

Toward a Conceptual Clarification of Foreign Language Anxiety*

Youngsang Kim

(Kyungnam University)

Kim, Youngsang. (2005). Toward a conceptual clarification of foreign language anxiety. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 11(4), 1-20.

Despite the noteworthy increase in the number of FL anxiety studies, inconsistencies associated with the effects of FL anxiety on language learner performance have been reported in literature. Such conflicting results seem to be attributable in part to unstable conceptualization of the FL anxiety construct and its measure. This paper purported to address the emerging call for a theoretical clarification of the construct at hand as a preface to a clear picture of language anxiety on a conceptual ground. This paper not only covers aspects of general anxiety from psychological perspectives, but examines how FL anxiety and its associated concepts have been conceptualized in the literature. Inconsistent results that pertain to FL learning were also delineated. Given the drawbacks found in the exiting theories of FL anxiety, several points were taken into account for a refinement of the conceptual framework. This attempt will hopefully shed new light on the construct *per se* and prove conducive to the development of the field of English education.

[FL anxiety/construct/theorizing/anxiety research, 외국어학습 불안감/구인/이론화/불안감 연구]

* This paper was funded through the 2005 Kyungnam University Research Grant.

I. INTRODUCTION

A variety of learner variables are generally assumed to influence the success or failure of language learning. Among these, some variables are often cited as individual difference variables which are regarded as determinants of successful mastery of a target language. On the basis of the interdisciplinary research in linguistics, psychology, and neuroscience, numerous language professionals have paid their attention to learner variables on theoretical and practical grounds and tried to give answers to the following three:

- a. Why do individual differences exist in second or foreign language (L2 or FL) learning?
- b. How are we able to account for the differences among individual students of second or foreign languages?
- c. What are treatment interventions that have proven effective for helping students with difficulty when they are engaged in learning second or foreign language?

As to a number of individual difference variables widely said to affect second language (L2) acquisition and foreign language (FL) learning, language researchers have recently shown interest in investigating affective variables such as the constructs of motivation and anxiety, which they commonly hold are subject to alteration over the course of language learning. In the last few decades, a proliferation of research on the topics of the motivation and anxiety of language learners has reflected a research tradition in which language-learning researchers have been conducting their studies. However, literature on FL anxiety abounds with conflicting and confusing findings. The researcher found such inconsistencies partly ascribable to unstable conceptualization of the FL anxiety construct available today to the field of language education.

The discussion that follows is confined to the construct of anxiety in general and language anxiety or FL anxiety. First, research that has a significant bearing on a conceptual clarification of FL anxiety is introduced. For this purpose, theoretical conceptions of general anxiety are discussed from

psychological perspectives. In terms of the significance of a theoretical framework of the FL anxiety construct, the investigation of how researchers have theorized the construct of language anxiety or FL anxiety and the associated concepts applied to language anxiety studies follows. Second, research results characteristic of confusions or inconsistencies are detailed in association with given perspectives. The third section covers future research directions towards a theoretical clarification of the construct and suggests possible avenues language researchers may take in their investigations into FL anxiety.

II. THEORIES OF ANXIETY AND LANGUAGE ANXIETY

Anxiety is often portrayed as “the official emotion of our time” (Schlesinger, 1970, p. 2). It is not an easy job to issue a satisfactory definition of anxiety the extent to which no one can contest. Spielberger (1979) conceives of anxiety as “an unpleasant emotional state or condition which is characterized by subjective feelings of tension, apprehension, and worry, and by activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (p. 482).

Leary (1982) defines anxiety as “a cognitive-affective response characterized by physiological arousal (indicative of sympathetic nervous system activation) and apprehension regarding a potentially negative outcome that the individual perceives as impending” (p. 99). Recently, Wolman defines anxiety as a “feeling of one’s own weakness and inability to cope with real or imaginary threats” and such a feeling “originates internally and is associated with lack of self-confidence and feelings of inadequacy” (1989, p. 26). According to Sarason (1986), all the definitions above suffer from “low inter-writer reliability with respect to terms used to clarify the construct” (p. 19).

