

12

THE ROLE OF MOTIVATIONAL AND AFFECTIVE FACTORS IN L2 WRITING PERFORMANCE AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PROCESSING AND USE

Mostafa Papi

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

This chapter aims to highlight the importance of the learner factors of motivation and affect and their potential contributions to understanding second language (L2) writing and development. For this purpose, studies conducted on the role of motivational and affective factors in L2 writing and written corrective feedback (WCF) are reviewed, future research directions are outlined, and pedagogical implications are discussed. The main topics covered in this chapter include learner beliefs, motivational factors, and emotions.

Historical Perspectives

Research on the role of motivational and affective factors in L2 writing has been scarce and mostly random. This has probably been due to the fact that L2 writing researchers typically have a background either in second language acquisition (SLA) with a cognitive-linguistic perspective, or first language composition with a predominantly social approach (Polio & Friedman, 2016). The SLA approach has focused on exploring the role of cognitive-linguistic factors such as task complexity in L2 writing (e.g., Johnson, 2017; Ong & Zhang, 2010), whereas the social approach has focused on issues such as contrastive rhetoric, genre theories, and sociocultural theory (Cumming, 2016). Due to their areas of expertise and interest, the two groups of researchers have shown minimal interest in the role of motivational and affective factors in L2 writing. Researchers interested in the motivational and affective factors in SLA, likewise, have not paid sufficient attention to the role of these factors in the processes involved in L2 writing and development. The main reason for such a disconnect has been attributed to the common perspective which focuses on quantitative effects that such learner factors can have on L2 outcomes rather than qualitative differences in L2 writing performance and development (Papi, 2016, 2018). In this chapter, I discuss potential links between motivational and

affective factors on the one hand, and various dimensions of the L2 writing process and development on the other.

Critical Issues and Topics

The empirical studies reviewed in the following section highlight the connection between major motivational and affective learner factors on one hand, and the L2 writing process on the other hand. First, studies on learner beliefs are discussed. While research on factors such as the role of teachers, and instructional methods, materials, and tasks furthers our understanding of the learning environment, belief studies give researchers a glimpse of what is going on in a learner's mind. Over the course of learning how to write in a second language, students form opinions about different aspects of their abilities and different aspects of the L2 writing process; these opinions may shape how learners emotionally relate to and engage in the learning process. Through experience, however, these opinions seem to change or be reaffirmed (Manchón, 2009), leading to what is commonly known as beliefs. According to Wenden (1986) beliefs are "opinions which are based on experience and the opinions of respected others, which influence the way they act" (p. 5). The relationship between beliefs and educational experiences, therefore, is reciprocal. Beliefs influence students' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement in L2 writing (e.g., Storch & Wiggleworth, 2010), and L2 writing experiences influence beliefs (e.g., Manchón, 2009). Research on learner beliefs marked the beginning of scholarly attention to the role of learners in research on L2 writing and WCF. These studies included both qualitative and quantitative surveys, mostly conducted from a pedagogical perspective, as a tool to identify what learners believe to be effective in their writing development and whether learners would like to receive WCF on their L2 performance. Surveys conducted on learner beliefs (e.g., Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995), however, typically include a limited number of statements that reflect what the researcher considers myths or false beliefs impeding learner's L2 writing development. Other studies have looked at the nature of beliefs and how they are influenced by the learner's social context and instructional experiences (e.g., Han, 2017; Manchón, 2009; Wan, 2014). The main goal of such studies is to find ways to improve instruction.

Second, research on motivation highlights the basic principle that learners are in charge of the learning process and without their will, nothing fundamental will happen regardless of the teaching resources and techniques they are exposed to. Motivation studies draw on a wide range of theories, models, and constructs. These include but are not limited to the integrative motive (e.g., Gardner, 1985), the L2 motivational self system (Dörnyei, 2009), the self-determination theory (e.g., Noels, 2001), directed motivational currents (Dörnyei, Henry, & Muir, 2015), and more recently, language mindsets (e.g., Waller & Papi, 2017), regulatory focus (Papi, 2018; Papi, Bondarenko, Mansouri, Feng, & Jiang, 2019), buoyancy and resilience (Yun, Hiver, & Al-Hoorie, 2018), and feedback-seeking behavior (Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, & Zhou, 2020). The attempts have greatly contributed to our understanding of different facets of the highly complex notion of motivation. The multiplicity of the conceptualizations, which shows the complexity and multidimensionality of motivation, nonetheless, can be confusing. Following Papi and Hiver (2020), I have employed Higgins's (2012) classification of different motivational constructs under three broad dimensions: *control*, *value*, and *truth*. According to Higgins (2012), people want to be effective in their life and they do so by being effective in terms of three dimensions: managing what happens (*control*), having desired outcomes (*value*), and establishing; what's real (*truth*). In other words, motivation can come from the desire to engage in doing what one enjoys or is good at doing (*control*), the desire to achieve desirable end-states and avoid undesirable ones (*value*), and the curiosity for discovering and learning the truth of different matters (*truth*). In the next section, the motivation models concerned with end-states in L2 writing are discussed under the *value* dimension; those concerned with learner's interest in the

knowledge of writing are discussed under truth; and those about the experience and process of L2 writing development are discussed under the control dimension.

Finally, research on emotions is discussed. Most studies on the role of emotions have focused on L2 writing anxiety while other emotions such as enjoyment have received marginal attention, if any. Even though a wide range of emotions have recently been introduced to and examined in the field of SLA (e.g., MacIntyre, Gregerson, & Mercer, 2016; Teimouri, 2018), in the field of L2 writing only anxiety has received attention and other emotions have either been examined only as secondary to L2 writing anxiety (e.g., enjoyment and self-confidence) or have been completely ignored (e.g., pride, shame, guilt, enthusiasm).

