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This study proposed various models with different constructs of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) and tested the competitive models with a view to finding the constructs that best account for the FLCAS. The FLCAS was administered to 918 EFL university students in Korea, and the data were analyzed by performing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The results of data analyses indicated that even though the fit indices for all the hypothesized models in general did not meet the cutoff points of acceptability, the model containing four constructs fit the data better than the models containing one, two, or three constructs of the FLCAS. Implications of these findings followed by future research areas were provided to deepen the insight into foreign language anxiety in the classroom in general and the FLCAS in particular.

I. INTRODUCTION

Foreign language anxiety is defined as the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language (MacIntyre, 1998). More specifically, Horwitz et al. (1986) saw foreign language anxiety as a unique situation-specific anxiety and developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS).

Since its development, the FLCAS has gained widespread popularity in measuring the extent of anxiety particular to foreign language learning and in investigating the relation of anxiety to foreign language performance in various learning contexts (Aida, 1994; Chen & Chang, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz, 1986; Kim, 2002; Kitano, 2001; Koul et al., 2009; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000a, 2000b; Saito et al., 1999; Sparks & Ganschow, 2007; Toth, 2008). For instance, the correlation between the FLCAS and final grades were -.49 and -.54 for Spanish and French classes, respectively (Horwitz, 1986), -.38 for Japanese classes (Aida, 1994), and -.41 for English classes (Chen & Chang, 2004). Thus, aforementioned correlational studies on anxiety
suggest that in general anxiety is negatively related to L2 performance probably because it interferes with L2 acquisition in three stages: input, processing or storing, and output (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994).

Regardless of the popularity of the FLCAS worldwide, the underlying constructs of the instrument as measured by exploratory factor analysis (EFA) are not clear to date (Aida, 1994; Kim, 2002; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Toth, 2008; Cheng et al., 1999). For instance, Cheng et al. (1999) and Matsuda and Gobel (2004) found two identical factor structures in the FLCAS among university students in Taiwan and Japan, respectively: Low Self-confidence in Speaking English and General English Classroom Performance Anxiety. However, many of the FLCAS items within these two identical factor labels were different from each other.

Liu and Jackson (2008) found three factor structures of the FLCAS by university students in China: Fear of Negative Evaluation, Communication Apprehension, and Test Anxiety. These factor structures of the FLCAS were similar to the structures theorized by Horwitz et al. (1986) who posited that the FLCAS items were reflective of these three components of anxiety present in the foreign language classroom.

Even though Aida (1994) and Toth (2008) found four factor structures of the FLCAS by university students in the USA and Hungary, respectively, the factor labels were different from each other. Aida’s factor structures of the FLCAS consisted of Speech Anxiety, Fear of Failing, Comfortableness with Japanese, and Negative Attitudes, whereas Toth’s factor structures of the FLCAS in the initial run of EFA consisted of Global, Fear of Inadequate Performance in English, Attitudes to English Classes, and Teacher-related Anxieties.

In a study conducted using English as a foreign language (EFL) university students in Korea, Kim (2002) found five underlying factor structures of the FLCAS. These structures were labeled as General Speaking Anxiety, Concern about Success in Classes, Discomfort in English Classes, Negative Attitudes Regarding English Classes, and Anxiety in Understanding Speech of English Teachers.

What made the findings of EFA more complex to understand in regard to the underlying constructs of the FLCAS was that the FLCAS items were loaded within different factor labels. For instance, six items of the FLCAS (#2 related to “making mistakes in language class,” #13 related to “volunteering answers in language class,” #14 related to “speaking the foreign language with native speakers,” #24 related to “feeling self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students,” #27 related to “nervousness and confusion when speaking in language class,” and #31 related to “afraid of being laughed at when speaking the foreign language”) were loaded within the factor label of Low Self-confidence in Speaking English by Cheng et al. (1999) but within the different factor label of General English Classroom Performance Anxiety by Matsuda and Gobel (2004).

In addition, Liu and Jackson (2008) reported that three items of #2 related to “making
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mistakes in language class,” #13 related to “volunteering answers in language class,” and #31 related to “afraid of being laughed at when speaking the foreign language,” and two items of #8 related to “feel at ease during tests in language class,” and #21 related to “studying for a language test and confusion,” were loaded within the factor labels of Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety, respectively. On the other hand, Aida (1994) and Toth (2008) reported that two items of #8 and #21 were loaded within the factor labels of Speech Anxiety and Global Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA), respectively.

