The Effect of Flipping a Foreign Language Writing Course on Writing Performance and Writing Motivation

Zeinab Moradi Khazaee *   **Hamid Reza Dowlatabadi** **

Majid Amerian ***
English language and literature, Literature and humanities faculty, Arak University, Arak, Iran

Jalil Fathi ****
University of Kurdistan

Abstract

To explore the effectiveness of flipped instruction in influencing second language learning outcomes, the current research investigated the contribution of flipped classrooms of an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) writing course to Iranian learners' writing development and writing motivation. In so doing, two intact classes were chosen as the participants (N=43) of this research and they were randomly assigned to a Control Group (N = 18) and an Experimental Group (N = 25). During one semester, the Control Group underwent the traditional writing instruction, while the Experimental Group received a flipped writing instruction. Second Language Writing Motivation Scale (SLWMS) and two timed writing tasks were given to gather the required data. The results demonstrated that the flipped method of teaching was substantially effective in improving the L2 writing performance of the experimental group (F=

* Ph.D. Candidate, Email: zeinab.moradi86@gmail.com
** Assistant Professor, Email: h-dowlatabadi@araku.ac.ir, Corresponding Author
*** Assistant Professor, Email: m-amerian@araku.ac.ir
**** Assistant Professor, Email: jfathi13@yahoo.com

22.20, $p = 0.000$, partial eta squared = 0.35). Also, the results indicated that the flipped instruction had a statistically significant effect on learners' writing motivation ($F = 51.67$, $p = 0.000$, partial eta squared = 0.56). The findings have remarkable implications for L2 writing methodology.

Keywords: EFL Context, Flipped Classroom, Writing Performance, Writing Motivation

Recent developments in technology, accompanied by new orientations in education, have resulted in the popularity of flipped instruction in second language (L2) education (Chen Hsieh, Wu, & Marek, 2017; Kim, Park, Jang, & Nam, 2017; Chuang, Weng, & Chen, 2018). It is argued that flipped instruction can foster more effective management of cognitive load, enhance motivation as well as autonomous learning, and encourage better learning (Engin, 2014; Ferreri & O'Connor, 2013; Kim, Park, Jang, & Nam, 2017; Tucker, 2012). A flipped teaching methodology, a recently emerged mode of learning, might be a viable alternative to traditional EFL classrooms where active engagement of the learners may not be guaranteed. Flipped instruction is an inventive teaching methodology that reverses the order of doing assignments and classroom activities (Herrald & Schiller, 2013). In a traditional classroom, learners learn new information and knowledge in the classroom mainly through teachers' lectures and carry out the assignments outside the classroom and at home. In the flipped type of instruction, however, students are asked to study the content outside the class through watching the video clips prepared by the teacher and do the assignments in the classroom in which the teacher can help students by providing them with further feedback and correcting their errors (Akçayır & Akçayır, 2018).

The fundamentally beneficial function of flipped instruction is the fact that it facilitates the management of class time and further engagement of the pupils (Buitrago & Díaz, 2018; Clark, Nguyen, & Sweller, 2005). Within this

learning context, pupils are given the instructional materials prior to attending the class and they are asked to learn the materials outside the class, freeing formal class time for doing assignments and learning tasks in a collaborative manner. Therefore, learners in the class are more actively engaged in the learning process (Burke & Fedorek, 2017; Sergis, Sampson, & Pelliccione, 2018). In other words, flipping the classroom is operationalized by providing the learners with instructional materials such as recorded files of the presentations and lectures, video clips, and main content before formal class time, then devoting formal class time to engaging the learners in more engaging and interactive classroom practices (Buitrago & Díaz, 2018; Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013). Compared to traditional classrooms, flipped mode of learning, also known as the reverse teaching method, has offered some changes such as 1) change in the mode of content delivery (i.e., the use of technology in content delivery), 2) change in managing the time of the class, 3) change in activities and assignments, and 4) change in the degree of engagement in classroom (Comber & Brady-Van den Bos, 2018). Nevertheless, every change or modification is very likely to offer both benefits and challenges. When the order of instruction method is changed, the roles of teachers and learners in the new instruction will be changed and redefined (Hsieh, Wu, & Marek, 2017). New roles require new training especially for the teachers on how to control and manage the process of instruction. Besides, such changes may need modifications in content, curriculum, infrastructures, and educational system (Zarrinabadi & Ebrahimi, 2018). Learners' sense of autonomy and responsibility to manage their time before the class plays a significant role in their active engagement in classroom activities in FC. One major concern for teachers in FC is to encourage learners to watch the videos and study uploaded files before the class. Researchers maintain that by providing instructional materials in advance, FC fosters learners' competence,

increases the domain of classroom tasks, addresses individual differences, and encourages learners for cooperative learning (Chuang, Weng, & Chen, 2018; He, Holton, Farkas, & Warschauer, 2016).