1. Anxiety from Psychological Perspectives

It is hardly possible to contest that anxiety or apprehension is a “pervasive psychological phenomenon in this rapidly changing modern society” (Levitt, 1980, p. 1). Anxiety is a psychological construct or entity. We cannot see it with the naked eye or even with the aid of microscope, because it is an

abstract entity without physical qualities in its existence. It is a hypothetical construct which has turned out to be useful in the account of an individual's propensity to experience fear or apprehension, based on its manifestations.

Psychologists classify anxiety as trait, state, and situation-specific anxiety. A summary of each of the perspectives will be of use to a clearer understanding of the construct of FL anxiety. Furthermore, it will not be futile to explore the construct at hand within the context of general anxiety research in psychology (Endler, 1980) on the following grounds: (i) Some L2/FL anxiety researchers have accepted the assumption that L2/FL anxiety is a subset of general anxiety; (ii) The research findings of some of their probes into the role of language anxiety in learning may have been reflexes of the discrepancies in the conceptualization of the construct of anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991).

Cattell and Scheier (1960) introduced the dichotomy of trait anxiety and state anxiety which was widely used in the classical anxiety model. According to Spielberger (1975), trait anxiety is based on the assumption that there is a relatively stable predisposition of an individual to display anxious feelings across situations, whereas state anxiety is referred to as apprehension with a temporal reference point, i.e., apprehension a person develops at a given moment. Whether the point of reference is considered or not makes state anxiety distinct from trait anxiety. Research from the third perspective, situation specific anxiety, focuses on the measurement of anxiety developing consistently over time only in a particular type of situation or context.

More specifically, today's psychologists conceive of trait anxiety and state anxiety as totally distinct, though they are related to each other. There are two views of trait anxiety: unidimensional and multidimensional. First, following Spielberger's (1975) definition, trait anxiety is viewed as "a single, unitary characteristic of the organism that is based primarily in past experience, and like other personality traits, is firmly established in adulthood" (Levitt, 1980, p. 14). This view reflects the approach to anxiety as a person's general personality trait, the measure of which purports to predict a person's propensity to be anxious in every situation. Under this view, we can easily notice that its primary focus is on the predisposition within the person (i.e., on intrapsychic properties), but not on the specific situations (Levitt, 1980). The personality trait viewpoint conceives anxiety to be the sum of situations and to be applicable

across circumstances. The second view of anxiety as a multidimensional trait derives from the criticism of the unidimensional view of a general personality trait. That is, in the first view, the individual is primary and the situations are secondary. Situation theorists (or social-learning theorists) like Mischel (1968) have challenged the unitary view that follows the principle of compositionality (i.e., the sum of situations in which an individual feels anxious). The opposing viewpoint is two-fold:

- a. The situation must be accorded the most prominent place in determining an individual's predispositions at any moment.
- b. Given the rare specification of the situations in the measures of a unitary personality trait, the trait tests cannot be valid ones in predicting the disposition of a person to develop anxiety in a given situation with consistency and accuracy.

Endler (1980) and Mischel and Peake (1982) take a moderate stance between the extremes. Endler proposes a person-situation interaction model of anxiety. He argued that if personality traits are not taken into account within the confines of a situation, they are not significant at all. The situation within which an individual develops anxiety must be considered to be at least as meaningful as the individual's traits, if not paramount.