Current Contributions and Research

Beliefs About L2 Writing and WCF

Learner belief studies in the field of L2 writing can be categorized in terms of the content of the beliefs: beliefs about learning and teaching how to write in a second language, and beliefs about one's abilities and potential to learn how to write in a second language (e.g., self-efficacy beliefs and mindsets). The former is discussed here and the latter under the topic of motivation.

Only a few studies in the first group have focused on learner beliefs about L2 writing in general. Manchón (2009), Wan (2014), and Han (2017) explored such beliefs and found that they can be malleable and change either over the course of a writing class or through more explicit interventions. Manchón (2009) found that students' initial beliefs about the self, the nature of L2 writing, and the L2 writing teacher changed positively by the end of an EAP course which included instructional activities such as making students aware of text construction process, training them on writing strategies, analytic reading of texts, and providing feedback on their writing. Wan (2014) found that a student-generated metaphor-sharing intervention was useful in broadening students' beliefs and understanding of various aspects of the writing process and improved their writing skills and practices. Han (2017) found that learner beliefs influenced students' cognitive, behavioral and affective engagement with L2 writing and WCF, which, in turn, influenced learners' original beliefs about L2 writing and WCF.

Studies on learner beliefs about WCF have been more common. Due to the specificity of beliefs about WCF, such studies have typically been conducted using researcher-produced questions. Studies on WCF beliefs generally show that the majority of students prefer to receive WCF (e.g., Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Cohen, 1987) especially if it is positive and encouraging (Ferris, 1995), whereas there are other students who prefer not to receive any WCF. It also seems that high performing students tend to believe in the value of WCF and pay attention when they receive it whereas low-performing ones do not value it as much and are less interested in receiving or processing it (e.g., Cardelle & Corno, 1981; Cohen, 1987). In another study, Radecki and Swales (1988) classified 59 ESL learners into feedback receptors (46%), feedback semi-resistors (41%), and feedback resistors (13%) based on their feedback preferences. The receptors and semi-resistors preferred to receive feedback on the content and form of their writing and welcomed doing revisions whereas the resistors did not want such feedback and saw revision assignments as a form of punishment. In sum, these studies show that the majority of language learners consider WCF to be useful, and would like to receive such feedback. However, in almost all of the studies reviewed above, there were students who reported to have ignored teachers' comments or did not believe in the learning value of WCF. These studies also show that beliefs are malleable and with proper instructional interventions, students can improve their belief systems, which, in turn, can contribute to more adaptive learning patterns. Therefore, until we improve learner beliefs and preferences for WCF, we cannot expect WCF to be as effective as we want it to be.

Motivation from Control

Bandura (1994) defines perceived self-efficacy as “people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives” (p. 71). Self-efficacy beliefs are directly related to the control aspect of motivation. Without the confidence that one can accomplish a goal, one may not put sufficient effort in that pursuit. Studies conducted on the construct of self-efficacy beliefs have furthered our understanding of the motivational processes underlying second language writing. Positive L2 writing self-efficacy beliefs have been found to enhance learner’s self-regulatory control (Csizér & Tankó, 2015), decrease their anxiety (Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015), improve their engagement with WCF (Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013), and contribute to higher levels of L2 writing quality (McCarthy, Meier, & Rinderer, 1985).

According to Bandura (1997) learners form self-efficacy beliefs based on information that they collect from their *enactive mastery experiences* (in a given skill area), *vicarious experiences* (observing a role model success in the goal pursuit), *verbal persuasion* (positive and realistic feedback from others), and their *physiological states* regarding their chances of success or failure in the pursuit. In L2 writing research, these factors have been found to significantly enhance students’ L2 writing self-efficacy (Manchón, 2009; Sasaki, Mizumoto, & Murakami, 2018). Examples of enactive mastery experiences include studying abroad, revising practice at the university’s writing center, writing journals free of concerns about the form of language, and freely choosing the topic of these journals; vicarious experiences include watching classmates’ performance, and using student’s and peers’ work as writing models; and, verbal persuasion can be achieved through providing encouragement and positive feedback.

Teacher and peer feedback, which influences learners’ self-efficacy beliefs, show the interaction between the control and truth dimension of motivation. Whereas self-efficacy concerns control over the process of goal pursuit, feedback acts as a way for students to establish the truth about their efficacy and progress in their goal pursuit; in other words, feedback helps learners establish that their progress towards the goal is real and they are truly able to accomplish the task of L2 writing. In Bandura’s account of the sources of self-efficacy beliefs, feedback (corrective or otherwise), which falls under verbal persuasion, has been shown to influence L2 writing self-efficacy beliefs but not always positively. Whereas teacher feedback has been found to give motivated students a sense of progress (Busse, 2013) and enhance their self-efficacy, peer feedback has not shown any positive effects on self-efficacy probably due to the fact that learners may not need perceive their peer’s feedback to be as useful as their teacher’s feedback. In fact, Ruegg (2018) found that the self-efficacy beliefs of the students who received peer feedback were slightly lower than when they started their writing course. Feedback can be demotivating when it is vague or when the feedback is not specific enough or too comprehensive. This is probably because vagueness and lack of specificity deduct from the truth dimension of such feedback which no longer shows learners’ a clear picture of their weaknesses and strengths.

