 Anthropologist, 21(1,2): 311-322 (2015)

The Effects of Various Variables on University Students' Writer's Block Levels

Kemal Zeki Zorbaz

Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education, Alahan, Antakya, Hatay, 31001, Turkey
Telephone: +90 (326) 245 60 00 – 52 76, E-mail: kemal_zeki@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS Writer's Block. Blocking. QIWB. Writing. Writing Skills

ABSTRACT This study examined the writer's block levels of the freshman students in a faculty of education based on the relevant variables about socio-economic features and reading-writing frequency. The subjects of the research consisted of 428 students studying at the Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education. In this study, the items in the blocking and lateness sub-scales of the 'Questionnaire for Identifying Writer's Block' were used. The scale was adapted to Turkish with all items in order to determine the functionality of blocking and lateness factors. Considering the faculty of education freshman students' writer's block levels, it was determined that twenty-four percent of the students almost always and often have the writer's block, seventy percent of them have it somethimes or occasionally, and six percent of them have it almost never. It was determined that the students having writer's block vary in accordance to their reading-writing frequencies rather than their socioeconomic features, and the students who had writing activities in secondary and high school and still have the habit of writing have a lesser degree of the writer's block. It was detected that the students who have a regular reading habit also have the writer's block lesser.

INTRODUCTION

One of the important qualifications of the writing of expression is to convey the emotions and thoughts fluently and comfortably. Not being fluent and comfortable in expressing the emotions and thoughts also prevents transferring the information to the mind. The state of not being fluent and comfortable in written expression is known as the *writer's block.* Rose (1984: 3) explained the writer's block as "an inability to begin or continue writing for reasons other than a lack of basic skill or commitment".

The writer's block is also among the reasons why individuals cannot write qualified writings and produce texts. Huston (1998) explained the writer's block as "a stress reaction that paralyzes the ability to put thoughts into words". Smith (1982, quoted by Hall 1998: 10) explained the writer's block as "an inability to form the thoughts and resistance of words against the writer".

According to Hall (1998: 9), the writer's block is a state of mental inaction experienced by amateur and professional writers, and although it can be caused due to several reasons, it is often caused by the writer's lack of knowledge of content in a specific discipline.

According to Rose (1984: 15, 37), the indication of blocking is that a person spends too much time at the planning stage regarding what he/she will write before moving on to the actual writing process. Thus, the individual avoids starting the principally stressful work. Kellog (1999: 115) explains this state with an example, "For instance, one blocked writer developed overly elaborate plans that lengthened the prewriting stage to several days. Then, with only a few hours left for creating a draft, the student found it impossible to transform the complex plan into a short essay."

According to Hall (1998: 10, 35), the writer's block is also triggered by causes such as anxiety, rage, anger, generated fears, uneasiness, and perfectionism as well as factors such limited time to write the essay, unhelpful teachers, students not knowing how to write, and unfamiliarity with the given subject. According to Minninger (1997, quoted by Peterson 1987: 37), many people have the writer's block since they are afraid of what the others may have to say about their writings.

All of attendants of the study by Lowenthal and Wason (1977, quoted by Kellog 1999: 113) stated that beginning to write is the most difficult part of the process. In parallel to this, Rose (1983: 3) determined that the high-blocker students spend one-half or even two-thirds of their time on thinking and planning before writing.

Hall (1998: 14) stated that the behaviors of those who have writer's blocks are negativism, pessimism, frequent pauses during writing, de-

sire to finish quickly, disgust, dawdling, seeking interruptions, performing unnecessary errands, anxiety, expression of frustration, anger, and confusion.

Boice (1993) counts the interference of self-censor or internal criticism, fear of failure, perfectionism, past experiences, postponement, and sanity problems among the common reasons for a writer's block.

As beginning to work with the postulate that he/she is not good at a work or cannot succeed in doing that work, affects the success, thinking that he/she will not succeed in writing before beginning to write or being afraid of failing also causes the writer's block. Considering the fact that students get a mark for what they have written, it can be said that the blocking based on the fear of failure most influences the students. Besides the fear of failure, if the individual has bad memories about the evaluation of what he/she wrote in the past, it could cause the individual to be afraid of making mistakes and the individual will prefer not writing rather than making mistakes.