Flipping the classroom is usually connected with the employment of technology for learning outside the class like asking learners to watch videos or podcasts prepared by the instructor (Herrald & Schiller, 2013). This type of learning lends support to a number of studies highlighting the instructional advantages of mobile technology and mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) in L2 learning (Chen, Hsieh, & Kinshuk, 2008; Stockwell, 2010, 2013). Widespread access to technological tools has provided adequate infrastructures to conduct flipped classrooms. Despite the fact that FC has received much attention recently and some practitioners have used flipped instruction in different disciplines and different educational contexts (Chen, Wang, & Chen, 2014; Lai, Hsiao, & Hsieh, 2018) it is still an under-researched construct in EFL contexts (Lee & Wallace, 2018). Additionally, as far as L2 writing is concerned, feedback is of high importance (Cutumisu & Schwartz, 2018). Wigglesworth and Storch (2012) stated that pair working and receiving feedback in writing tasks increase learners' opportunities to scaffold each other's improvement. However, some variables such as administrative constraints, class size, and limited class time may prevent L2 writers from receiving adequate feedback on their drafts (Bitchener, 2012). L2 writing is usually associated with a number of challenges as it requires much cognitive and linguistic engagement as well as an adequate command of language proficiency in terms of lexical knowledge, grammatical accuracy, cohesion, and coherence (Xu & Qi, 2017). Flipped writing classroom is argued to be able to mitigate such challenges and difficulties (Fathi & Rahimi, 2020). Zou and Xie (2019) found that flipped writing instruction contributed to enhancing writing competencies, motivation, and critical thinking of EFL students.

Flipped writing instruction has been also effective in improving the EFL learners' writing competence both at the global (i.e. content) and at the local (i.e. grammar) levels (Wu et al., 2019). In addition, Exploring the impact of flipped instruction on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency, Fathi and Rahimi (2020) found that the flipped writing course significantly improved the writing fluency of EFL participants. Nevertheless, its impact on the writing complexity and accuracy was not substantial.

Overall, it is worth noting that flipped instruction might be an effective alternative for EFL contexts as it provides EFL learners with more time to use and get exposed to English both inside and outside the classroom due to the inverted nature of the classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2012). In other words, since exposure to English or using it is so limited in EFL contexts, the learner has little chance to get exposed to language input or to produce output outside the classroom. Therefore, it may be hypothesized that flipping the writing course can affect the students' writing process by providing teachers with more time to give feedback to their students. Besides, since it is argued that individual differences such as motivational variables and affective factors (Burns, 1999) disjointedly or conjointly affect writing processes (Kormos, 2012), consequently, it is also hypothesized that a flipped writing course may influence L2 writers' affective variables and perceptions. In order to investigate these hypotheses and to shed more light on the role of flipped instruction in influencing affective variables in language learning, the present study investigated the impact of flipping the classroom for an EFL writing course on Iranian students' writing performance and writing motivation. As a result, to address the objectives of the present study, two research questions were formulated:

1) Does flipped writing instruction enhance Iranian EFL learners' L2 writing performance?

2) Does flipped writing instruction enhance Iranian EFL learners' L2 writing motivation?

Review of Literature

Within the pertaining past studies, few empirical studies have investigated flipped learning in L2 contexts (e.g., Adnan, 2017; Afrilyasanti, Cahyono & Astuti, 2016; Basal, 2015; Fathi & Rahimi, 2020). Hsieh et al., 2017; Day & Foley, 2006; Hung, 2015). In a study conducted at a South Korean university, Lee and Wallace (2018) compared the two groups of EFL learners taught either by a communicative language teaching approach or by a flipped instruction. The researchers collected data by administering tasks and surveys to students. The teacher's notes were also analyzed. The findings indicated that the participants in the flipped classroom had a better performance than the control classroom in their final examination. Additionally, survey results indicated that the most of participants in the study appeared to have enjoyed the flipped type of learning. Furthermore, the teacher found that the learners that underwent the flipped instruction were more involved in the process of learning. Similarly, Adnan (2017) conducted action research to investigate the impact of flipped instruction on pupils' learning and perceptions of experiencing flipped instruction. The findings divulged that participants of the flipped group had generally a better performance on essay writing than the students from the non-flipped group. Moreover, it was divulged that the L2 writers held largely positive attitudes towards their experience of flipped instruction. In another study, Hsieh et al. (2017) employed flipped mode of instruction and Wen's Output-driven/Input-enabled theory to create a global oral instruction program. The participants were required to learn English idioms via flipped instruction, by the use of the LINE smartphone app, and by traditional type of instruction. The results of

the study indicated that the flipped course not only increased the students' motivation and engagement in class but it also substantially enhanced their knowledge of idioms.

Although the results of some L2 studies reviewed above largely confirmed the positive effects of FC in many aspects, some researchers (e.g., Hung, 2018; Yilmaz, 2017) maintain that the success or failure of FC in engaging learners may be attributed to some factors. One factor which is of high importance in engaging students in online classrooms is learners' technology literacy knowledge. For instance, Yilmaz (2017) explored the effectiveness of technology literacy and learners' readiness on their satisfaction and motivation in FC. Using the FC model of instruction, he conducted a study on 236 undergraduate students. The results of the study highlighted that learners' readiness with technology literacy subscales was a significant predictor of learners' motivation and satisfaction in the FC mode of teaching. Learners need to acquire the necessary knowledge on conducting a class in an online setting; how to work with different apps, and how to communicate in the new setting. The adequate knowledge of technology devices influences the personal characteristics of individuals such as self-efficacy, self-regulation, self-confidence, and communication skill which Yilmaz (2017) considered them as significant factors in ensuring learners' motivation as well as satisfaction in flipped classrooms. Moreover, Hao (2016) argued that to increase the effectiveness of FC, learners need to have both enough responsibility and commitment to engage in the classroom and some basic technical skills which help them handle the class. Therefore, the ability to manage one's own learning in technology-enhanced learning environments may be a variable affecting the success of FC.