In addition, when feedback does not contain positive comments or when too much feedback is provided, it may signal failure to some students and harm their self-efficacy and motivation (Busse, 2013; Duijnhouwer, Prins, & Stokking, 2012). Negative feedback may be perceived by learners as a sign of lack of progress or even ability. Interview data from the study by Duijnhouwer et al. (2012) confirmed that students with low self-efficacy beliefs interpreted the provision of feedback as an indication of their teachers’ belief in their lack of competence, leading to poor self-efficacy beliefs. However, assuming that learners start every new task without clear self-efficacy beliefs, a sense of confidence in one’s abilities to complete a task should not be the only factor leading to motivation for doing so. Something more than self-efficacy is needed for someone to embark on such a long-term process of trial and error as writing in a second language. Ferris et al. (2013), for example, found one of the participants to show low levels of L2 writing self-efficacy but “a

teachable attitude,” a mindset that helped her believe that she can learn and grow her L2 writing ability. Such mindsets are the topic of the next component of the control dimension of motivation.

Dweck’s (1999) notion of mindsets refers to beliefs about the malleability of one’s intelligence. Those who believe that one’s intelligence and natural talent can always grow through experience are considered to have a *growth mindset*. Those who endorse a *fixed mindset* believe that their intelligence can never change. Mindsets have been examined in the field of second language writing as well. Waller and Papi (2017) examined 142 US-based ESL learners’ mindsets about their L2 writing talents in relation to their preference for receiving WCF and motivation. The study found that ESL learners who had a growth L2 writing mindset, that is they believed that their ability to learn how to write in a second language was malleable, showed a preference for receiving WCF and high levels of L2 writing motivation whereas those who endorsed a fixed mindset believing that their natural talent for L2 writing was fixed reported a feedback-avoiding orientation and low motivation.

In another recent study in the foreign language context of the USA, Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, and Zhou (2020) examined the notion of L2 mindsets (beliefs about the malleability of one’s language-learning abilities) in relation to student-writers’ feedback-seeking behavior. The researchers collected questionnaire data from students enrolled in foreign language writing classes in the United States and found that the learners’ growth L2 mindset significantly predicted the perceived value of feedback seeking, which, in turn, predicted the students’ feedback-seeking behaviors. A fixed mindset, on the other hand, significantly predicted the perceived self-presentation cost of feedback seeking (e.g., feeling embarrassed), which itself negatively predicted feedback-seeking behaviors. The findings suggest that students with a growth mindset value feedback and seek it through different means whereas those with a fixed mindset see feedback seeking largely as a costly behavior to be avoided. Related to the notion of mindsets are achievement goals.

Achievement goals have a long history of research in the field of motivation (Ames, 1992; Elliott & Dweck, 1988). According to the original versions of this theory, individuals are motivated to achieve two types of goals in their pursuits, a performance goal and a mastery (or learning) goal. Individuals who pursue mastery goals “seek to increase their ability or master new tasks” (Elliott & Dweck, 1988, p. 5). Those who pursue performance goals, on the other hand, “seek to maintain positive judgments of their ability and avoid negative judgments by seeking to prove, validate, or document their ability and not discredit it” (Elliott & Dweck, 1988, p. 5). The achievement goals have been found to lead to differences in cognitive, emotional, and behavioral patterns in learning (e.g., Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Learners with a growth mindset tend to follow mastery goals whereas those with a fixed mindset tend to follow performance goals. The achievement goals can serve learners in their long-term pursuit for desirable end-states. The mastery orientation has been found to lead to the increased use of writing strategies (He, 2005), and contribute to the complexity (Rahimi & Zhang, 2019) and quality of L2 writing (He, 2005). Performance goals, on the other hand, has negatively predicted writing complexity (Rahimi & Zhang, 2019).

Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) is based on the motivational principle that the more self-determined a learner’s goal is for completing a task the higher the learner’s motivation, engagement and enjoyment would be during task completion. Whereas extrinsic motives are about the desire for relatedness to the environment, intrinsic motivation concerns the desire for autonomy and competence. This theory classifies motivations into five categories. The most self-determined type of motivation is *intrinsic* motivation which represents personal interest in and enjoyment of an activity; among the more external types of motivations, *integrated* motivations are integrated within value and belief systems; *identified* motivations are personally valued but not integrated; *introjected* motivations are partially assimilated within the system of values; and *external* motivations are completely external to the person. Lack of any source of regulation and motivation is labeled *amotivation*.

Even though self-determination theory is prominent in social and educational psychology, I am aware of only two applications in L2 writing. Yeşilyurt's (2008) analysis of self-report data collected from students enrolled in EFL writing classes showed that the more self-determined types of motivation orientations (i.e., intrinsic motivation and identified regulation) significantly and positively correlated with writing achievement whereas amotivation had a negative correlation with writing achievement. In another study, Tsao, Tseng, and Wang (2017) found that learners' intrinsic motivation positively predicted their evaluation of both teachers' and peers' WCF whereas the extrinsic motivation did not.

Motivation from Value

Future selves, outlined within the framework of the L2 Motivational Self System (L2MSS), have been at the center stage of L2 motivation research over the last decade. Dörnyei (2009) drew on the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987) and the possible-selves theory (Markus & Nurius, 1986) to establish the theoretical foundation of the model. He posited that the difference between a learner's current L2 self and his or her desired L2 selves would create a discomfort that learners want to minimize by approaching those future selves. There are two desired selves outlined in the L2MSS, ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. An ideal L2 self is the image of an L2 user that the learner ideally hopes to achieve in the future. An ought-to L2 self, on the other hand, represents the obligations and expectations that the learner thinks she or he has to realize in order to avoid negative consequences. Even though a large number of studies have been conducted using the notion of selves to examine general L2 motivation, the role of selves in the area of L2 writing motivation has been explored only in a few studies.