State anxiety is conceptualized as different from trait anxiety and situation specific anxiety. It is characterized by a person's momentary state of feeling anxious or nervous that alternates over time to a varying extent. This kind of anxiety is not perceived as referring to the person's likelihood of feeling anxious in a given situation, as is the case with trait anxiety and situation specific anxiety. Levitt (1980) summarized state anxiety as having the following multimodal response modes, based on the consensus among theorists. Researchers depend on some of the modes for the definition of state anxiety in their studies:

- a. A verbal report, spoken or written, that conveys via ordinary language the message that the reporter is consciously experiencing fear;
- b. Minor surface physical reactions such as pallor, sweating, or trembling,

which are ordinarily manifest;

- c. Internal physiological reactions such as elevated blood pressure and pulse rate, elevated rate of breathing, hormonal and gastrointestinal changes, and loss of consciousness;
- d. Voluntary gross motor behavior or absence of behavior (freezing), most often taking the form of withdrawal from, or avoidance of, a situational threat (p. 12).

A serious issue arises as to the source of anxiety reactions when the state anxiety measure is administered. Because the instrument does not ask the respondent to ascribe the anxious reaction to a certain source, the source of anxiety experience via self-report is hard to locate, unlike situation specific anxiety measures. The most serious drawback of the state anxiety measure is that the measured scores may render an assortment of source variables almost impossible. This is due to the possible interventions of numerous factors in state anxiety reaction at the time of answering an instrument item (Levitt, 1980).

The perspective that a specific situation has primacy over a person represents the third approach to anxiety. As noted above, situation specific anxiety is conceptualized as applied to a specific circumstance, not across various situations. The level of anxiety a person feels varies from situation to situation. Thus, one may feel anxiety in a Situation A, but not in Situations B, C, D, and so forth. A measure of situation specific anxiety can be perceived to be a trait anxiety measure confined to a specific situation (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). The situation specific approach has an advantage over the state anxiety perspective. The measure of the situation specific construct can be used to cope with the difficulty of identifying the sources of feeling anxious in the use of state measures. A tremendous volume of research literature on FL anxiety in the 1990s reflects the situation specific perspective. This may indicate that language anxiety researchers have begun to recognize the advantages of a situation specific approach over other approaches. In the conceptualization of the situation specific construct, a crucial thing to be considered is the extent to which a situation is specified.

2. Theoretical Conceptions of Language Anxiety and Associated Concepts

Given the voluminous research on language anxiety and its effects on language learning in recent times, one might suspect that there would be an equally considerable amount of literature exploring the construct on conceptual grounds. However, language anxiety research probing the theoretical conceptions of language anxiety was virtually nonexistent before Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) in the strict sense of the meaning. Language researchers' theoretical conceptions of language anxiety originated from the tradition in which the historical connection and alleged affinity of the construct with its counterpart in psychology prevalently influenced their frame of mind through the language anxiety construct of concepts and approaches imported from the antecedent. Yet, even such a tradition helped to yield very few research studies conducive to the clarification of the construct unique to language learning. Similar to but not identical with the construct of language anxiety as we know today, several terms were instead introduced as indications of conceptual research on another individual difference variable other than attitudinal and motivational variables among language researchers. These terms were used merely as substitute concepts, some of which enjoyed no longevity in the literature.

First of all, Gardner and his colleagues' research efforts on individual difference variables within the socio-educational framework produced an abundance of literature (Lee, 2005). But the relative affluence obtained in their research did not translate into that of conceptual studies on the construct of language anxiety as a consequence. Rather, the deprivation was exacerbated by the lack of a solid conceptualization, though researchers continued to employ the terms, language anxiety or self-confidence as related to language anxiety as one of the variables in their research studies. That is to say, the disparity was aggravated by the lack of alternative conceptions of language anxiety that could offset a zero-sum hierarchy based on the voluminous research into the individual difference variables, specifically into affectives focused on a motivational variable.

A conceptual foundation Gardner himself continued to rely on for his theory and research regarding language anxiety is that language anxiety was

postulated not as a generalized anxiety, but as an anxiety specific to the language learning context (Gardner, 1979, 1985; Young & Gardner, 1990). Gardner's conception of language anxiety, more specifically, situation anxiety, does not tell us much about formal language learning contexts such as classroom learning situations, as was professed by Gardner, Lalonde, and Pierson (1983) that "motivation and situational anxiety play a more dominant role in informal learning..." (p. 2).