In short, previous studies conducted to determine the latent constructs of the FLCAS by performing EFA have produced different findings across studies probably because these studies were conducted among different learners in different learning contexts. Nevertheless, it deserves to note that EFA has limitations in determining factor structures and factor labels because there are various ways to calculate factor structures which are labeled subjectively (McDonald, 1985). Furthermore, the number of participants in some EFA studies such as Aida (1994) and Toth (2008) has been too small for reliable interpretation of the data.

The confusing findings and limitations of EFA create a need to undertake confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the FLCAS to determine the best latent constructs of the instrument by investigating the relationships between the observed variables and their preconceived latent constructs. Nevertheless, no published studies to date have been undertaken to find the constructs of the FLCAS by performing CFA. Compared with EFA, CFA makes it possible to calculate the causal relationship between each item and latent constructs that are determined a priori, while allowing for bidirectional relationships among the constructs (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995).

The purpose of this study was to address the disagreements about the constructs of the FLCAS and to provide possible solutions. The author first provided various hypothesized models which consisted of different latent constructs of the FLCAS on the basis of theoretical assumptions and experimental findings (Aida, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz et al., 1986; Kim, 2002; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Toth, 2008). Then, these hypothesized competitive models with different latent constructs were tested using maximum likelihood CFA among Korean EFL university students.

II. METHODOLOGY

1. Participants

A total of 971 university students who were taking an English conversation course at a university in Korea were recruited as participants for this study. When the data with
missing information were eliminated, the actual participants consisted of 918 students with 359 males and 559 females aged about 21. For the sake of generalizing the findings, the participants were recruited from various academic disciplines in the college of humanities (19%), social sciences (29%), natural sciences (13%), engineering (19%), medical sciences (18%), and medicine (2%). These students were chosen because Korean EFL learners showed high levels of anxiety in the classroom and reducing anxiety is a large concern for teachers and students, and because the FLCAS was significantly related to classroom anxiety (Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz, 2001; Kim, 2002). The course was designed to help the participants improve their English speaking proficiency and was taught by native English teachers. The participants had studied English as a required course in elementary and secondary school for 10 years. Their English proficiency was assumed to be intermediate with individual differences depending on many variables, including motivation, anxiety and learning strategies used inside and outside the classroom (Park, 1997; Skehan, 1991).

2. Instrument

This study attempted to determine the underlying constructs that best represent the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) developed by Horwitz et al. (1986). Since the FLCAS measures classroom anxiety arising from foreign language learning, it was modified to measure anxiety specific to English language learning in Korea. In the modification, the words “(foreign) language” in the original version of the FLCAS were replaced with “English” as seen in Appendix. The modified version of the FLCAS was translated into Korean to minimize errors coming from the students’ comprehension of English. The FLCAS consists of 33 items which were subsumed under several constructs including communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety. The five point Likert-scale items of the FLCAS range from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree, and the score of each item can be combined to form a composite total score. It should be noted that nine items (#2, #5, #8, #11, #14, #18, #22, #28, and #32) of the FLCAS reflect lack of anxiety, whereas the remaining 24 items reflect anxiety. These nine items reflecting lack of anxiety should be reversed in scoring so that high scores mean high foreign language anxiety levels. In addition to the FLCAS, the participants’ demographic information was obtained to help contextualize and generalize the findings of this study.

3. Data Collection and Data Analysis

The author contacted the staff of the Department of Practical English Education which
was in charge of English teaching at the university, and asked her to recommend committed and cooperative native English teachers who would help to collect the data. As per the recommendation of the staff, the author contacted by phone eight native English teachers from the USA (3), Canada (3), Britain (1), and Australia (1), who taught an English conversation course designed to improve students’ speaking proficiency in English.

After assuring their cooperation in the middle of the semester, the author met the native English teachers individually at the author’s office and explained to them how to collect the data: (1) briefly explain the purpose of this study to the students, (2) explain what the FLCAS is about and how to respond to each item on a five-point Likert scale, (3) ask the participants to respond to each item sincerely and honestly, (4) remind the students that the data will be used for research purposes only, and (5) think about anxiety arising from learning English because it plays a crucial role in explaining individual differences in success. Data were analyzed using SPSS 17.0 to measure the reliabilities of and the correlations among the constructs of the FLCAS and using AMOS 17.0 to run CFA which explains the causal relationship between observed variables and latent constructs while simultaneously allowing for item-level measurement error and bi-directional relationships among latent constructs (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995).