In the context of South Korea, Jang and Lee (2019) found that ideal L2 self positively predicted students' planning, overall writing strategy use, and writing quality whereas the ought-to L2 self only predicted the revising strategy. Similarly, Csizér and Tankó (2015) found that English-major students with stronger ideal L2 selves reported using more self-regulatory control strategies in their advanced academic writing classes. These results of the two studies confirmed that the ideal L2 self, which has a promotion focus concerned with the presence or absence of positive consequences, results in an eager tendency to take advantage of more writing strategies, which can in turn result in the higher quality of writing. The ought-to L2 self, on the other hand, leads to a vigilant tendency to avoid mistakes; hence, it increases the use of revising strategies (Papi, Bondarenko, Mansouri, Feng, & Jiang, 2019; Papi & Khajavi, 2021). Using future-self scales specifically developed for L2 writing contexts, Tahmouresi and Papi (2021) found that ideal L2 writing self and ought-to L2 writing self positively predicted L2 writing motivation. However, whereas ideal L2 writing self positively predicted L2 writing achievement and fluency, ought-to L2 writing self was a negative predictor of L2 writing achievement.

According to regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), individuals develop two motivational systems sensitive to different kinds of end-states. A *promotion* system is concerned with growth, accomplishments, and achievements. Individuals with a strong promotion system approach positive end-states, are sensitive to the presence (gain) or absence (non-gain) of positive outcomes, and follow an eager strategy in their goal pursuit to take advantage of every opportunity and maximize their chances of gain. A *prevention* system, on the other hand, is concerned with security, responsibility, and calmness. Individuals with a strong prevention system tend to avoid negative end-states, are sensitive to the presence (loss) or absence (non-loss) of negative outcomes, and follow a vigilant strategy in their goal pursuit to avoid making mistakes and minimize their chances of loss. Papi (2016, 2018) used framing as a technique to examine how a match between learners' dominant regulatory focus (promotion vs. prevention) and the way a task is framed would affect learners' engagement and incidental vocabulary learning through an integrated reading and

writing task. He asked 188 ESL students in the United States to complete the task, which was framed in two conditions, promotion and prevention. Students in the promotion condition received instructions in gain terms; they were told they start the essay with zero points and had to obtain 75 points to qualify for a chance to win one of three \$100 gift cards through a raffle. Those in the prevention condition were told they would start the study with 100 points and had to avoid losing more than 25 points to qualify for the raffle. The results of the study showed that learners in the gain condition and those with a stronger promotion focus were more engaged in the task and learned more vocabulary items. In addition, those with a stronger prevention focus learned more vocabulary items in the loss condition than in the gain condition. Learners with a promotion focus, however, performed similarly across the two conditions. Papi attributed these asymmetric results to the promotion nature of writing an argumentative essay, a question that deserves scholarly attention and can lead to a new venue of research on the link between motivation and L2 writing performance and development.

Some sources of motivation relate to one's personality, belief, value, and motive systems while other sources relate to one's social and instructional environment, which itself shapes our belief, value, and motive systems. Regardless of its source, motivation for making a decision to act or not to act seems to boil down to a final analysis of the costs and benefits involved in making decisions. In other words, whereas our personal dispositions, beliefs, and values lead to differential and biased calculations of the cost and value involved in a decision, the cost-value analysis, no matter how biased, is the most immediate predictor of our final decisions. Such analysis has been usually highlighted in the expectancy-value theory of motivation (e.g., Eccles, Wiegfield, & Schiefele, 1998), which proposes that individuals' beliefs about the likelihood of their success in task performance and the extent to which they value the activity explain their choice and motivation in task performance.

In the field of L2 writing, a few studies have employed this framework. Lin, Cheng, Lin, and Hsieh (2015) found that learners' expectancy-value motivation, constituted by utility value, interest value, cost, connectedness value, and ability self-concept of L2 writing significantly predicted learners' self-regulation strategies and abstract-writing ability. Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, and Zhou (2020) also used a cost-value framework and found that the value of feedback positively and the self-presentation cost of feedback-seeking negatively predicted feedback-seeking behavior. Even though few studies have used a cost-value framework to understand the motivational dynamics of L2 writing, the cost-value explanation can be extended to interpret the results of some other studies. For instance, Han and Hyland (2015) found that when given indirect, selective, and focused WCF on their most frequent errors, learners ignored, misinterpreted, or misidentified WCF as content feedback. In addition, learners' negative emotional reactions to the lack of comprehensible feedback led to their cognitive and behavioral disengagement. From a cost-value perspective, it seems that even though the researchers have reduced the cost of WCF by making it indirect, they have reduced its value at the same time by making it vague and incomprehensible. Giving clear, direct, and comprehensible feedback can increase the learning value of the feedback and result in more positive outcomes especially for learners with adaptive motivational profiles (Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, & Zhou, 2020; Papi, Wolff, Nakatsukasa, & Bellwoar, 2021).

Motivation from Truth

The truth aspect of L2 motivation is represented in constructs such as intrinsic interest in learning foreign languages or positive attitudes towards or curiosity about the target language community, and culture. These have been classic constructs in Gardner's theory of L2 motivation (e.g., Gardner, 1985) but rarely examined in L2 writing. Students' attitudes towards ESL writing have generally been found to be positive (e.g., Al-Sobhi, Md Rashid, & Abdulla, 2018; Yoon & Hirvela, 2004)

and positive attitudes towards L2 writing have been related to success in L2 writing (Hashemian & Heidari, 2013). Learners' intrinsic knowledge orientation (represented by items such as "*I experience a great pleasure while discovering new techniques of expression of ideas and feelings through writing*") has also been found to positively predict learners' positive evaluation of both teacher and peer WCF (Tsao et al., 2017) and their L2 writing achievement (Yeşilyurt, 2008).