Perfectionism, which is one of the personal characteristics of an individual, can also affect the written expression studies of the individual. As the individual thinks that, "I must write better" and "I must express more suitably", his/her writing loses its fluency and he/she may face the writer's block.

If the subject given for writing is not interesting or there are too many things to be planned to write or it is not possible to find something to write about on the subject, the postponement situation becomes a matter for the individual. This situation causes blocking. Boice (1993) stated that the fear of making mistakes by these students presents features such as reluctance and lack of self-confidence.

The writer's block can be seen not only in the beginning of writing but also in course of writing. This situation, which is seen in the beginning of writing as to wish to write but not to be able to write, comes up in the way that the writing completely stops during the process. Miller (2010: 17) stated that a writer's block not only slows the process of writing, but it can also cast doubts on the writer on his or her ability to compose at all.

Rose (1984: 5) stated that setting up rigid rules such as, "Always put your thesis statement at the end of your first paragraph" or "Never use the verb 'to be'" also causes the writer's block.

Although there are several studies with respect to writing, studies regarding the writer's block that affects the individuals negatively on generating texts are quite limited in Turkey. There are no studies regarding the writer's block performed except for the study (Zorbaz 2010) on the secondary school students.

Purpose of the Study

In this study, in the model of casual-comparative research the writer's block levels of the faculty of education freshman students were tried to be determined based upon their socioeconomic features and reading-writing frequencies. Within this framework, the answers to the following questions have been sought:

Are there any statistically significant differences on the faculty of education freshman students' writer's block levels based on the following?

a. Gender,
b. Department studied,
c. Educational background and profession of parents,
d. Average monthly income of the family,
e. The situation of keeping a diary and the habit of writing,
f. The frequency of conducting written expression activities in secondary, and high school,
g. The frequency and habit of reading books other than schoolbooks.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The population of the study is composed of freshman students studying at Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education and the sample consists of 539 students who can be accessed with a simple random sampling in this population. However, 428 students were included in the study since some of them deficiently completed the data collection tools. The departments (Computer Education and Instructional Technologies, Science Education, English Language Education, Special Education, Painting and Crafts Education, Primary School Education, Turkish Language Education) and the number of students included in the study are in Table 1.

Table 1: The departments and number of students

			Comp. edu.	*Sci. edu.*	*English lang.*	*Special edu.*	*Painting edu.*	*Primary edu.*	*Turkish lang.*	*Total*
Gender	Female	N	33	40	71	8	18	77	47	294
		%	50.8	63.5	78	61.5	94.7	83.7	55.3	68.7
	Male	N	32	23	20	5	1	15	38	134
		%	49.2	36.5	22	38.5	5.3	16.3	44.7	31.3
Total		N	65	63	91	13	19	92	85	428
		%	15.2	14.7	21.3	3	4.4	21.5	19.9	100

Instruments

The data used in the research was obtained using the *Personal Information Form* and the "Blocking and Lateness" sub-scales of the *Questionnaire for Identifying Writer's Block* that measures the blocking.

a) Personal Information Form

The Personal Information Form was used to obtain information about the socioeconomic features and the reading-writing frequencies of the students. Corresponding with the socioeconomic levels, the features such as the education level and profession of the parents, average monthly income of the family were used. Corresponding with the reading-writing frequency, the information regarding their situation of keeping a diary, habit of writing, frequency of conducting written expression activities in secondary, and high school, number of books other than schoolbooks read in the recent years, time allocated for reading book other than schoolbooks in a week, and their ways of self-evaluation in terms of habit of reading were obtained from the students.

b) Questionnaire for Identifying Writer's Block (QIWB)

The Questionnaire for Identifying Writer's Block, measuring the blocking, developed by Mike Rose (1981) was used in order to obtain information about the writer's blocks of the students based on several variables. Rose (1981: 1) stated that the researcher or teachers who wish to measure simply the blocking should administer the *blocking* and *lateness* sub-scales (the behavioral sub-scales) (12 items).