III. RESULTS

1. Five Hypothesized Models of the FLCAS

In order to determine the best latent constructs that represent the FLCAS, five models were generated *a priori* based on theoretical assumptions and experimental findings through EFA (Aida, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Toth, 2008). These hypothesized models consisted of one to four latent constructs in the FLCAS. No items were eliminated from Model 1 to Model 4 to keep the originality of the FLCAS. However, in Model 5, one item (#6: During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.) was eliminated to investigate the result of item revision or elimination from the FLCAS.

Model 1: Model 1 hypothesized that a single latent construct labeled General Foreign Language Anxiety could account for the 33 items of the FLCAS. General Foreign Language Anxiety refers to all types of anxiety or apprehension related to foreign language learning.

Model 2: Model 2 consisted of two latent constructs: Communication Apprehension and Fear of Negative Evaluation. Communication Apprehension pertained to communication anxiety, communication confidence, anxiety related to
understanding a foreign language, and foreign language class anxiety, comprising 24 items of the FLCAS (#1, #3, #4, #5, #9, #11, #12, #13, #14, #15, #16, #17, #18, #20, #22, #24, #26, #27, #28, #29, #30, #32, and #33). Fear of Negative Evaluation pertained to comparing with others, making mistakes, and test anxiety, comprising a total of 9 items (#2, #7, #8, #10, #19, #21, #23, #25, and #31).

Model 3: Model 3 consisted of three constructs: Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation, and Test Anxiety which refers to performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure. Model 3 was the same as Model 2 except that the construct of Test Anxiety encompassing three items (#8, #10, and #21) was derived from the construct of Fear of Negative Evaluation in Model 2.

Model 4: Model 4 was the same as Model 3 except that Communication Apprehension in Model 2 and in Model 3 was subdivided into Communication Apprehension and Foreign Language Class Anxiety which refers to foreign language class anxiety other than Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation, and Test Anxiety. More specifically, Model 4 consisted of four constructs: Communication Apprehension encompassing 15 items (#1, #3, #4, #9, #13, #14, #15, #18, #20, #24, #27, #29, #30, #32, and #33), Foreign Language Class Anxiety encompassing nine items (#5, #6, #11, #12, #16, #17, #22, #26, and #28), Fear of Negative Evaluation encompassing six items (#2, #7, #19, #23, #25, and #31), and Test Anxiety encompassing three items (#8, #10, and #21).

Model 5: Model 5 was the same as Model 4 except that item #6 was eliminated because the item was considered irrelevant to the construct of Foreign Language Class Anxiety. More specifically, #6 (During English class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.) is more related to attention than anxiety.

Before testing the hypothesized models, internal consistency reliabilities using Cronbach’s α were computed on the items in the constructs of each model, as shown in Table 1. A rule of thumb is that the items of Cronbach’s coefficient α higher than .60 are considered consistent (Landau & Everitt, 2004). Thus, the results of Cronbach’s α in Table 1 indicated that the total FLCAS as well as the items in the constructs of the FLCAS were consistent and correlated each other. Even though Cronbach’s α coefficients of the two constructs—Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety—were relatively lower than the other constructs, these low values might be due to the relatively small number of items in each construct.
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TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Num. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>General Foreign Language Anxiety (GFLA)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Communication Apprehension (CA)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Communication Apprehension (CA)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Anxiety (TA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Communication Apprehension (CA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Language Class Anxiety (FLCA)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Anxiety (TA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>Communication Apprehension (CA)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Language Class Anxiety (FLCA)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test Anxiety (TA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Testing the Models

CFA was performed to find the best latent constructs that represent the FLCAS. The fit indices used to test whether or not the proposed five models fit the data were the chi-square (χ²) statistic, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), and the Bentler-Bonett normed fit index (NFI). The chi-square statistic provides a model estimation to test whether the model fits the data. If the chi-square statistic of a model is significant, the model does not fit the data, suggesting that all the models in Table 2 were inadequate to the data. However, it should be noted that the chi-square statistic is sensitive to the correlations among the constructs and sample size (Kline, 2005; Schumaker & Lomax, 1996). That is, the bigger the correlations among the constructs and the bigger the sample size, the less likely for the chi-square statistic to accept a model. The RMSEA measures the degree of falseness of a model. If the value of RMSEA is between .05 and .08 as presented in Table 2, it suggests reasonable errors of approximation (Browne & Cutdeck, 1993). Other fit indices such as the CFI and the NFI measure the relative improvement in the goodness-of-fit index of a proposed model compared with a baseline model. The values of these indices higher than .90 indicate a good fit, indicating that the proposed four models were close to but falling short of the cutoff point (Bentler, 1990; Bentler & Bonett, 1980). Taken together, the goodness-of-fit indices presented in Table 2 indicated that the hypothesized models of the FLCAS in general did not fit the data. Nevertheless, Model 4 increased the model fits over the other
models when no elimination of the items from the FLCAS was made. When one item (#6) was eliminated from Model 4 as in Model 5, however, Model 5 fit the data better than Model 4.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Num. of Factors</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2673**</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2637**</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2623**</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2511**</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2327**</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .01