An accumulated body of studies suggested that writing skill can have a facilitative role in language development (Williams, 2012). Among four

language skills, the writing skill can be improved by intense practice and FC is likely to provide an opportunity for teachers to devote their classroom time to writing practice (Kormos, 2012). In other words, if teachers encourage learners to peruse the writing instructions before the actual class, they might have enough time to practice written tasks and assignments in class time. Buitrago and Díaz (2018) used FC in Colombia to teach writing in which students were imposed to six videos of flipped writing workshops. They employed different technology such as YouTube videos and self-made videos to provide the intended content. The findings indicate that learners well-received the use of technology in writing instruction. Learners believed that employing different apps provided them with flexible opportunities to practice their lesson plans. However, some learners showed an unwillingness to participate and engage in online courses and in some cases, there was no difference between FC and conventional classrooms. FC mode of instruction might have influenced their motivation and their anxiety, and consequently their performance in the actual learning environments.

In a recent study, Alghasab (2020) examined the effect of flipping a writing classroom on the writing competencies and perceptions of EFL learners. To this end, 30 EFL student teachers who were taking an advanced writing course participated in this study. The study lasted for a period of thirteen weeks. The data were collected by administering a questionnaire as well as semi-structured interviews. The results indicated that the EFL learners held positive attitudes towards the flipped classroom. Further analysis of the data revealed that flipping the writing classroom created a more useful learning environment, provided flexible instruction which enhanced students' writing strategy use, and improved students' motivation and interaction. Employing a qualitative research design, Judy Shih and Huang (2020) also compared employing metacognitive strategies in a group of EFL students in a

university flipped classroom and a traditional classroom. Eight students were the participants of this study. The data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. Their findings revealed that the flipped classroom provided a more engaging and deeper employment of metacognitive strategies. In another study, Su Ping, Verezub, Adi Badiozaman, and Chen (2019) examined EFL learners' perceptions and experience of a flipped writing program. The participants were 18 low proficiency university students in Malaysia. Data gathered from semi-structured interviews indicated that most participants help positive attitudes of the use of flipped classroom and stated that they devoted further time to preparing prior to the class, had further practice, active learning, discussion, interest and quick feedback during the class time, and a greater degree of competence beliefs after the class.

Since reviewing the related literature, as discussed above, indicates that there are problematic factors and obstacles in the effective implementation of FC, more studies are required and more attention should be given to FC mode of instruction in different contexts so as to appropriate solutions can be found to avoid or at least to alleviate the possible hindrances and to enhance stakeholders' understandings of this new mode of teaching. Moreover, as the flipped type of instructional methodology is relatively new, further empirical evidence is required to guarantee its success in L2 education.

Method

This paper is derived from a bigger project in which the contribution of a flipped writing instruction to some relevant variables was examined. This paper reports the details pertaining to the purpose of the current study with writing performance and writing motivation as the two dependent variables. This research was carried out using the quantitative research method. As it was not possible for the experimenter to select and divide the participants

randomly in the context of research (University of Kurdistan), a quasi-experimental research design was employed. This design is normally used when it is not logistically feasible to conduct a randomized, controlled trial study (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker, 2019). In a quasi-experimental design, participants are not randomly selected and intact groups are recruited as the participants of the study.

Participants

This research was conducted at the University of Kurdistan, Iran. As for the participants of this study, learners from two EFL writing classes during the fall 2018 academic year were recruited as the participants of the study. They were undergraduate students of Applied Linguistics. These two classes were randomly assigned to a control group (N= 25) and an experimental group (N= 18). The two classes contained both male and female participants and their ages varied from 20 to 24 years old. The students were approximately at the identical level of English proficiency as was confirmed by the results of the Oxford placement test (OPT) which was given to both classes. Before beginning the treatment, students became aware of the purpose of the project and were made sure that their information would remain confidential. None of the students in both classes reported to have had the experience of being instructed according to flipped model and it was the first time that they experienced flipped model instruction.

Instrumentation

Oxford Placement Test (OPT: 2004) In order to make sure of the homogeneity of students prior to beginning the treatments, OPT was administered to the students as a standard language proficiency test in both experimental and control groups. This simulated standard test contained 200

items for measuring listening, grammar ,vocabulary and reading skills. This scale is utilized for measuring the language proficiency of different learners with various levels of language proficiency (Allan 2004). As estimated by Cronbach's alpha formula, the reliability coefficient of the test turned out to be .82 in this study.

Second Language Writing Motivation Scale (SLWMS)

The L2 writing motivation scale (SLWMS) developed by Waller and Papi (2017) was employed in the present study. SLWMS includes L2 writing motivation items which were developed according to other general L2 motivation scales designed by Taguchi, Magid, and Papi (2009) (as cited in Wallera and Papi, 2017). The scale encompasses statements about L2 writers' intended attempts for learning the L2, their desire, as well as their motivational intensity in learning the language. Each item is assessed on a 6-point Likert scale varying from 1 (never) to 6 (always). A sample item of this scale is "I would like to spend lots of time learning to write in English." The reliability coefficient of the scale, as calculated by Cronbach's Alpha, was 0.79 in the present research.

Timed Writing Essays

Two 45-minute writing tasks were used as the pre-test and post-test of the current study. The two writing tasks did not require the students to have any technical background information about the topics. The students were required to write an essay between 300 to 500 words for each topic within 45 minutes. They were not allowed to use dictionaries or the Internet. The topics were selected from "185 TOEFL Writing (TWE) Topics and Model Essays" The topics were as the following:

Topic 1: *" In the future, students may have the choice of studying at home by using technology such as computers or television or of studying at traditional schools. Which would you prefer? Use reasons and specific details to explain your choice.*

Topic 2: *Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer "*

Procedure

Before the beginning of the semester, permission for carrying out the treatment and data collection was granted by the head of the English language department at the University of Kurdistan, Iran. Data collection occurred in fall 2018. The participants were enrolled in the 'advanced writing course' presented to English major students as a compulsory course. The purpose of this course was to develop the writing proficiency of students in doing academic writing tasks. In the first session of the course, a timed writing essay (Topic A) and the SLWMS were given to the students in both the experimental group (flipped) and the control group (non-flipped) as the pre-tests of the study. During this writing course, the students were first familiarized with the main sections of an essay including the introductory paragraph, body, and concluding paragraph. They were also instructed on how to write different paragraphs. In fact, each session, they were provided with the instruction on different types of paragraphs such as descriptive and process, opinion, comparison and contrast, and problem/solution paragraphs. In addition, they were also provided with explanations on how to outline, develop, and finish a coherent and unified essay.