In order to use all or part of the scale, the scale in the Turkish form needs to be tested to see whether or not it is valid and reliable. For this purpose, the scale was adapted to Turkish. The adaptation to Turkish of the scale consists of 24 items in total and is based on the model of a five-point Likert type scale. The points are as follows, *almost always, often, sometimes*, *occasionally*, and *almost never*, and these were carried out as the relevant publications (Savasir 1994; Hambleton and Patsula 1998; Aksayan and Gozum 2002; Deniz 2007; ITC 2010) stipulate. During the adaptation of the scale to Turkish, permission was received via e-mail from the researcher Mike Rose who developed the scale. The scale was translated to Turkish by three field experts. For the best translation the opinions of three English Language Teaching experts (two of them had been in USA with the Fulbright scholarship) and two field experts who completed their postgraduate educations in the Unites States of America were received and necessary changes were made in the translation. Post this, the Turkish translation was translated in English and three English Language Teaching experts were asked to compare the original form of the scale with the form translated from Turkish to English and it was concluded that both forms expressed exactly the same thing as a result of the evaluation conducted. At the last stage, 34 freshman students in total studying at Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching were tested with the original form of the scale and its Turkish translation one week later. As a result of this application the correlation between the English and Turkish forms of the scale was found to be .92.

When the language validity study is carried out, it is seen that changes in the 7th, 9th and 12th items in the Turkish form are required.

- The item, "There are times when I sit at my desk for hours, unable to write a thing." was changed into "There are times when I sit at my desk for a long time, unable to write a thing."
- The item, "While writing a paper, I'll hit places that keep me stuck for an hour or more." was changed into "While writing a paper,

I'll hit places that keep me stuck for a long time."

- The item, "There are times when it takes me over two hours to write my first paragraph." was changed into "There are times when it takes me too much time to write my first paragraph."

Besides, the 25th item, "While writing my paper, I cannot finish up to deadline since I was stuck up." was added as a third item for the factor involving the 4th and 14th items only from the factors in the original scale.

While inputting the data obtained from the Turkish form of the scale "almost always", "often", "sometimes", "occasionally", and "almost never" expressions are graded with 1 point, 2 points, 3 points, 4 points, and 5 points, respectively. Due to the sense structure, the 1st, 6th, 13th and 22nd items were graded as contrary of this point scoring.

Following the language validity study, the factor analysis was carried out to examine the structural validity of the scale. In order to determine the factor structure of the scale, the principal component factor analysis was applied by means of using the varimax rotation method on the points obtained from the responses that 428 students gave in the scale. In the principal component factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was founded at an acceptable level of .94. This indicates that the data obtained accorded with the factor analysis well. Significant chi-square test statistics obtained as a result of this test indicate that the data was derived from the multivariate normal distribution. As a result of the analysis carried out within the study, the Bartlett's Test was found to be statistically significant (χ^2=4506.31; p<0.01).

In the first factor analysis carried out by means using the varimax rotation method and the Principal Component Analysis, the 11th item (.505 for the first factor and .515 for the third factor) and 20th item (.392 for the second factor and .449 for third factor) gave higher values for two factors, and these items were excluded from the scale. In this factor analysis the last factor consisting of 3rd, 8th and 18th items and called as "Premature Editing" by Rose (1981) explains 4.18 of the total variance and the load values of the items vary between .655 and .783. The items involved in this factor exactly accorded with the factor structure (3, 8, 18) of Rose (1981). The internal consistency of this factor was found to be .57. However, the correlations of the items in this factor with the total test were found to be quite low (.049, .095, and .212) and it was deemed suitable to exclude from the scale.

As a result of the second factor analysis carried out after the 3rd, 8th, 11th, 18th, and 20th items were excluded, a structure occurred that consisted of four factors, which explains sixty percent of the total variance and has an eigenvalue over 1. The results of this analysis are given in Table 2.

As it can be seen in Table 2, the first factor consisting of nine items explains 41.16 percent of the total variance and the load values of the items vary between .552 and .768. The items under the first factor were called "Blocking" by Rose (1981). The items involved in this factor substantially accorded with the factor structure of Rose (1981) (7th, 9th, 12th, 16th, 17th, 22nd, and 24th). However, unlike the 15th and 23rd items, these are also involved under the "blocking" factor. This structure also shows similarity with the factor structure in the study by Lee and Krashen (2003) on Taiwanese university students. In this study, the 7th, 9th, 12th, 17th, and 24th items were involved under this factor.

The second factor consisting of four items explains 7.83 percent of the total variance and the load values of the items vary between .627 and .801. The items under the second factor were called "Attitudes" by Rose (1981). The items involving in this factor were in accordance with the factor structure of Rose (1981) (1st, 6th, 13th, and 21st), however the 2nd, 10th, and 20th items, which are stated to be involved under this factor by Rose, are involved in different scales.