Emotions

L2 writing anxiety negatively affects the quality of individuals' cognitive and behavioral engagement in the process of L2 writing and has been a topic of research in L2 writing for over two decades. Early studies on L2 writing anxiety were conducted using Daly and Miller's (1975) Writing Apprehension Test (WAT), which was developed to examine anxiety in the context of first language writing. In response to the needs of the field of L2 writing and the limitations of WAT, Cheng (2004) developed a questionnaire called the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) for measuring L2 writing anxiety, which has become the most-commonly used measure in this area. The questionnaire has not only shown appropriate psychometric properties but it has also provided a conceptual framework for understanding L2 writing anxiety as a unitary but multi-dimensional construct with three subcomponents: *cognitive*, *somatic*, and *behavioral avoidance*. The cognitive subcomponent of L2 writing anxiety represents the thoughts and worries underlying the feeling of anxiety. These include but are not limited to negative expectations and concerns about others' evaluations (e.g., *While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.*). The somatic subcomponent concerns the physiological symptoms of feeling anxious such as tenseness and nervousness (e.g., *I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.*). Finally, the behavioral avoidance subcomponent reflects the behavioral consequences of anxiety such as missing classes and avoiding challenging situations (e.g., *I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.*). L2 writing anxiety has often been found to negatively affect different aspects of the L2 writing process and performance (for a meta-analysis see Teimouri, 2018). For instance, Cheng (2004) collected data from 421 EFL learners in Taiwan and found that both global L2 writing anxiety and its components negatively correlated with L2 writing self-efficacy, motivation, and performance as well as willingness to take L2 writing courses. Other studies have found that L2 writing anxiety was negatively associated with learners' L2 writing self-efficacy (Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015), use of self-regulatory control strategies in L2 writing (Tsao et al., 2017), perceived value of WCF (Tsao et al., 2017), and writing achievement (McCarthy et al., 1985; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021).

The effects of anxiety on L2 writing performance and achievement are not fixed though and seem to vary depending on task complexity. Zabihi, Mousavi, and Salehian (2018) found that for a simpler narrative task, somatic anxiety and cognitive anxiety negatively correlated with accuracy whereas for a more complex argumentative writing task, cognitive anxiety negatively correlated with one measure of accuracy and all the measures of fluency. Similarly, Rahimi and Zhang (2019) found that the behavioral component of L2 writing anxiety was negatively associated with writing complexity in a complex but not a simple task. These results suggest that L2 writing anxiety can play a role in task performance especially when the task has a high level of complexity, supporting Skehan's (1998) trade-off hypothesis that increasing task difficulty results in a trade-off between the complexity, accuracy, and fluency measures of L2 production.

Given the negative impact of anxiety, researchers have taken interest in exploring the sources of L2 writing anxiety and methods to minimize the effects of this unpleasant emotion. Studies on the sources of L2 writing anxiety, however, have been rare. In one such example, Tahmouresi and Papi (2021) found that the ideal L2 writing self (representing L2 writing skills one would ideally like to possess) negatively correlated with L2 writing anxiety whereas the ought-to L2 writing self (represented by the L2 writing attributes one has to possess to avoid negative consequences)

positively correlated with L2 writing anxiety, which, in turn, negatively correlated with L2 writing motivation and achievement. In addition, situational and contextual factors such as time pressure, fear of negative teacher evaluation, lack of sufficient practice or self-confidence, linguistic problems, fear of writing tests, and pressure for delivering perfect work can also be major sources of L2 writing anxiety among students (Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015; Rezaei & Jafari, 2014).

L2 writing enjoyment represents the feeling of joy and pleasure that learners experience while writing in a second language. Traditionally, enjoyment has been investigated as the emotional representation of the intrinsic motivation. In addition to the studies on intrinsic motivation reviewed above, other studies have looked at L2 writing enjoyment as an independent emotion. Tahmouresi and Papi (2021) found that the ideal L2 writing self was positively associated with L2 writing enjoyment, which, in turn, positively predicted L2 writing motivation and achievement. This makes theoretical sense from a motivational perspective as it is not hard to imagine that moving towards one's desired end-states could lead to enjoyable experiences.

In instructional experiences where the stakes of the tasks are low, learners also seem to experience more enjoyment. Students who receive peer feedback report to have enjoyed and benefited from their L2 writing instruction (Kurt & Atay, 2007). The use of technology seems to improve the L2 writing experience and increase L2 students' engagement, enjoyment, motivation, and overall writing performance (Allen et al., 2014; Lo & Hyland 2007). Students also experience more enjoyment and show higher motivation in L2 writing when teachers respond to their work with empathy and attention, give suggestions on how to improve, share their own personal experiences, and encourage further reflection (Liao & Wong, 2010). Lower anxiety can also help students enjoy their learning process (Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021).

Main Research Methods

Barcelos (2003) classified mainstream SLA studies on student beliefs into three approaches: normative, metacognitive, and contextual. The normative approach includes quantitative questionnaire surveys that aim to examine learner beliefs and opinions about language learning and see how those affect their future learning behavior. The metacognitive approach uses qualitative methods such as interviews and content analysis to examine beliefs as more stable metacognitive skills and knowledge that can help learners become more autonomous in learning. Finally, the contextual approach uses ethnographic methods such as observations, life stories, and metaphors to examine beliefs as embedded within the context of learning. Whereas the metacognitive and contextual approach can give an in-depth account of learner beliefs, using questionnaire surveys that typically include a limited number of belief statements that the researcher choose for students to respond to, can restrict the range of beliefs that can otherwise be freely expressed by students in relation to the specific context in which they are situated (Sakui & Gaies, 1999; Yang, 1992). Unless a survey of such beliefs and preferences is focused on specific aspects of L2 writing such as WCF, the use of close-ended questionnaires can only give us a narrow understanding of learner beliefs about L2 writing.