As for the treatment of the experimental group (i.e., flipped group), each writing session included two main stages: pre-class and during-class intervention. In the pre-class stage, the participants were asked to watch the videos given to them before attending the class. Each session students received the videos for the next session at the end of their writing class. In fact, the students were required to watch the videos of each session before attending the class. Table 1 presents the topics of the videos for each session.

In the next phase of intervention, which was the during-class phase, students who had watched videos at home attended the class and were required to the writing activities in the class under the supervision of the instructor. Every session at the beginning of the class, the teacher asked some questions about the video (length, quality, atmosphere, etc.) in order to make sure that all the students in the experimental group had watched and understood the video. Meanwhile, students could ask questions about the content of the video if they had any. After around 10 minutes of warm-up, the teacher gave students an assignment, and students were required to do the assignment considering what they had learned from videos. While writing, students could ask any questions or further explanations from the teacher or their peers in the class. Doing written tasks usually took about 60 minutes each session. The teacher gathered all the writings and rated them using Jacobs et al.'s (1983) rating rubric. Evaluated writings were then delivered to the students next session. During the last 10 minutes of each session, all the students received the videos for the next lesson. Moreover, videos were uploaded on a telegram group each session for the absent students.

Concerning the control group, the students were taught the same content and materials by the same instructor. Every session the teacher began the class by giving some writing instructions via in-class lectures. In fact, the beginning part of each session was a kind of traditional teacher-fronted classroom in

which the students remained silent and listened carefully. In each session, at least 60 minutes of the time of the class was allocated to the teacher's instruction and lecturing. The teacher also explained how to do writing assignments in order to help them to be able to carry out the written tasks at home. Moreover, because of the lack of time in the class, the teacher could not allocate much of the time to doing all of the writing tasks. In the next session, the students were required to deliver their writing tasks, which they had done at home. The completed tasks were evaluated by the instructor and returned to the students in the next sessions. When the writing course was over, another timed writing task (Topic B) and the SLWMS were re-administered to both groups as the post-tests of this research.

Table 1.

Descriptions of Sessions

Sessions	Topic of the video	Length of the video	Writing assignment
Session one	Introduction: process writing	33	Recognizing six steps of the writing process
Session two	Pre-writing: Getting ready to write	27	Narrowing some topics, Listing ideas for a topic, Mapping ideas for a topic, Editing mapped and listed ideas
Session three	The structure of a paragraph	30	Recognizing topic sentences, supporting sentences, and concluding sentences. writing a topic sentence for a topic
Session four	The development of a paragraph	27	Starting to use peer editing, writing some supporting sentences, writing some concluding sentences
Session five	Descriptive and process paragraph	33	Writing two descriptive paragraphs, using transition words and phrases
Session six	Opinion paragraph	24	Writing an opinion paragraph using modal auxiliaries and cause/ effect connectors

Sessions	Topic of the video	Length of the video	Writing assignment
Session seven	Comparison/contrast paragraph	27	Writing Comparison/contrast paragraphs using block organization or point by point organization. Advantages and disadvantages
Session eight	Problem/solution paragraph	24	Writing Problem/solution paragraphs using conditional structures
Session nine	The structure of an essay	30	Recognizing the structure of an essay, writing an essay
Session ten	Outlining an essay	27	Writing an outline for an essay, writing an essay
Session eleven	Introduction and conclusions	24	writing an essay
Session twelve	Unity and coherence	30	writing an essay
Session thirteen	How to write an essay for examination	24	writing an essay

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, matched t-test, and ANCOVA were used to empirically measure the impact of the flipped teaching on the students' writing performance and writing motivation. Moreover, Jacobs et al.'s (1981) writing scale with an analytical scoring procedure was used to score the students' essays. The scoring rubric for Jacobs et al.'s (1981) scale involves five subcategories, comprising, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. To check the rater consistency in scoring, two other writing instructors who were familiar with this scored one-third of the writing tasks randomly. The reliability coefficient using Cohen's Kappa's formula was 0.88.

Results

As previously pointed out, two research questions were formulated for this research. For the purpose of addressing the first research question that was concerned with the effectiveness of flipped instruction in improving writing performance, a matched *t*-test was used to investigate the degree of difference in the mean scores from pre-test to the post-test of writing performance. In fact, a matched *t*-test was run for each group (i.e., control & experimental). The mean scores for pre-test and post-test were obtained from administering the timed-writing tasks before and after the treatment. The results obtained from matched *t*-tests analyses revealed that statistically significant progress was observed in the mean scores of the writing performance from pre-test to post-test for each group. These results have been presented in Table 2. According to the table, the control group also witnessed a substantial increase in the mean scores of the writing essay (t = -6.22, $p < 0.05$). In the same way, the change in the writing means scores of the experimental group was statistically significant (t = -13.54, $p < 0.05$). As demonstrated by the results, the mean score of the control group was 66.16 in the pre-test and was raised to 76.16 on the post-test, highlighting that the control group experienced a significant increase in writing performance. Likewise, concerning the experimental group, there was substantial progress in the mean scores of writing pre-tests from 69.40 to 87.92 on the post-test. This difference was also statistically meaningful.