The third factor consisted of three items and called "Lateness" by Rose (1981) and explains 5.98 percent of the total variance and the load values of the items vary between .646 and .835. The items involving in this factor exactly accorded with the factor structure of Rose (1981) (4th and 14th) and the 25th item which was added by the researcher was also involved under this factor.

The fourth factor consisting of four items and called "Strategies for Complexity" by Rose (1981) explains 5.02 percent of the total variance and the load values of the items vary between .489 and .824. Only the 5th and 19th items involved in

Table 2: Writer's block scale item-total test correlations and factor loadings

Scale items	*r*	*Factors*			
		1	*2*	*3*	*4*
9. While writing a paper, I'll hit places that keep me stuck for a long time.	.749	.768			
12. There are times when it takes me too much time to write my first paragraph.	.670	.749			
7. There are times when I sit at my desk for a long time, unable to write a thing.	.709	.707			
22. There are times when I find it hard to write what I mean.	.763	.695			
17. It is awfully hard for me to get started on a paper.	.748	.657			
16. I find myself writing a sentence then erasing it, trying another sentence, then scratching *it* out. I might do this for some time.	.617	.627			
24. Some people experience periods when, no matter how hard they try, they can produce little, if any, writing. When these periods last for a considerable amount of time, we say the person has a writing block. Estimate how often you experience writer's block.	.539 .599	.599 .578			
23. I have trouble with writing assignments that ask me to compare and contrast or analyze.					
15. There are times when I'm not sure how to organize all the information I've gathered for a paper.	643 .	.552			
6. I like having the opportunity to express my ideas in writing.	.402		.801		
1. Even though it is difficult at times, I enjoy writing.	.448		.767		
21. Writing is a very unpleasant experience for me.	.610		.682		
13. I think my writing is good.	.641		.627		
14. I run over deadlines because I get stuck while trying to write my papers.	.571			.835	
25. While writing my paper, I cannot finish up to deadline since I was stuck up.	.595			.832	
4. I have to hand in assignments late because I can't get the words down on paper.	.658			.646	
2. I've seen some really good writing, and my writing doesn't match up to it.	.368				.824
19. I find it difficult to write essays on books and articles that are very complex.	.491				.514
10. My teachers are familiar with so much good writing that my writing must look bad by comparison.	.594			.514	
5. It is hard for me to write on topics that could be written about from a number of angles.	.634				.489
Eingenvalues		8.23	1.56	1.19	1
Explained variance (%)		41.16	7.83	5.98	5.02
Total explained variance (%)			60.00		
Coefficient Alpha		.893	.788	.828	.671
Entire Scale Coefficient Alpha			.921		

this factor accord with the factor structure of Rose (1981), however the 11th, 15th, and 23rd items, which are stated to be involved under this factor by Rose are involved in different scales. The 5th and 19th items were also involved under this factor in the study by Lee and Krashen (2003).

The coefficient alpha was calculated to determine the reliability of the scale. When the 3rd, 8th, 11th, 18th, and 20th items were excluded, the coefficient alpha for the entire scale was calculated as .92. The coefficient alpha of the first, second, third, and fourth factors were found to be .89, .78, .82, and .67, respectively. These results can be shown as a significant proof that the scale is a reliable scale.

The correlation between the sub-scales and the points obtained from the scale are shown in the Table 3.

The correlations between the sub-scales and total point obtained from the scale vary between .74 and .93 and these correlation coefficients were found statistically significant at a confidence level of 0.01. All these findings were considered as proofs regarding the structural validity of the scale.

In this study, 12 items of the Writer's Block Scale, regarded the "blocking and lateness" were

Table 3: Correlations between the sub-scales and total scale points

	Total scale	*Bloc-king*	*Attitu-des*	*Late-ness*
Blocking	.933			
Attitudes	.741	.566		
Lateness	.753	.638	.433	
Strategies of complexity	.790	.663	.487	.496

* p < 0.01

evaluated as a scale and analyzed based on the variables regarding the socio-economic features and reading-writing frequency. Rose (1981) stated that the researchers who wish to measure the blocking should use these items. The points obtained from the scale express that the points between 12-21 are for "almost always", the points between 22-31 are for "often", the points between 32-40 are for "sometimes", the points between 41-50 are for "occasionally", and the points between 51-60 are for "almost never", as the frequencies of the writer's block are observed. It can be said that as the points obtained from the scale decrease, the writer's block increases, and as it raises, the blocking decreases.