Second, some research by Gardener and his colleagues also used the self-confidence concept as a related concept in place of language anxiety (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977, 1980). Self-confidence assumed to be germane to the "motivational aspect of second language acquisition" (Pak, Dion, & Dion, 1985, p. 369) was conceptualized as an absence of anxiety when speaking outside the classroom setting (Clément et al., 1977, 1980; Clément, Major, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977).

Third, independent of Gardner's research framework, Clément's conceptions of language anxiety and self-confidence in his model still leave much to be refined. Language anxiety is defined as "the individual's discomfort when using the second language" (Clément & Kruidenier, 1985, p. 36). Clément (1980) also conceptualized self-confidence as a secondary motivational process that affects a learner's motivation in a multiethnic milieu. The self-confidence concept includes both language use anxiety and self-evaluation of competence regarding second language learning in multicultural settings. The frequency and contact with other ethnic groups are determinants of self-confidence (Clément, 1980, 1986; Clément & Kruidenier; Labrie, & Clément, 1986). More recently, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noel (1994) operationally defined self-confidence as "low anxious affect and high self-perceptions of L2 competence" (p. 422). Similarly, Dörnyei (1994) conceptualized the same construct as "the belief that one has the ability to produce results, accomplish goals or perform tasks competently" (p. 276).

Fourth, Ely (1986) investigated the language class discomfort construct tantamount to the construct of language class anxiety, along with two other hypothetical constructs: language class risk taking and language class sociability. Ely assumed these additional constructs to be predictors of L2 learning in classroom settings. According to Ely, language class discomfort is defined as a hypothetical "construct concerned with the degree of anxiety,

self-consciousness, or embarrassment felt when speaking the L2 in the classroom” (p. 3). He further noted that language class discomfort is analogous to French Class Anxiety in Gardner and his colleagues’ socio-educational approach to language anxiety.

Fifth, Horwitz et al. (1986) marked an epoch-making statement on the conceptualization of the construct of FL anxiety. Given the lack of an appropriate conception since the calls from Brown (1973) and Scovel (1978), Horwitz et al.’s conceptual framework on the construct laid a foundation upon which subsequent research has been formulated. Horwitz et al. conceptually framed the construct of FL anxiety as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to the classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” with focus on skills of speaking and listening (p. 128).

In line with their previous recommendation on areas of future research (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991), MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) define language anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language learning contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (p. 284). Very recently, MacIntyre (1999) conceptualized the construct as “the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (p. 27).

The conceptualizations discussed so far are directed at engaging language anxiety researchers with the goal of constructing a solid theoretical foundation. Apparently, the successors have owed much to their predecessors in refining the construct on conceptual grounds, however inadequately conceptualized their antecedents might have been. Given that the nature of current discussion is evolutionary, not revolutionary, the field of FL anxiety research again is now at a juncture from which the evolution of a second conceptual paradigm seems to be inevitable before it sets off any further inquiry into the embodiment of a clearer image of the construct. Given the research studies conducted prior to Horwitz et al. (1986), Young (1991) expressed that “the research in the area of anxiety as it relates to second or foreign language learning and performance was scattered and inconclusive” (p. 426). Young’s statement still sounds worthwhile to revisit on a conceptual ground for the establishment of a sounder conceptual framework.

III. INCONSISTENT FL ANXIETY RESEARCH FINDINGS

Ahead of Horwitz et al. (1986), quite a few researchers conducted research into a conceptual clarification of the construct of language anxiety or FL anxiety itself distinct from general anxiety. Almost all researchers conducted their research studies with the exclusive use of one of the dichotomous perspectives of general anxiety. Such practices definitely laid quite an unstable theoretical foundation on which subsequent research on FL anxiety has been built. For example, Brown (1973) and Scovel (1978) already addressed this issue regarding several ambiguities stemming from foreign language anxiety studies. Scovel offered a model in terms of Buddhist philosophy, citing Hilgard, Atkinson, and Atkinson's (1971) operational definition of anxiety as "a state of apprehension, a vague fear..." (in Scovel, 1978, p. 134). But the model gained no visible support from language researchers. In what follows, some of language research will be examined on the effects of anxiety on learning from the three perspectives.