Motivational and affective factors are usually explored using descriptive, correlational, and experimental designs. Descriptive and correlational studies can be conducted using both quantitative and qualitative tools and designs. Whereas interview questions and protocols can be tailored to the specific purposes of each study especially for exploratory and hypothesis-generating purposes (e.g., Duijnhouwer et al., 2012; Papi & Hiver, 2020), there are questionnaires that have been developed to measure L2-writing-specific constructs such as self-efficacy beliefs (e.g., Csizér & Tankó, 2015), mindsets and motivation (e.g., Waller & Papi, 2017), intrinsic and extrinsic motives (Tsao et al., 2017), achievement goals, cost-value perceptions, and feedback-seeking behavior (Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, & Zhou (2020)), and anxiety (Cheng, 2004), which can be adopted, adapted, and used to test hypotheses in L2 writing contexts. When it comes to learners' future and long-term goals, however, it is best to combine both a qualitative and a quantitative

method for eliciting items that represent the future L2 writing selves of the specific sample under study. For instance Tahmouresi & Papi (2021) used an idiographic method for developing items that represented their sample's specific L2 writing self-guides. In addition, experimental and quasi-experimental studies can be developed to test hypotheses formulated within different theoretical frameworks (Allen et al., 2014; Lo & Hyland 2007; Papi, 2018).

Recommendations for Practice

Learners come to L2 writing classes bringing with them their own complex set of personality, motives and belief systems that are beyond the control of L2 writing teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, have the opportunity to provide positive learning experiences that can influence the way learners make sense of the writing process as well as their own abilities and future goals, which can, in turn, lead to their L2 writing development. Based on the findings of the studies reviewed above, these experiences can include using technology, games, choice in writing topics, free journal writing, new instructional programs, and study abroad, which have been found to enhance learners' interest, motivation, and engagement in the writing process, hence, their L2 writing development.

Changing a fixed mindset to a growth one can lead to improving learners' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral patterns in their L2 writing pursuit (see Lou & Noels, 2016). Using interventions to enhance L2 writers' growth mindsets can have remarkable effects on their motivation to write, their engagement in the writing process, and their feedback-seeking behavior, among other things. The adaptability of goal orientations is also good news for teachers who want to enhance such adaptive learning patterns among their students. A mastery goal orientation can be enhanced, for example, simply by having students reflect on the feedback they receive (Duijnhouwer et al., 2012).

Instructional techniques can be employed to assist highly anxious students. Studies have found that compared with teachers' WCF, peer feedback significantly lowers L2 writing anxiety and increases their self-confidence (Kurt & Atay, 2007) especially when it is computer-mediated (Zhang, Song, Shen, & Huang, 2014) and asynchronous (Iksan & Halim, 2018) rather than face-to-face and immediate. Dialogue journal writing can also reduce students' L2 writing anxiety and contribute to their English writing competency, fluency, and reflections (Liao & Wong, 2010). Low-anxiety students prefer certain instructional strategies that help them minimize this undesirable emotion. These strategies include enhancing background knowledge of writing topics, creating a safe environment for making mistakes, peer correction, relaxation exercises, good preparation, and more practice. Teachers have also reported enhancing students' self-confidence, adopting positive attitudes towards making mistakes, using familiar writing topics, and adopting a process teaching approach as effective instructional strategies (Qashoa, 2014).

Adopting a promotion-focused instructional approach focused on gains, achievement and accomplishments could lead to enhancing learners' risk-taking tendencies, which can, in turn, lead to creative, fluent, and even more accurate writing performance. Such a promotion-focused approach could include enhancing the ideal selves (Papi & Tahmouresi, 2021) or the use of promotion-focused writing tasks (encouraging creativity and risk-taking), framing instructions, incentives, management, assessment and feedback style (Papi, 2018; Papi, Rios, Pelt, & Ozdemir 2019). Such an approach would downplay the costs of making mistakes and unleash learners' potentials for writing creatively, effectively, and free of concerns about formal aspects of language.

Future Directions

It seems that it is time to move beyond descriptive studies that exclusively focus on beliefs and WCF preferences. A more theoretically constructive way of exploring beliefs would be in connection with learners' motivational and emotional dispositions such as their mindsets (e.g.,

Waller & Papi, 2017), which may underlie learners' variable preferences in L2 writing and WCF (see Papi, Wolff, Nakatsuksa, & Bellwoar, 2021). The notion of mindsets is very new in the field of second language writing and has great potentials for research and practice. Likewise, achievement goals could play an important role in L2 writing motivation and engagement. Studies on achievement goals in the field of L2 writing, however, have mostly been conducted using the more traditional version of the model. Newer versions of achievement goals with additional components (e.g., Korn & Elliot, 2016; Elliott, Murayama, & Pekrun, 2011) can further our understanding of the role of achievement goals in L2 writing.

Learning how to write in a second language is a long-term process that requires more self-determined forms of motivation for autonomy and competence. Understanding the L2 writing process through the lens of the self-determination theory, therefore, deserves more scholarly attention as it can contribute to effective writing instruction through, for instance, creating the conditions that enhance learners' interest and engagement in the process of L2 writing.