RESULTS

The writer's block frequencies of faculty of education freshman students who attended to the study are shown based on their total blocking and lateness points in Table 4.

Table 4: The writer's block frequencies of faculty of education freshman students

	f	%
Almost always (12-21)	25	5.8
Often (22-31)	78	18.2
Sometimes (32-40)	149	34.8
Occasionally (41-50)	150	35
Almost never (51-60)	26	6.1
Total	428	100.0

When Table 4 is examined, it was determined that twenty-four percent from the faculty of education freshman students almost always or often experience the writer's block and seventy percent of them have sometimes or occasionally had the writer's block, and six percent of them almost never have the writer's block.

The independent sample t-test was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by gender. According to the Levene test result (F=.462, p<.05), which was carried out to determine whether the samples show a homogenous distribution, it was determined that the distribution variances of the blocking and lateness points of the students by gender were homogenous and the t-test results performed are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: t-test results of total blocking and lateness points by gender

Gender	*N*	*sd*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*Cohen's d*
Female	294	38.73	9.26426	(2.688)	(.007*)	(.282)
Male	134	35.73	8.88			

*p<.05

According to the data in Table 5, it was determined that the girls' experience fewer writer's blocks and the difference was statistically significant. The effect size was found to be low ($t_{(246)}$=2.688 p<.05, Cohen's d=.282).

The one-way ANOVA was carried out to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant by the department studied (Computer Education and Instructional Technologies, Science Education, English Language Education, Special Education, Painting and Crafts Education, Primary School Education, Turkish Language Education). According to the ANOVA results, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students do not vary statistically based on the department studied in (F=.841, p<.05).

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the education level and the profession of their mothers. According to the ANOVA results, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students do not vary statistically significantly based on the education level (F=1.960, p<.05) and the profession (F=2.109, p<.05) of their mothers.

The one-wayANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education

freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the education level and the profession of their fathers. According to the ANOVA results, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students do not vary statistically significantly based on the education level (F=.712, p<.05) and the profession (F=1.591, p<.05) of their fathers.

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the income level of their families. According to the ANOVA results, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students do not vary statistically significantly in accordance with the income level of their families (F=.682, p<.05).

The independent samples t-test was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the situation of keeping a diary. According to the Levene test result (F=.009, p<.05) which was carried out to determine whether the samples show a homogenous distribution, it was determined that the distribution variances of the blocking and lateness points of the students by the situation of keeping a diary were homogenous. As a result of the t-test, although the students who keep a diary ($\overline{X}$ = 39.9) have fewer writer's blocks than those who do not keep a diary (X= 37.2), the difference between them is not statistically significant ($t_{(426)}$=1.879, p>.05).

The independent samples t-test was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the situation of conducting writing activities. As a result of the Levene test performed (F=5.331, p<.05), it was determined that the distribution variances of the samples were not homogenous. Therefore, since the parametric test assumption was not met, the Mann Whitney U Test, which is used in the non-parametric unrelated measurement was carried. The results of the analysis performed are in Table 6.

Table 6: U-test results of total blocking and lateness points by situation of conducing writing activity by the students

Writing activity	*N*	*Mean rank*	*Sum of ranks*	*U*	*p*
Yes	120	281.74	33808.50	10411.500	.000*
No	308	188.30	57997.50		

*p<.05

According to the data in Table 6, it was determined that the students who had not conducted various writing activities had writer's block more than those who had conducted writing activity and the difference between them was statistically significant. But the effect size was low.

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by conducting written expression activities in secondary schools. As a result of the Levene test performed (F=1.108, p>.05) it was seen that the distribution variances of the points were homogenous. The results of the ANOVA performed are given in Table 7.

According to the ANOVA results in Table 7, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students vary statistically significantly by the frequency of conducting written expression activity in secondary schools (F=10.281, p<.05, partial η^2=.068). Effect size is medium. The results of the Bonferroni test performed to determine the difference in ranges between the groups are presented in Table 8.