In a study of Swain and Burnaby (1976), the relationship between trait anxiety and L2 learning was examined. They discovered that when French learners in an immersion class were compared with their counterparts in a regular language program in kindergarten and grades 1-2, no significant differences were captured between language anxiety and other measures of language proficiency. The only relationship was reported to hold for a reading test. Contrary to Swain and Burnaby's research, another study conducted by Bartz (1974) showed a correlation only between trait anxiety and German learners' writing performance at high school level. These studies may insinuate that inconsistencies of the findings are likely to be ascribable to intervening variables such as learners' age, target languages, and emphasis on different language skill areas.

With respect to research on the relationships between state anxiety and language learner achievement, studies resulted in confusing findings as well. On the one hand, Chastain's (1975) study with an audio-lingual French class revealed a negative relationship found between test anxiety and adult learners' language achievement, whereas no correlations were identified in regular courses of French and German. His study as well as others, on the other hand,

contained some inconsistent or confusing findings in German and Spanish ones. The inconsistencies were (i) positive correlations between anxiety and FL learner achievement in traditional classes and between test anxiety and learners' achievement in Spanish and (ii) no relationship between learner achievement and a measure of Manifest anxiety (see also Horwitz, 2001). That is, FL learners with higher levels of anxiety substantially displayed better performance scores and achievement. Contrary to the anticipation of language anxiety researchers, such complicated findings led Chastain to the following suggestion: some anxiety proves to be conducive to improving learner performance; much higher anxiety most likely hampers language performance on the parts of FL learners. Chastain's suggestion paved the way for Kleinmann's (1977) study employing Alpert and Haber's (1960) concepts of facilitating anxiety and debilitating anxiety. Kleinmann's concern was basically with testing the following two postulates: (i) learners would avoid some syntax of a target language that differs from their native language one; (ii) facilitating anxiety would impact a student's use of FL syntax his or her native language classmates would be likely to avoid, due to visible differences in syntax between target language and mother tongue. Kleinmann reported that Spanish and Arabic students with high scores on facilitating anxiety scales showed a tendency toward a more frequent use of difficult FL syntax. The facilitating anxiety measure that Kleinmann used for the research is: Nervousness while using English helps me do better. Meanwhile, no negative relationship was identified with language achievement on the measures of debilitating anxiety. Using diverse foreign language majors in a university-based setting, Young (1986) investigated the relationship between state anxiety and oral proficiency. A negative relationship was reported between state anxiety and oral proficiency scores. She noted that with the ability variable controlled, the relationship turned out not to be significant any longer. From this, she concluded that ability was more responsible for oral performance than anxiety was.

Given the numerous research studies on the relationship between situation-specific anxiety and language achievement, confusing and inconsistent results have been still identified. For example, in a study conducted by Backman (1976), FL learning Spanish students with the poorest ability demonstrated the poorest and best performances when the measure of anxiety