In addition, to investigate which group, experimental or control, had further improvement in terms of writing performance, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was performed. The purpose of running ANCOVA was to compare the two kinds of treatments with regard to their effects on the writing development of the EFL participants. In ANCOVA analysis which is commonly used for pretest-posttest designs, the groups are compared at

posttest, considering the scores of pre-tests as the covariate to statistically control already existing differences between the groups.

Table 2.

Paired Samples t-test for Writing Scores in each Group

| Groups | Pre-test | | Post-test | | | |
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	Sig.
Control	66.16	10.91	76.16	11.16	-6.22	0.00
Experimental	69.40	7.80	87.92	12.65	-13.54	0.00

Table 3.

ANCOVA Results for Writing Performance Scores

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2954.114[a]	2	1477.057	34.880	.000	.636
Intercept	1045.745	1	1045.745	24.695	.000	.382
Pre.writing	1508.454	1	1508.454	35.621	.000	.471
Group	940.302	1	940.302	22.205	.000	.357
Error	1693.886	40	42.347			
Total	300875.000	43				
Corrected Total	4648.000	42				

Before performing ANCOVA, its assumptions were checked. The assumptions included linearity, normality of data, homogeneity of regression slopes as well as variances, and accurate assessment of the covariate. The results indicated that the assumptions were not violated. The results of ANCOVA, as seen in Table 3, indicated that a statistically significant difference was found between the experimental group and the control group on writing post-test scores, $F(1, 40) = 22.20$, $p = 0.000$, partial eta squared = 0.357).

	Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65	**52** Zeinab Moradi Khazaee

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Research question two was concerned with exploring the effect of flipped instruction on the writing motivation of the EFL participants. Table 4 indicates the descriptive statistics for the scores of writing motivation of both groups for pretest and posttest. To answer this question, another ANCOVA analysis was used. Again, the pre-test scores of writing motivation were considered as the covariate. Also, the investigation of the assumptions of ANCOVA indicated that no assumption was violated. Therefore, ANCOVA could be performed. The results of ANCOVA revealed that the two groups were significantly different in terms of their post-test scores of writing motivation, $F(1, 40) = 51.67$, $p = 0.000$, partial eta squared = 0.56). As the ANCOVA results in Table 5 show, flipped writing courses enhanced L2 writing motivation of the experimental group significantly.

Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics for pre and Posttests Scores of Writing Motivation

	Pre-test		Post-test	
Groups	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Control	87.83	11.42	91.72	12.15
Experimental	85.12	11.17	99.92	13.24

Table 5.

ANCOVA Results for Writing Motivation Scores

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2940.502[a]	2	1470.251	74.046	.000	.787
Intercept	1054.052	1	1054.052	53.085	.000	.570
Pre.Motivation	2237.209	1	2237.209	112.671	.000	.738
Group	1026.046	1	1026.046	51.674	.000	.564
Error	794.242	40	19.856			
Total	404065.000	43				
Corrected Total	3734.744	42				

Discussion

Flipped method of teaching has received remarkable attention among numerous researchers and practitioners. However, it may have been neglected in the EFL context. This study sought to clarify the effects of a flipped writing course on Iranian EFL students' ability in writing and writing motivation. The results of the data analysis revealed that the flipped writing course significantly improved the writing performance of the experimental group. This is in line with the findings of some previous empirical studies (e.g., Abedi, Keshmirshekan, & Namaziandost, 2019; Ahmed, 2016; Fathi & Rahimi, 2020; Leis, Cooke, & Tohei, 2015). The findings of the present study verify the bulk of past studies that investigated the impacts of the flipped mode of instruction in EFL contexts (Hung, 2018; Mehring, 2016).

Flipped instruction is argued to be beneficial for second language instruction as it provides the learners with further opportunities to devote more time to L2 learning inside as well as outside the class due to the inverted nature of learning in such classrooms. In such classrooms, the learners are provided with pre-class content usually through video recordings and they are required to study the materials and read the teacher-made worksheets on their own outside the classroom (Tucker, 2012). Having studied the pre-class input materials, the participants could reinforce what they had learned by doing the assignments, being more engaged in class activities cooperatively, and receiving further teacher and peer-feedback (Milman, 2012; Roehl, Reddy, & Shannon, 2013). Moreover, since the learners in the flipped classroom were required to study the input materials of the videos prior to the class, the point of departure inside the class was the output mainly through writing the essays or discussing the content of the videos. Therefore, the improved writing performance of the participants may be justified in the light of the 'Output-driven, input-enabled' hypothesis (Wen, 2008) in which it is argued that when

language classes begin with output, L2 learners gain further motivation to learn the language and to use their learned language knowledge. Also, this flipped mode of instruction in which the classes begin with output is likely to foster participants' self-regulatory competencies and their autonomous learning (Han, 2015). In addition, flipped instruction can result in further actuation of higher-order thinking abilities such as problem-solving and metacognitive abilities which contribute to students' meaningful learning and engagement, thereby enhancing better learning (Amiryousefi, 2019; Hung, 2015).