According to Table 8, it was determined that in secondary schools the students who often

Table 7: ANOVA results of total blocking and lateness points by frequency of conducting writing activities in secondary schools by the students

Variance source	*Sum of squares*	*df*	*Mean square*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Between groups	2454.956	3	818.319	10.281	.000*	.068
Within groups	33750.007	424	79.599			
Total	36204.963	427				

* p<.05

Table 8: Bonferroni test difference control results of total blocking and lateness points by frequency of conducting writing activities in secondary schools by the students

(I) group	*(J) group*	*Mean difference (I-J)*	*Std. error*	*p*
Often	Occasionally	3.455	1.191	.024*
Often	Sometimes	4.237	1.232	.004*
Often	Never	11.058	2.070	.000*
Occasionally	Never	7.603	1.940	.001*
Sometimes	Never	6.821	1.966	.003*

*p<.05

conducted written expression activities had the writer's block less than those who had occasionally, sometimes or never conducted them and the students who occasionally conducted the written expression activities had the writer's block less than those who never conducted them and the students who sometimes conducted the written activities had the writer's block less than those who never conducted them and the difference between was found to be statistically significant.

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by conducting written expression activities in high schools. As a result of the Levene test performed (F=1.085, p>.05) it was seen that the distribution variances of the points were homogenous. The results of the one-way ANOVA performed are given in Table 9.

According to the ANOVA results in Table 9, the total blocking points of faculty of education freshman students vary statistically significant by the frequency of conducting written expression activity in high schools (F=5.609, p<.05, partial η^2=.038). But effect size is small. The results of Bonferroni test performed to determine that this difference ranges between in which groups are presented in the Table 10.

According to Table 10, it was determined that in the high schools the students who had often conducted written expression activities had the writer's block less than those who never conducted them and the students who occasionally conducted the written expression activities had the writer's block less than those who sometimes conducted them and the students who sometimes conducted the written activities had the writer's block less than those who never conducted them and the difference between them was found to be statistically significant.

Table 10: Bonferroni test difference control results of total blocking and lateness points by frequency of conducting writing activities in high schools by the students

(I) group	*(J) group*	*Mean difference (I-J)*	*Std. error*	*p*
Often	Never	6.576	1.635	.000*
Occasionally	Never	3.591	1.303	.037*
Sometimes	Never	3.494	1.281	.040*

*p<.05

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the number of books other than school-books read in the recent year. As a result of the Levene test performed (F=.543, p>.05) it was seen that the

Table 9: ANOVA results of total blocking and lateness points by frequency of conducting writing activities in high schools by the students

Variance source	*Sum of squares*	*df*	*Mean square*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Between groups	1382.088	3	460.696	5.609	.001*	.038
Within groups	34822.875	424	82.129			
Total	36204.963	427				

*p<.05

Table 11: ANOVA results of total blocking and lateness points by number of books other than schoolbooks read by the students in the recent year

Variance source	*Sum of squares*	*df*	*Mean square*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Between groups	1603.749	5	320.750	3.913	.002*	.044
Within groups	34601.214	422	81.993			
Total	36204.963	427				

*p<.05

distribution variances of the points were homogenous. The results of the ANOVA performed are given in Table 11.

According to the ANOVA results in Table 11, the total blocking and lateness points of faculty of education freshman students vary statistically significantly by the number of books other than schoolbooks ready in the recent year (F=10.281, p<.05, partial η^2=.044). Effect size is small. The results of the Bonferroni test performed to determine the different ranges in between the groups are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Bonferroni test difference control results of total blocking and lateness points by number of books other than schoolbooks read by the students in the recent year

(I) group	*(J) group*	*Mean difference (I-J)*	*Std. error*	*p*
Read 21-50 books	Not read any book	8.333	2.613	.023*

According to Table 12, it was determined that the students who have read between 21 to 50 books in the recent year have the writer's block less than those who have not read any book in the recent year and the difference between the two groups was statistically significant.

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by the time allocated to read a book in a week. As a result of the Levene test performed (F=.863, p>.05) it was seen that the distribution variances of the points were homogenous. The results of the ANOVA performed are given in Table 13.

According to the ANOVA results in Table 13, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students vary statistically significant by the time allocated to read a book in a week (F=5.088, p<.05, partial η^2=.046). Effect size is small. The results of Bonferroni test performed to determine the different ranges in between the groups are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Bonferroni test difference control results of total blocking and lateness points by time allocated to read a book in a week by the students

(I) group	*(J) group*	*Mean difference (I-J)*	*Std. error*	*p*
Between 6-10 hours	Less than one hour	5.546	1.479	.002*
More than 10 hours	Less than one hour	5.889	1.7	.006*

*p<.05

According to Table 14, it was determined the students who allocate "less than one hour" to read a book in a week have the writer's block more than those who allocate "between 6-10 hours" and "more than 10 hours" and the difference between the groups was statistically significant.

