					
3	I feel nervous when editing my writing.					
4	I feel comfortable when I write a long easy .					
5	It bothers me to revise and reread what I have written.					
6	It does not bother me to read about the topic before starting to write.					
7	It does not bother to start writing without having any plan or outline.					
8	Grammatical mistakes make me feel apprehensive .					
9	Spellings and punctuations are stressful.					
10	It does not bother me when I have to change a word or a sentence.					
11	I get apprehensive when I don't understand what the topic is talking about .					
12	I get apprehensive when I don't know the right word to express my ideas.					
13	I feel more tense and nervous in writing skill than in other language skills.					
14	I feel pressure when I do not write as many words as the teacher expects.					
15	I feel tense when I write English composition without using Arabic.					
16	It does not bother me to write more than one draft before handing in the final one.					
17	It does not stress me to write words that I do not know their spellings.					
18	It does not bother me to follow a model of English writing written by a skilled writer.					
19	I feel apprehensive to use expressions and sentence patterns incorrectly .					
20	I usually feel comfortable and at ease when writing in English .					
21	It does not bother me to hand in my essay without checking the neatness and the layout of the content.					
22	Practicing writing with others is an enjoyable experience.					

APPENDIX III
Analytical Scoring Scheme

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