Another cause for the greater performance of the flipped classroom may be attributed to the students' further degree of engagement in the course content, a justification previously mentioned by numerous researchers (e.g., Chen Hsieh, Wu, & Marek, 2017). From this viewpoint, the flipped classroom can assign more freedom, agency, and sense of responsibility to students and they, therefore, become more motivated to do the learning tasks. As a result, it can be argued that this sense of heightened responsibility of the experimental group students enhanced not only their writing performance but also their L2 writing motivation. Also, the improved writing motivation of the participants of the flipped group can be discussed in the light of Dörnyei and Ottó's (1998) process model which highlights the significance of the contextualized experience of the learners in affecting their learning motivation. As such, it can be argued that the perceived improvement of the participants in L2 writing might have enhanced their motivation for doing written tasks.

Second, it was revealed that flipped instruction increased the writing motivation of the students. This finding supports findings obtained by Hsieh et al. (2017) in which the beneficial role of flipped instruction in enhancing learning motivation was confirmed. Therefore, it might be argued that learners' pre-class preparation and in-class further participation in conjunction

with regular feedback by both peers and the teacher are likely to have improved the writing motivation of the EFL participants. This finding might be also justified in light of L2 model of motivation as introduced by Dornyei and Otto´(1998). According to their model, L2 motivation is considered to be continually changing and evolving. From this point of view, the dynamics of the learning environment plays a key role in affecting the motivation of L2 learners. Subscribing to this model, we may argue that the particular context of flipped learning has contributed to increasing the writing motivation of Iranian EFL learners. The improved motivation of the EFL writers may be also contributed to the potentials of flipped instruction in providing the participants with a sense of agency to take the control and responsibility of their writing development. This students' sense of active involvement, responsive agency, and self-regulation is in line with Engestrom's (1987) expanded activity system and is argued to influence the motivation of L2 writers (e.g., Fathi, Ahmadnejad, & Yousofi, 2019; He et al., 2016; Sasaki, 2011).

Conclusions

The focus of this project was to cast light on the usefulness of a flipped mode of learning in EFL contexts. Overall, the findings verified that flipping the writing instruction contributed to improving students' writing performance and motivation. Additionally, the learners' perceptions of their experience of the flipped learning were explored. The results of the study confirmed that FC has a positive effect on the learners' motivation and engagement. These findings might be attributed to being the direct result of learners' interaction with the content (learner-content interaction) and their increasing participation in the class tasks (learner-learner interaction). Flipped mode of learning might be proposed as an effective and viable instructional

	Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65	**56** Zeinab Moradi Khazaee

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

technique for EFL context in general and writing classrooms in particular. However, teachers' perceptions and willingness to use such innovative techniques play a key role in the successful implementation of these new methodologies (Fathi & Ebadi, 2020). Since flipped instruction normally requires using technology devices, teachers' technology self-efficacy and literacy help them to encourage further student engagement and motivation in flipped classrooms (Yilmaz, 2017). Being aware of the new pedagogical instruction, simple instruction, and considering individual differences are other variables that could mold learners' perceptions of this new mode of teaching and the extent they prefer to engage in it. Another important factor which was one of the main reasons behind the negative opinion of learners was the difficulty level of flipped learning materials. Intelligible educational materials can motivate the learners to gain a sense of accountability and commitment to perform their flipped learning outside the class.

Even though the results of the present research appear promising, they were derived from the short-term practices of a small group of learners in a specific context. Further studies especially longitudinal ones are required to uncover practitioners' and learners' attitudes towards flipped instruction in their local contexts and to appraise the evidence of congruence or discrepancy of their beliefs and their practices which they do in their actual learning environments. More particularly, the change in an affective variable like writing motivation needs to be investigated over an extended period of time as the cross-sectional quantitative designs may not truly reflect the dynamicity of such affective variables. Moreover, to increase the generalizability of the findings of this research as well as the credibility of the findings, more studies are required to examine language teaching courses that have employed flipped instruction for different L2 skills, components, and other underlying abilities.

References

Abedi, P., Keshmirshekan, M. H., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). The comparative effect of flipped classroom instruction versus traditional instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' English composition writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *6*(4), 43-56.

Abeysekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development, 34*(1), 1-14. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.934336

Adnan, M. (2017). Perceptions of senior-year ELT students for flipped classroom: a materials development course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 30*(3-4), 204-222. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1301958

Afrilyasanti, R., Cahyono, B. Y., & Astuti, U. P. (2016). Effect of flipped classroom model on Indonesian EFL students' writing ability across and individual differences in learning. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *4*(5), 65-81.

Ahmed, M. A. E. A. S. (2016). The effect of a flipping classroom on writing skill in English as a foreign language and students' attitude towards flipping. *US-China Foreign Language*, *14*(2), 98-114.

Akçayır, G., & Akçayır, M. (2018). The flipped classroom: A review of its advantages and challenges. *Computers & Education*, *126*, 334-345.

Alghasab, M. B. (2020). Flipping the writing classroom: Focusing on the pedagogical benefits and EFL learners' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, *13*(4), 28-40.

Allan, D. (2004). *Oxford Placement Test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Amiryousefi, M. (2019). The incorporation of flipped learning into conventional classes to enhance EFL learners' L2 speaking, L2 listening, and engagement. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *13*(2), 147-161.

Ary, D., L. C. Jacobs, C. Sorensen, & D. Walker. (2019). *Introduction to research in education.* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage.

Basal, A. (2015). The implementation of a flipped classroom in foreign language teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *16*, 28–37.

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). Before you flip, consider this. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94*(2), 25-25.