was administered. This was construed as no relationship between scores on anxiety and FL learner achievement. In the same year, Tucker, Hamayan, and Genesee reported that scores on the measures of FL learners' anxiety revealed a significant negative relationship with reading comprehension, but not with oral proficiency. Phillips' (1992) study looked into the impacts of anxiety on speaking test performance, using college students of French. In her study the FL students' oral examination scores exhibited a negative relationship with their anxiety scores. Her research endorsed earlier studies conducted by Gardner, Smythe, Clément, and Gliksman (1976) and Horwitz (1986). Gardner et al.'s and Horwitz's studies identified that language anxiety has a negative relationship with FL learners' performance. The moderate correlation ($r = .40$) found in Phillips' study suggested that more anxious students are likely to gain lower exam scores than less anxious ones. With the use of the situation-specific perspective, subsequent research findings have been relatively uniform since the appearance of Horwitz et al. (1986). Some of the studies conducted from the situation-specific perspective, however, yielded contradictory results. Aida's (1994) factor analytic study of Horwitz et al.'s model of FL anxiety showed that several items on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) did not load on any one factor. According to her findings, items that represent the construct of test anxiety were suggested to be removed from the instrument. Her findings coincided with MacIntyre and Gardner's (1989) findings. Their study indicated that test anxiety was not responsible for FL anxiety in association with the communication-oriented foreign language classroom. Thus, MacIntyre and Gardner saw test anxiety not as an issue related to the language classroom, but as a general anxiety. In the same vein, Not only did Kim (2002) investigate FL anxiety among Korean adult learners, but Kim (2004) also conducted a factor analytic study of FL anxiety in order to identify its underlying dimensionalities, employing Horwitz et al.'s construct of FL anxiety and replicating Aida's earlier study. His factor analytic research turned out to be successful in supporting some of the previous research findings. In terms of such a discrepancy in results, however, his study refuted some findings shown in Horwitz et al.'s, MacIntyre and Gardner's, and Aida's studies.

A very unique approach to FL anxiety and FL achievement has been advocated by Sparks and Ganschow (1991, 1993a, 1993b) and Sparks, Ganschow,

and Javorsky (2000). They regarded FL anxiety as originating from a poor achievement associated with FL learning. Their proposal is tantamount to denying the existence of the construct of FL anxiety. Such a perspective they took consequently implies that individual learner differences in language performance are determined by cognitive variables rather than by affective variables. In response to Sparks et al.'s argument against the existence of FL anxiety, Horwitz (2000, 2001; see also MacIntyre, 1995a, 1995b) attempted to refute their theory based on the Linguistic Coding Deficit Hypothesis (LCDH) and cited the fact that numerous FL learners and instructors the world over recognize anxiety reactions to FL learning and its potential harm, based on empirical evidence. Contrary to Sparks et al.'s position, Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, and Daley (2000) have recently supported Horwitz's FL anxiety construct. Onwuegbuzie et al. found that among college learners, FL anxiety conceived as an affective variable was "the second best predictor" of L2 acquisition, following GPA average.

In summary, we have seen that the degree of inconsistency shown in a variety of research studies varies from perspective to perspective. Price (1991) attributes such inconsistencies to the difficulty with the measurement of anxiety and to the use of many different anxiety measures. The first perspective regards anxiety as a general personality trait with a person's being likely to become anxious in every situation. This trait perspective with its overemphasis on intrapsychic properties particularly gave rise to confusing results. The second viewpoint examines anxiety as the apprehension an individual experiences at a specific moment in time, for example, before taking an examination. The third situation-specific approach aims to measure anxiety developing consistently in a particular situation. Finally, Sparks et al.'s radical approach to FL anxiety and FL achievement that denies the existence of the FL anxiety construct seems to contribute to another confusion over a conceptual framework of the construct at hand.

IV. FUTURE DIRECTION TOWARDS A CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

Given that FL anxiety research over the last decades has shown

inconsistencies and confusions as revealed through the research results, the field of language education needs to take into account the emerging call for a sound conceptual work of the FL anxiety construct. Such a call definitely constitutes the state of the art issue on language anxiety research and deserves language professionals' attention. In particular, language anxiety research has been devoted to the methods of remedies and treatment intervention or the development of anxiety reduction programs. Of course, this endeavor has contributed to helping FL learners with anxiety reactions in classroom language learning settings. At the same time, language educators' concerted efforts to frame a sounder conceptualization of the FL anxiety construct are needed and these will eventually lead to a better remediation of the FL anxiety students experience as well as to a clear picture of the FL anxiety construct. In other words, language researchers' equal attention to the construct on theoretical and practical grounds will help to pave the way for a complete awareness of the anxiety influencing student language performance.