Table 13: ANOVA results of total blocking and lateness points by time allocated to read a book in a week by the students

Variance source	*Sum of squares*	*df*	*Mean square*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Between groups	1661.843	4	415.461	5.088	.001*	.046
Within groups	34543.120	423	81.662			
Total	36204.963	427				

*p<.05

Table 15: ANOVA Results of total blocking and lateness points by Self-assessment in terms of reading habits of the students

Variance source	*Sum of squares*	*df*	*Mean square*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Between groups	4394.587	4	1098.647	14.609	.000*	,121
Within groups	31810.375	423	75.202			
Total	36204.963	427				

*p<.05

The one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether the total blocking and lateness points of the faculty of education freshman students show a statistically significant difference by their self-assessment in terms of reading habit (very bad, bad, so-so, good, and very good). As a result of the Levene test performed (F=.388, p>.05) it was seen that the distribution variances of the points were homogenous. The results of the ANOVA performed are given in Table 15.

According to the ANOVA results in the table, the total writer's block points of faculty of education freshman students vary statistically significantly by their reading habits (F=14.609, p<.05, partial η^2=.121). Effect size is medium. The results of Bonferroni test performed to determine this difference range between the groups are presented in Table 16.

Table 16: Bonferroni test difference control results of total blocking and lateness points by the self-assessment in terms of reading habits of the students

(I) group	*(J) group*	*Mean difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*p*
So-so	Very bad	6.768	1.514	.000*
Good	Very bad	9.598	1.586	.000*
Good	Bad	5.01	1.221	.000*
Very good	Very bad	14.493	2.365	.000*
Very good	Bad	9.905	2.137	.000*
Very good	So-so	7.725	2.053	.002*

*p<.05

According to the Table 16, it was determined that the students who qualify themselves as "very bad" in terms of their reading habit have the writer's block more than those who qualify themselves as "so-so", "good", and "very good" and the students who qualify themselves as "bad" have the writer's block more than those who qualify themselves as "good" and "very good" and the students who qualify themselves as "so-so" have the writer's block more than those who qualify themselves as "very good" and the difference between the groups was statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

It can be said that the Writer's Block Scale substantially shows similarity with the structure in the studies by Rose (1981), and Lee and Krashen (2003) and Turkish can be used in addition to English and Chinese.

It was determined that six percent of the faculty of education freshman students do not have the writer's block, however a significant number (approximately 94%) of them have the writer's block from time to time. In a similar way, Miller (2010:167) determined that most of the students either "occasionally" or "sometimes" say they struggle with writer's block on at least a semi-regular basis.

It was determined that in this study the gender has an influence on the writer's block and the males studying at the faculty of education freshman students have the writer's block more frequently than the girls. Daly (1985: 47) determined that the girls have the writing apprehension lower than the men in the study regarding the writing apprehension. Besides, Jeroski and Conry (in 1981, quoted by Daly 1985: 48) determined that girls have a more positive attitude towards writing than the men in the study performed on the 8th and 9th grade students. Less blocking for the girls can be attributed to the fact that they have less writing apprehension and they have a positive attitude towards writing and can write more comfortably. In the study performed by Zorbaz (2010) on the secondary school students (6th, 7th, and 8th grades), by means of using the 9th item measuring only the block, no differences by the gender occurred.

Besides, it was determined that having the writer's block by the students varies mostly by their reading-writing frequencies. It was

determined that the students who engage in writing outside the class and conduct the written expression activity have the writer's block less than those who do not. It was determined that the students have the writer's block less than those who do not, although it was not found statically significant. The writing skill presents a feature, which may reach comfortableness and easiness in expression based upon writing much. Therefore, the students who have a habit of writing and keep a diary have the writer's block less.

It was determined that the students who have conducted the written expression studies in secondary and high school have the writer's block less than those who have not. This situation suggests the importance of having the students conduct the writing activities in the education process. When the students have conducted regular written expression activities in elementary and high schools and evaluated accordingly, it can be said that they may express their thought in written more comfortably.