With the introduction of more nuanced conceptualizations and measurement tools for L2 selves (e.g., Papi, Bondarenko, Mansouri, Feng, & Jiang, 2019; Papi & Khajavy, 2021; Tahmouresi & Papi, 2021), exploring the role of future selves in L2 writing can be eye opening. Examining future selves can help us understand not only L2 writers' motivation and persistence (Feng & Papi, 2020), but also the process of L2 writing, the quality and quantity of L2 writing strategies, and learners' emotional experience during their L2 writing processes.

Exploring learners' chronic motivational differences such as their regulatory focus and mode (Teimouri, Papi, & Tahmouresi, 2021), which underlie personality types (Higgins, 2012), can also be another generative and practical direction for future research in L2 writing. Research studies could be designed to situationally induce regulatory foci and modes as interventions to increase learners' orientation towards different dimensions (complexity, accuracy, fluency) of L2 writing tasks and promote L2 writing development (e.g., Papi, 2016, 2018).

Research on the role of emotions in L2 writing has been largely limited to L2 writing anxiety. Given the call for conducting more L2 research from a positive psychology perspective (MacIntyre et al., 2016), it is imperative that the role of such important and constructive emotions be extensively investigated in the field of L2 writing. Such research not only can further our understanding of learner engagement in L2 writing, but it can also contribute to L2 writing instruction and further connect L2 writing research and pedagogy.

Highlighting the lack of attention to the role of the learner in research on WCF, Papi, Bondarenko, Wawire, Jiang, & Zhou (2020; see also Papi, Rios, Pelt, & Ozdemir, 2019) have recently proposed the notion of feedback-seeking behavior (FSB) in L2 writing and learning. Drawing on similar work from the field of organization psychology, the authors made a case for paying attention to the proactive and agentic role of the learner in the feedback process and for viewing WCF as a learner resource. Such a perspective puts the learner in charge of the learning process. It recasts WCF as a learning resource and views the success of WCF to be a function of learners' motivated and strategic attention to the information that they perceive as feedback. It complements the current research on the kinds of WCF teachers employ by drawing attention to whether the learner is seeking feedback to begin with. A new agenda for research on FSB can therefore be set. Such an agenda should focus on the individual, interpersonal, contextual, and instructional factors that can be manipulated to enhance learners' FSB, thereby the success of WCF. This line of research is still in its infancy but can make significant contributions to L2 writing research and instruction (see Papi, Rios, Pelt, & Ozdemir, 2019).

References

Allen, L.K., Crossley, S.A., Snow, E.L., & McNamara, D.S. (2014). L2 writing practice: Game enjoyment as a key to engagement. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18(2), 124–150.

Al-Sobhi, B., Md Rashid, S., & Abdullah, A.N. (2018). Arab ESL secondary school students' attitude toward English spelling and writing. *SAGE Open*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018763477>

Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals and the classroom motivational climate. *Student Perceptions in the Classroom*, 1, 327–348.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior* (Vol. 4) (pp. 71–81). New York: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Barcelos, A.M.F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A. M.F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches* (pp. 7–33). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Boroujeni, A.A.J., Roohani, A., & Hasanianesh, A. (2015). The impact of extroversion and introversion personality types on EFL learners' writing ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(1), 212–218.

Busse, V. (2013). How do students of German perceive feedback practices at university? A motivational exploration. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 406–424.

Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(3), 251–261.

Cheng, Y.S. (2004) A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 313–335.

Cohen, A.D. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57–69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Csizér, K., & Tankó, G. (2015). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(3), 386–404.

Cumming, A. (2016). Theoretical orientations to L2 writing. In R.M. Manchón & P.M. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 65–90). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

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*, 9(3), 250–256.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19(2), 109–134.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 Motivational Self System. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., Henry, A., & Muir, C. (2015). *Motivational currents in language learning: Frameworks for focused interventions*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Duijnhouwer, H., Prins, F.J., & Stokking, K.M. (2012). Feedback providing improvement strategies and reflection on feedback use: Effects on students' writing motivation, process, and performance. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(3), 171–184.

Dweck, C.S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Hove; Psychology Press.

Eccles, J.S., Wigfield, A., & Schiefele, U. (1998). Motivation to succeed. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 1017–1095). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Elliot, A.J., Murayama, K., & Pekrun, R. (2011). A 3 × 2 achievement goal model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(3), 632.

Elliott, E.S., & Dweck, C.S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(1), 5.

Feng, L., & Papi, M. (2020). Persistence in language learning: The role of grit and future self-guides. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 81, 101904.

Ferris, D.R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33–53.

Ferris, D.R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307–329.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London; Arnold.

Han, Y. (2017) Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, 65, 133–143.

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 31–44.

Hashemian, M., & Heidari, A. (2013). The relationship between L2 learners' motivation/attitude and success in L2 writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 476–489.

He, T. (2005). Effects of mastery and performance goals on the composition strategy use of adult EFL writers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(3), 407–431.

Higgins, E.T. (1987). Self-discrepancy theory: What patterns of self-beliefs cause people to suffer? *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, pp. 93–136. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60306-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60306-8).

Higgins, E.T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280.

Higgins, E.T. (2012). *Beyond pleasure and pain: How motivation works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iksan, H., & Halim, H.A. (2018). The effect of e-feedback via wikis on ESL students' L2 writing anxiety level. *MOJES: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(3), 30–48.

Jang, Y., & Lee, J. (2019). The effects of ideal and ought-to L2 selves on Korean EFL learners' writing strategy use and writing quality. *Reading and Writing*, 32(5), 1129–1148.

Johnson, M.D. (2017). Cognitive task complexity and L2 written syntactic complexity, accuracy, lexical complexity, and fluency: A research synthesis and meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 37, 13–38.