As possible avenues language researchers may take in their inquiry into a conceptual clarification of FL anxiety, the following considerations may be taken into. First, most of the FL learning opportunities occur inside the classroom settings. This amounts to meaning that language researchers need to take an insightful look at the settings in which language learning takes place. By doing so, they can capture a better understanding of what characterizes the language classroom with FL students in them. Second, researchers may seek opportunities to figure out what is called upon to engage in classroom FL learning on the parts of individual students. This aspect of probe also holds useful for the language instructors. Both learners and instructors need to be aware of what they learn and teach, respectively (Brown, 2000). Third, researchers may observe FL classrooms so as to collect information on what kinds of language learning tasks or classroom activities are available to learners. The information obtained through classroom observations will eventually help to determine which activities or tasks cause students to exhibit anxiety reactions in FL contexts. Along with observations, in-depth interviews with anxious learners can also shed light with regard to possible sources of anxiety reactions individual FL learners develop, leading to a possible refinement of the conceptual framework of the construct. Fourth, language researchers may approach the FL anxiety

reaction the individual learners develop either from a cognition-based perspective or from an emotion-based perspective, or from both perspectives, i.e., from an interactionist's perspective. This will guide researchers to clarify the nature of FL anxiety construct. Fifth, researchers' attention needs to be paid to ecological factors impacting FL learner performance in the classroom milieus as well as to the extent to which cultural differences between target language and native language influence language learner performance. Finally, language professionals will have to consider which theory (or theories) most likely becomes a candidate for a most appropriate framework in association with conceptualizing the FL anxiety construct.

Taking all the points above into account, researchers will be in a position to conceptualize the FL anxiety construct, which captures important aspects of FL learner anxiety reactions and which is subject to empirical tests. Furthermore, conceptualizing the FL anxiety construct on a theoretical level will be a preface to the development of a measure that is sensitive enough to tap the extents of FL students' anxiety. That is, equipped with a more stable conceptual framework of FL anxiety and an instrument to be offered from, FL researchers and teachers will be able to better diagnose students with higher anxiety in the FL classrooms, followed by a provision of treatment interventions or remedial services to the language students. These subsequent steps will facilitate our understanding of individual differences in the language learning process. In this regard, the current discussion will hopefully serve as an impetus for language professionals home and overseas who entertain discourses that comprise explorations into FL anxiety.

REFERENCES

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 155-168.
- Alpert, R., & Haber, R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, 207-215.
- Backman, N. (1976). Two measures of affective factors as they relate to

- progress in adult second-language learning. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 10, 100-122.
- Bartz, W. H. (1974). A study of the relationship of certain learner factors with the ability to communicate in a second language (German) for the development of measures of communicative competence. *Dissertation Abstracts international*, 35, 4852A (Ohio State University).
- Brown, H. D. (1973). Affective variables in second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 23, 231-244.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Catell, R. B., & Scheier, I. H. (1960). Stimuli related to stress, neuroticism, excitation, and anxiety response patterns. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60, 195-204.
- Chastain, K. (1975). Affective and ability factors in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 25, 153-161.
- Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson & P. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 147-154). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Clément, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5, 271-290.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44, 417-448.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 9, 123-133.
- Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1980). Social and individual factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 12, 293-302.
- Clément, R., & Kruidenier, B. G. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clément's model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 4, 21-37.