	Journal of Teaching Language Skills **(JTLS)**	**58**
JTLS	39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65	**Zeinab Moradi Khazaee**

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 348–363. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.006

Buitrago, C. R., & Díaz, J. (2018). Flipping Your Writing Lessons: Optimizing Time in Your EFL Writing Classroom. In J. Mehring, & A. Leis, *Innovations in Flipping the Language Classroom* (pp. 69-91). Singapore: Springer. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6968-0_6

Burke, A. S., & Fedorek, B. (2017). Does "flipping" promote engagement?: A comparison of a traditional, online, and flipped class. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 18*(1), 11-24. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417693487

Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Csizér, K. & Tankó, G. (2017). English Majors' Self-Regulatory Control Strategy Use in Academic Writing and its Relation to L2 Motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, *38*(3), 386–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv033

Chen, Y., Wang, Y., & Chen, N. S. (2014). Is FLIP enough? Or should we use the FLIPPED model instead? *Computers and Education*, *79*, 16–27. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2014.07.004

Chen, N.S., Hsieh, S.W., & Kinshuk. (2008). Effects of short-term memory and content representation type on mobile language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *12*(3), 93-113.

Chen Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, doi:10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 313–335. doi:doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001

Chuang, H. H., Weng, C. Y., & Chen, C. H. (2018). Which students benefit most from a flipped-classroom approach to language learning?. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *49*(1), 56-68.

Clark, R. C., Nguyen, F., & Sweller, J. (2011). *Efficiency in learning: Evidence-based guidelines to manage cognitive load*. John Wiley & Sons.

Comber, D. P., & Brady-Van den Bos, M. (2018). Too much, too soon? A critical investigation into factors that make Flipped Classrooms effective. *Higher*

| | Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) | **59** |
| JTLS | 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65 | Zeinab Moradi Khazaee |

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Education Research & Development, 1-16. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07294360.2018.1455642

Cukurbasi, B., & Kiyici, M. (2018). High School Students' Views on the PBL Activities Supported via Flipped Classroom and LEGO Practices. *Educational Technology & Society, 21*(2), 46–61.

Cutumisu, M., & Schwartz, D. L. (2018). The impact of critical feedback choice on students' revision, performance, learning, and memory. *Computers in Human Behavior, 78*, 351-367. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.06.029

Davies, R., Dean, D., & Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Education Technical Research Development*, *61*, 563–580.

Day, J.A., & Foley, J.D. (2006). Evaluating a web lecture intervention in a human-computer interaction course. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, *49*(4), 420_431.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dornyei, Z., & Otto ´, I. (1998). Motivation in action: A process model of L2 motivation. *Thames Valley University Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, *4*, 43–69.

Engestrom, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultiti.

Engin, M. (2014). Extending the flipped classroom model: Developing second language writing skills through student-created digital videos. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 12-26.

Fathi, J., Ahmadnejad, M., & Yousofi, N. (2019). Effects of blog-mediated writing instruction on L2 writing motivation, self-Efficacy, and self-Regulation: A mixed-methods study. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 159-181.

Fathi, J., & Ebadi, S. (2020). Exploring EFL pre-service teachers' adoption of technology in a CALL program: obstacles, motivators, and maintenance. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-21.

Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2020). Examining the impact of flipped classroom on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency: a case of EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-39.

	Journal of Teaching Language Skills **(JTLS)** 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65	**60** **Zeinab Moradi** **Khazaee**

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Ferreri, S. P., & O'Connor, S. K. (2013). Redesign of a large lecture course into a small-group learning course. *American journal of pharmaceutical education*, *77*(1).

Han, Y. J. (2015). Successfully flipping the ESL classroom for learner autonomy. *NYS TESOL Journal*, *2*(1), 98-109.

Hao, Y. (2016). Exploring undergraduates' perspectives and flipped learning readiness in their flipped classrooms. *Computers in Human Behavior, 59*, 82-92. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.032

He, W., Holton, A., Farkas, G., & Warschauer, M. (2016). The effects of flipped instruction on out-of-class study time, exam performance, and student perceptions. *Learning and Instruction, 45*, 61-71. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.07.001

Herrald, C.F., & Schiller, N.A. (2013). Case studies and the flipped classroom. J*ournal of College Science Teaching*, *42*(5), 62-66.

Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 30*(1-2), 1-21. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910

Horwitz, E. K. (2010). Foreign and second language anxiety. *Language Teaching*, *43*, 154–167. doi:10.1017/S026144480999036X

Horowitz, E.K., Horowitz, M.B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 125_132.

Hung, H. T. (2015). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *28*(1), 81–96. doi:10.1080/ 09588221.2014.967701

Hung, H. T. (2018). Gamifying the flipped classroom using game-based learning materials. *ELT Journal,* 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx055

Judy Shih, H. C., & Huang, S. H. C. (2020). EFL learners' metacognitive development in flipped learning: a comparative study. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 1-13.

Kim, J. E., Park, H., Jang, M., & Nam, H. (2017). Exploring flipped classroom effects on second language learners' cognitive processing. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(2), 260-284.

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 390–403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.003

Lai, H. M., Hsiao, Y. L., & Hsieh, P. J. (2018). The role of motivation, ability, and opportunity in university teachers' continuance use intention for flipped

| | Journal of Teaching Language Skills **(JTLS)** | **61** |
| JTLS | 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65 | Zeinab Moradi Khazaee |

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

teaching. *Computers & Education, 124*, 37-50. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.013

Lai, C., & Hwang, G. (2016). A self-regulated flipped classroom approach to improving students' learning performance in a mathematics course. *Computers & Education*, *100*, 126–140. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2016.05.006

Lee, G. (2009). Speaking up: Six Korean students' oral participation in class discussions in US graduate seminars. *English for Specific Purposes*, *28*, 142–156. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2009.01.007

Lee, G. & Wallace, A. (2018). Flipped learning in the English as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, doi:10.1002/tesq.372

Leis, A., Cooke, S., & Tohei, A. (2015). The effects of flipped classrooms on English composition writing in an EFL environment. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, *5*(4), 37-51.