As mentioned above, even though Model 4 fit the data better than Model 3, Model 2, and Model 1, the fit indices were still not acceptable to the data, except RMSEA. Thus, the Pearson product-moment correlations among the four constructs of Model 4 were calculated because CFA simultaneously allows for the bidirectional relationships among the latent constructs and the causal relationships between items and constructs (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995). As shown in Table 3, the correlations among the four constructs of the FLCAS (Communication Apprehension, Foreign Language Class Anxiety, Fear of Negative Evaluation, and Test Anxiety) turned out to be significant, which might cause lower fit indices in Table 2 (Kline, 2005; Schumaker & Lomax, 1996).

### TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>FLCA</th>
<th>FNE</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.798**</td>
<td>.740**</td>
<td>.633**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLCA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.687**</td>
<td>.677**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.567**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .01

### IV. DISCUSSIONS

The purposes of this study were to provide various models with different constructs of the FLCAS developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) and to test the competitive models by performing CFA with a view to finding the best constructs of the instrument. The FLCAS
could be classified into one to four constructs: one construct pertaining to General Foreign Language Anxiety (33 items) as in Model 1; two constructs pertaining to Communication Apprehension (24 items) and Fear of Negative Evaluation (9 items) as in Model 2; three constructs concerned with Communication Apprehension (24 items), Fear of Negative Evaluation (6 items), and Test Anxiety (3 items) as in Model 3; and four constructs concerned with Communication Apprehension (15 items), Foreign Language Class Anxiety (9 items for Model 4 and 8 items for Model 5), Fear of Negative Evaluation (6 items), and Test Anxiety (3 items) as in Model 4 and Model 5. These preconceived classifications of the constructs of the FLCAS were based on the theoretical constructs assumed by Horwitz et al. (1986, p. 129) who claimed that FLCAS items were "reflective of communication apprehension, test-anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the foreign language classroom." However, it should be noted that the number of constructs developed in the present study were in part supported by previous EFA studies in which two to five underlying factor structures of the FLCAS were found (Aida, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Kim, 2002; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Toth, 2008).

Matching items with latent constructs to propose various models was by no means an easy task because the items of the FLCAS were highly correlated with each other, as presented in the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the constructs in Table 1 and in the correlations among the constructs of the FLCAS in Table 3. Nevertheless matching items with constructs should be done to understand better the exact nature of the FLCAS as well as to build validity evidence of the FLCAS. It is worth noting that even though the FLCAS has been used worldwide to measure anxiety of foreign language learners and to relate anxiety to performance (Aida, 1994; Chen & Chang, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz, 1986; Kim, 2002; Kitano, 2001; Koul et al., 2009; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000a, 2000b; Saito et al., 1999; Toth, 2008), the different factor structures of the FLCAS in the EFA across studies call the validity of the FLCAS in question (Messick, 1989; see also Sparks & Ganschow, 2007).

Apart from the validity, the internal consistency of the 33 items of the FLCAS as determined by Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha$ turned out to be .941, coefficient $\alpha$ higher than or as high as most previous studies (Aida, 2004; Cheng et al., 1999; Horwitz, 1986; Kim, 2002; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Toth, 2008). In addition, the $\alpha$ values of all the constructs of the FLCAS were above the cutoff point of .60 (Landau & Everitt, 2004). Even though Fear of Negative Evaluation consisting of six items and Test Anxiety consisting of three items were relatively lower than other constructs, the lower reliabilities of these two constructs might be in part due to the low correlations among the items of the constructs and/or be in part due to the limited number of items calculated for Cronbach’s $\alpha$.