- Clément, R., Major, L., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Attitudes and motivation in second language acquisition: An investigation of Ontario francophones. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 12, 1-20.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 273-284.
- Ely, C. M. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risktaking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, 36, 1-25.
- Endler, N. S. (1980). Person-situation interaction and anxiety. In I. L. Kutash (Ed.), *Handbook on stress and anxiety* (pp. 249-266). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, R. C. (1979). Social psychological aspects of second language acquisition. In H. Giles & R. N. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and Social Psychology* (pp. 193-220). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., & Pierson, R. (1983). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: An investigation using LISREL causal modeling. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2, 1-15.
- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clément, R., & Gliksmann, L. (1976). Second language acquisition: A social psychological perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 198-213.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2000). It ain't over til it's over: On foreign language anxiety, first language deficits, and the confounding of the variables. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 256-259.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-13.
- Kim, Y-S. (2002). A qualitative inquiry into EFL anxiety: Through the voices of class constituents. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 8(1), 15-38.
- Kim, Y-S. (2004). A factor analytic study of English language anxiety: The case of Korean university EFL learners. *English Teaching*, 59(4), 239-256.
- Kleinmann, H. H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 27, 93-107.

- Labrie, N., & Clément, R.. (1986). Ethnolinguistic vitality, self-confidence and second language proficiency: An investigation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 269-282.
- Leary, M. R. (1982). Social anxiety. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology* (Vol.3). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lee, M-B. (2005). An investigation into the effects of integrative and instrumental orientations on language learning strategies. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 11(1), 37-55.
- Levitt, E. E. (1980). *The psychology of anxiety*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995a). How does anxiety affect second language learning?: A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 90-99.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995b). On seeing the forest and the trees: A rejoinder to Sparks and Ganschow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 245-248.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24-45). Boston: McGraw-Hill College.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, 41, 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 283-305.
- Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment*. NY: Wiley.
- Mischel, W., & Peake, P. K. (1982). Beyond déjàvu in the search for cross-situational consistency. *Psychological Review*, 89, 730-755.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. (2000). Cognitive, affective, personality, and demographic predictor of foreign-language achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(1), 3-15.
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students oral test performance and attitudes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76, 14-26.
- Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety:

- Interviews with highly anxious students. In E.K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp.101-108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sarason, I. G. (1986). Test anxiety, worry, and cognitive interference. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-related cognitions in anxiety and motivation* (pp. 19-33). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schlesinger, A. J. Jr. (1970). *The vital center*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28, 129-142.
- Sparks, R. L., & Ganschow, L. (1991). Foreign language learning differences: Affective or native language aptitude differences? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 3-16.
- Sparks, R. L., & Ganschow, L. (1993a). The impact of native language learning problems: Case study illustrations of the linguistic coding deficit hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 58-74.
- Sparks, R., & Ganschow, L. (1993b). Searching for the cognitive locus of foreign language learning difficulties: Linking first and second language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 289-302.
- Sparks, R. L., Ganschow, L., & Javorsky, J. (2000). Déjà vu all over again: A response to Saito, Horwitz, and Garza. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84, 251-255.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1972). Conceptual and methodological issues in anxiety research. In C. D. Spielberger (Ed.), *Anxiety: Current trend in theory and research* (Vol. 2). NY: Academic Press.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1975). Anxiety: State-trait process. In C. D. Spielberger & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Stress and anxiety* (Vol. 1). Washington D.C.: Hemisphere/Wiley.
- Swain, M., & Burnaby, B. (1976). Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 11, 115-128.
- Tucker, G. R., Hamayan, E., & Genesee, F. H. (1976). Affective, cognitive and social factors in second-language acquisition. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 32, 214-226.
- Wolman, B. B. (Ed.). (1989). *Dictionary of 1 science* (2nd ed.). San Diego:

Academic Press.

Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19, 439-445.

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 426-439.

Young, M. Y., & Gardner, R. C. (1990). Modes of acculturation and second language proficiency. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 22, 59-71.

예시언어(Examples in): English

적용가능언어(Applicable Languages): English/Foreign Languages

적용가능수준(Applicable Levels): Secondary/Tertiary

Youngsang Kim

Division of English, Kyungnam University

449 Wolyeong-dong, Masan, Kyungnam 631-701, Korea

Tel: (055) 249-2117

E-mail: yokim@kyungnam.ac.kr

Received in Oct., 2005

Reviewed by Nov., 2005

Revised version received in Dec., 2005