Mehring, J. (2016). Present research on the flipped classroom and potential tools for the EFL classroom. *Computers in the Schools*, *33*(1), 1-10.

Milman, N. B. (2012). The flipped classroom strategy: What is it and how can it best be used?. *Distance learning*, *9*(3), 85.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual.* New York: McGrow-Hill.

Roehl, A., Reddy, S. L., & Shannon, G. J. (2013). The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning strategies. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, *105*(2), 44-49.

Sasaki, M. (2011). Effects of varying lengths of study-abroad experiences on Japanese EFL students' L2 writing ability and motivation: A longitudinal study. *TESOL Quarterly, 45*(1), 81-105. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.240861

Sergis, S., Sampson, D. G., & Pelliccione, L. (2018). Investigating the impact of Flipped Classroom on students' learning experiences: A Self-Determination Theory approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *78*, 368-378.

Stockwell, G. (2010). Using mobile phones for vocabulary activities: Examining the effect of the platform. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(2), 95-110. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/ vol14num2/stockwell.pdf

Stockwell, G. (2013). Tracking learner usage of mobile phones for language learning outside of the classroom. In P. Hubbard, M. Schulze, & B. Smith (Eds.), *Learner-computer interaction in language education: A Festschrift in honor*

of Robert Fischer. CALICO Monograph Series (pp.118-136). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.

Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. *Learning Environments Research*, *15*, 171–193. doi:10.1119/1.3369920

Su Ping, R. L., Verezub, E., Adi Badiozaman, I. F. B., & Chen, W. S. (2019). Tracing EFL students' flipped classroom journey in a writing class: Lessons from Malaysia. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1-12.

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A Comparative Study. In Z. Dörnyei, & E. Ushioda, *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 66-97). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Tucker, B. (2012). The flipped classroom. *Education next*, *12*(1), 82-83.

Waller, L., & Papi, M. (2017). Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *35*, 54-65.

Wen, Q. F. (2008). On the output-driven hypothesis and reform of English-skill courses for English majors. *Foreign Language World*, *2*(2), 2-9.

Wigglesworth, G. & Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 364–374. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.005

Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 321–331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.007

Wu, W. C. V., Yang, J. C., Scott Chen Hsieh, J., & Yamamoto, T. (2019). Free from demotivation in EFL writing: the use of online flipped writing instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-35.

Xiao, L., Larkins, R., & Meng, L. (2018). Track effect: Unraveling the enhancement of college students' autonomous learning by using a flipped classroom approach. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 1-13. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1415815

Xu, C., & Qi, Y. (2017). Analyzing pauses in computer-assisted EFL writing-A computer- keystroke-log perspective. *Educational Technology & Society, 20*(4), 24-34.

| Journal of Teaching Language Skills **(JTLS)** | **63** |
| 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65 | **Zeinab Moradi Khazaee** |

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Ye, S. H., Hsiao, T. Y., & Sun, C. T. (2018). Using commercial video games in flipped classrooms to support physical concept construction. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 1-13. doi:DOI: 10.1111/jcal.12267

Yilmaz, R. (2017). Exploring the role of e-learning readiness on student satisfaction and motivation in flipped classroom. *Computers in Human Behavior, 70*, 251-260. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.085

Zarrinabadi, N., & Ebrahimi, A. (2018). Increasing peer collaborative dialogue using a flipped classroom strategy. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1-11. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1455688

Zemach, D. E. & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *Academic writing from paragraph to essay*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Zou, D., & Xie, H. (2019). Flipping an English writing class with technology-enhanced just-in-time teaching and peer instruction. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *27*(8), 1127-1142.

	Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) 39(3.2), Fall 2020, pp. 35-65	**64** **Zeinab Moradi Khazaee**

THE EFFECT OF FLIPPING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING COURSE

Appendix
Second Language Writing Motivation

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1.	I have to learn to write in English because I will need it for my career.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I have to learn to write in English because it will be useful for getting a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I have to learn to write in English so that I can communicate with other professionals in my field.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I need to learn to write in English for my area of studies.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I want to learn to write in English so that I can earn more money.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I learn to write in English because I want to be accepted by native speakers of English.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I learn to write in English because I want to communicate with native speakers of English.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I want to learn to write in English because I want to know more about the culture where English is spoken.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I want people to think I write like a native speaker of English.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I want to learn to write in English because I want to be like a native speaker of English.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I want to learn to write in English so that I can function in the culture.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Writing well in English is not important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I want to take the time to study so that I'll be able to write English fluently.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I would like to be able to write perfect English.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	It doesn't matter to me if I make a lot of mistakes in my English writing so long as people can understand what I write.	1	2	3	4	5

		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
16.	It's not important for me to write perfect English because there are other things I do well.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	I want to learn to write in English really well.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I write my compositions/papers in English very carefully, making sure I write everything correctly.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I try as hard as I can when I have to learn to write in English.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I take time to review what I have learned about English writing.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I do not put as much effort into my English writing assignment.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	I leave a certain amount of time every day to study English writing.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	I spend as much time as possible trying to learn to write in English.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I write my composition/papers in English quickly even though I know I could do better if I tried harder.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	When I study writing in English, I do just enough work to get by.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I take time to find out what mistakes I make in my English compositions/papers so that I can correct them.	1	2	3	4	5