The frequency of writer's block of the students varies with the number of books, other than the course materials, read by the students in the recent year, the time they allocate to read a book in a week, and the self-assessment (very bad, bad, so-so, good, and very good) in terms of reading habits. It was determined that the students who read between 21 to 50 books have the writer's block less than those who do not read any and the students who read a book for more than 6 hours have the writer's block less than those who read a book for less than one hour. Besides, the difference occurred in terms of having the writer's block between the student who qualify themselves as very bad and those who qualify themselves as so-so, good, and very good, those who qualify themselves as bad and who qualify themselves as good and very good, those who qualify themselves as so-so and those who qualify themselves as very good. It was determined that the individuals who have a reading habit (effect size is medium) have the writer's block less. Hall (1998:9) stated that the "lack of content information for the writer regarding a specific field" causes the writer's block. Therefore, since an individual who reads much will be informed more, he/she has the writer's block less. Besides, Temur (2006) determined that the number of words used by the students who read frequently increases. In parallel with that the students who read much have the writer's block less, it can be said that the students who read much produce more qualified texts. Peterson (1987: 159-160) determined that the individuals who have higher writing quality would have the writer's block less.

It was determined that despite the majority of studies stating that the socio-economic factors influence the language skills of students, in this study the socio-economic factors do not generate a significant change for the writer's block.

CONCLUSION

It was determined that the university students with a writer's block vary with their reading-writing frequencies rather than their socio-economic features, and the students who conducted writing activities in their secondary and high school and have a habit of writing have the writer's block less. It can be said that a regular reading habit is plays an essential role in experiencing or not experiencing a writer's block. It was detected that the students who have a regular reading habit also have the writer's block lesser.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Some new studies should be carried out about the writer's block and their relevance in students from different grades.
2. New studies should be carried out to study the relationship between the writer's block and participants' reading habits.
3. Further research might examine the writer's block and the conswquent writing quality of participants.

REFERENCES

Aksayan S, Gozum S 2002. A guide for transcultural adaptation of the scale I. *Journal of Research and Development in Nursing*, 4(1): 9-13.

Boice R 1993. Writing blocks and tacit knowledge. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(1): 19-54

Daly J 1985. Writing apprehension. In: Mike Rose (Ed.): *When a Writer Can't Write Studies in Writer's Block and Other Composing Process Problems*. New York: Guilford Pr., pp. 43-82.

Deniz KZ 2007. The adaptation of psychological scales. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 40(1): 1-16.

Hall BA 1998. *Writer's Block: Research, Past Remediation, and Recommendations for Future Treatment*. Master Thesis. Houston: The University of Houston-Clear Lake (UMI Number: 1393002).

Hambleton RK, Patsula L 1998. Adapting tests for use in multiple languages and cultures. *Social Indicators Research*, 45: 153-171.

Huston P 1998. Resolving writer's block. *Canadian Family Physician*, 44: 92-97.

International Test Commission (ITC) 2010. International Test Commission Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests. From <www.intestcom.org>.

Kellog RT 1999. *The Psychology of Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lee SY, Krashen S 2003. Writer's block in chinese sample. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 97: 537-542.

Miller KM 2010. *Stranger Than Fiction: A Study of Student Perceptions of Writer's Block and Film in the Composition Classroom*. Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana: Indiana University of Pennsylvania. (UMI Number: 3413182).

Peterson KE 1987. *Relationships Among Measures of Writer's Block, Writing Anxiety, and Procrastination*. Doctoral Dissertation. Ohio: Ohio State University. (UMI Number: 8717700).

Rose M 1981. *Questionnaire for Identifying Writer's Block (QIWB)*. (Eric Reproduction Service No. ED236652).

Rose M 1983. *Cognitive Dimension of Writer's Block*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press. (Eric Reproduction Service No. ED230932).

Rose M 1984. *Writer's Block: Cognitive Dimension*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press. (Eric Reproduction Service No. ED248527).

Savasir I 1994. The scale adaptation problems and some solutions. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 9(33): 27-32.

Temur T 2006. *The Examination of the 4th and the 5th Grade Students' Selections of Vocabulary Items in the Process of Writing with Respect to Some Variables*. Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: Gazi University.

Zorbaz KZ 2010. *The Relationship Between Middle School Students' Writing Apprehension and Blocking with Their Written Expression Skills*. Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: Gazi University.