The results of the CFA revealed two important points. First, Model 4 and Model 5 were more acceptable to the data than Model 1, Model 2, and Model 3, indicating that four
latent constructs accounted for the FLCAS best. This finding is supported by earlier studies where four factor structures of the FLCAS were found in the EFA (Aida, 1994; Toth, 2008). Second, the goodness-of-fit indices used in this study such as chi-square, RMSEA, CFI, and NFI were in general inadequate to meet the cutoff points of acceptability, except RMSEA. However, caution should be exercised before making a hasty conclusion for the following reasons: (a) CFA requires many subjects, which can increase the likelihood of significant chi-square value (Schumaker & Lomax, 1996). (b) The values of RMSEA between .069-.066 fall into a reasonable error of approximation (Brown & Cudeck, 1993). (c) The values of CFI and NFI between .800 and .851 are close to the cutoff point of .90 (Bentler, 1990; Bentler & Bonett, 1980). (d) The fit indices of Model 5 which eliminated one item from the FLCAS were more acceptable to the other models, suggesting that item elimination or revision of the FLCAS can increase the fit indices to the data.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In order to find the best constructs of the FLCAS, this study proposed several hypothesized models with different constructs of the FLCAS and tested the models by conducting maximum likelihood CFA among Korean EFL university students. The results showed that even though all the models did not provide acceptable fit indices, the model consisting of four latent constructs of the FLCAS provided fit indices better than the other models consisting of one to three constructs of the FLCAS.

These findings provided three implications for the FLCAS. First, several researchers have attempted to find the latent constructs of the FLCAS by performing EFA. However, the underlying factor structures of the instrument were different across studies, raising the construct validity of the FLCAS in question. The findings of this study by performing CFA seem to be that the FLCAS does indeed measure three commonly discussed constructs of Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation, and Test Anxiety, with the addition of the construct of Foreign Language Class Anxiety. This finding implies that even though foreign language anxiety is a situation-specific anxiety and the FLCAS measures anxiety particular to foreign language learning, it may not be as unique as Horwitz et al (1986) argued. Second, matching FLCAS items with each construct is a challenging task, but it is the cornerstone for understanding the nature of the FLCAS and testing the constructs of the instrument. Even though other studies attempted to match FLCAS items with each construct of the instrument, the attempts were either incomplete or caused confusion because of different EFA results across studies (Aida, 1994; Kim, 2002; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004; Toth, 2008; Cheng et al., 1999). This
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study is the first of its kind to match all 33 items of the FLCAS with the constructs in various models and to test each model by conducting CFA, which will provide a better understanding of the constructs of the FLCAS. Third, it should be noted that even when one item was eliminated from the FLCAS as in Model 5, the fit indices in the CFA increased. This finding implies that item revision or item elimination from the FLCAS should be taken into consideration in order to improve possible fit indices, and thus the validity of the instrument.

In spite of the important findings and implications of this study, caution should be executed in the generalization of these findings in three points. First, testing the proposed models with different constructs was undertaken using a particular sample of university students learning English in Korea. Second, Model 4, consisting of four constructs of the FLCAS, was close to but in general below the cutoff points of acceptability in CFA. Third, matching items with latent constructs was a huge task because some items either stood between the constructs or were out of place in the construct of foreign language anxiety.

Thus, more studies should be undertaken to deepen our insight into the nature and validity of the FLCAS which has gained popularity worldwide to measure anxiety particular to foreign language learning and to relate foreign language anxiety to foreign language performance. These studies should take into close consideration several factors including foreign language learners with different language backgrounds in different learning contexts, the number of participants when performing CFA, and any possible revision or elimination of items from the FLCAS.
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**Appendix**

**Foreign Language (English) Classroom Anxiety Scale**

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English class.
2. I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class.
3. I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in English class.
4. It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying in English.
5. It wouldn’t bother me at all to take more English classes.
6. During English class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my English class.
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English class.
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.
11. I don’t understand why some people get so upset over English classes.
12. In English class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.
14. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.
15. I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting.
16. Even if I am well prepared for English class, I feel anxious about it.
17. I often feel like not going to my English class.
18. I feel confident when I speak in English class.
19. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in English class.
21. The more I study for an English test, the more confused I get.
22. I don’t feel pressure to prepare very well for English class.
23. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.
25. English class moves so quickly, I worry about getting left behind.
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes.
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English class.
28. When I’m on my way to English class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
29. I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the English teacher says.
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of the rules that you have to learn to speak English.
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English.
33. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.

Applicable levels: college level
Key words: Foreign language anxiety: anxiety, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale; confirmatory factor analysis
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