Kirmizi, Ö., & Kirmizi, G.D. (2015). An investigation of L2 learners' writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety and its causes at higher education in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2), 57–66.

Korn, R.M., & Elliot, A.J. (2016). The 2 × 2 standpoints model of achievement goals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 742.

Kurt, G., & Atay, D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1), 12–23.

Liao, M.T., & Wong, C.T. (2010). Effects of dialogue journals on L2 students' writing fluency, reflections, anxiety, and motivation. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 9(2), 139–170.

Lin, M.C., Cheng, Y.S., Lin, S.H., & Hsieh, P.J., (2015). The role of research-article writing motivation and self-regulatory strategies in explaining research-article abstract writing ability. *Perceptual & Motor Skills: Learning & Memory*, 120(2), 397–415.

Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing students' engagement and motivation in writing: The case of primary students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 219–237.

Lou, N.M., & Noels, K.A. (2016). Changing language mindsets: Implications for goal orientations and responses to failure in and outside the second language classroom. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 46, 22–33.

MacIntyre, P.D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Positive psychology in SLA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Manchón, R.M. (2009). Individual differences in foreign language learning: The dynamics of beliefs about L2 writing. *RESLA*, 22, 245–268.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954.

McCarthy, P., Meier, S., & Rinderer, R. (1985). Self-efficacy and writing: A different view of self-evaluation. *College Composition and Communication*, 36(4), 465–471.

Noels, K.A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations and motivation. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*, 23, 43–68.

Ong, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2010). Effects of task complexity on the fluency and lexical complexity in EFL students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 218–233.

Papi, M. (2016). *Motivation and learning interface: How regulatory fit affects incidental vocabulary learning and task experience*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Papi, M. (2018). Motivation as quality: Regulatory fit effects on incidental vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 40(4), 707–730.

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A.V., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2019). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2 × 2 model of L2 self-guides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 337–361.

Papi, M., Bondarenko, A.V., Wawire, B., Jiang, C., & Zhou, S. (2020). Feedback-seeking behavior in second language writing: Motivational mechanisms. *Reading and Writing*, 33(2), 485–505.

Papi, M., & Hiver, P. (2020). Language learning motivation as a complex dynamic system: A global perspective of truth, control, and value. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(1), 209–232.

Papi, M. & Khajavy, G.H. (2021). Motivational mechanisms underlying second language achievement: A regulatory focus perspective. *Language Learning* 71(2), 537–572.

Papi, M., Rios, A., Pelt, H., & Ozdemir, E. (2019). Feedback-seeking behavior in language learning: Basic components and motivational antecedents. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(1), 205–226.

Papi, M., Wolff, D., Nakatsukasa, K., & Bellwoar, E. (2021). Motivational factors underlying learner preferences for corrective feedback: Language mindsets and achievement goals. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(6), 858–877.

Polio, C., & Friedman, D.A. (2016). *Understanding, evaluating, and conducting second language writing research*. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.

Qashqa, S.H.H. (2014). English writing anxiety: Alleviating strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 59–65.

Radecki, P.M., & Swales, J.M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16(3), 355–365.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2019). Writing task complexity, students' motivational beliefs, anxiety and their writing production in English as a second language. *Reading and Writing*, 32(3), 761–786.

Rezaei, M., & Jafari, M. (2014). Investigating the levels, types, and causes of writing anxiety among Iranian EFL students: A mixed method design. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1545–1554.

Ruegg, R. (2018). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students' writing self-efficacy. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 87–102.

Sakai, K., & Gaias, S.J. (1999). Investigating Japanese learners' beliefs about language learning. *System*, 27(4), 473–492.

Sasaki, M., Mizumoto, A., & Murakami, A. (2018). Developmental trajectories in L2 writing strategy use: A self-regulation perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(2), 292–309.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303–334.

Tahmouresi, S., & Papi, M (under review). Future selves, enjoyment and anxiety as predictors of L2 writing quality and achievement.

Teimouri, Y. (2018). Differential roles of shame and guilt in L2 learning: How bad is bad? *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(4), 632–652.

Teimouri, Y., Papi, M., & Tahmouresi, S. (2021). Individual differences in how language learners pursue goals: Regulatory mode perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1–26.

Tsao, J.J., Tseng, W.T., & Wang, C. (2017). The effects of writing anxiety and motivation on EFL college students' self-evaluative judgments of corrective feedback. *Psychological Reports*, 120(2), 219–241.

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.

Wan, W. (2014). Constructing and developing ESL students' beliefs about writing through metaphor: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 23, 53–73.

Wenden, A. (1986). What do second-language learners know about their language learning? A second look at retrospective accounts. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 186–205.

Yang, N.D. (1992). Second language learners' beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/74921>

Yeşilyurt, S. (2008). Motivational patterns and achievement in EFL writing courses: An investigation from self-determination theory perspective. *KKEFD*, 18, 135–154.

Yoon, H., & Hirvela, A. (2004). ESL student attitudes toward corpus use in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 257–283.

Yun, S., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A.H. (2018). Academic buoyancy: Exploring learners' everyday resilience in the language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 40(4), 805–830.

Zabihi, R., Mousavi, S.H., & Salehian, A. (2018). The differential role of domain-specific anxiety in learners' narrative and argumentative L2 written task performances. *Current Psychology*, 39(4), 1438–1444.

Zhang, H., Song, W., Shen, S., & Huang, R. (2014). The effects of blog-mediated peer feedback on learners' motivation, collaboration, and course satisfaction in a second language writing course. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(6), 670–685.