

영어교육 55권 1호 2000년 봄

A Study on Language Learning Anxiety and Goal Orientation : Their Relationship Across Different Classroom Contexts

Sung-Yeon Kim

(Ewha Womans University)

Kim, Sung-Yeon. (2000). A study on language learning anxiety and goal orientation : Their relationship across different classroom contexts. *English Teaching*, 55(1), 23-46.

This study examined language learning anxiety and goal orientation, classified into mastery, performance α (ego-social), performance β (utilitarian), and work-avoidant goals. The association between goal orientation and anxiety was investigated in relation to two different classroom contexts: a traditional context and a communicative context. Data for this study consist of responses to a series of questionnaires completed by 59 college students learning English in both classroom contexts. The questionnaires, such as Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, Achievement Motivation Questionnaire, and Background Information Questionnaire, elicited the students' perceptions of foreign language classroom anxiety and goal orientation. Also, the students' grades from each classroom context were used as measures of achievement. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were performed to examine the relationship among the variables. The findings indicate that the relationship between anxiety and goal orientation, and the relationship between goal orientation and achievement differed across contexts. However, the relationship between anxiety and achievement was consistently negative, regardless of contexts. Also, the mastery and work-avoidant goals were found to be predictors of anxiety in the traditional context, whereas in the communicative context, the mastery and performance α (ego-social) goals were predictors. Teaching implications for reducing anxiety and enhancing motivation are also suggested.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is commonly observed that some people learn a second or foreign language faster and better than others. In the field of second language acquisition, this variation is often understood to result from individual learner differences in factors such as age, aptitude, motivation, anxiety, beliefs, and personality (see Ellis, 1994, for a review). Some of these factors would seem to deserve more attention than others in that they may be more amenable to change. In particular, anxiety and motivation, because of their modifiable nature, have received much attention in the field of second language acquisition.

A substantial body of literature has suggested that anxiety influences the success and failure of second language acquisition. Phillips (1992) reported the impact of anxiety on students' attitudes toward their language learning and their intentions to study a foreign language in the future. Many other studies have concluded that anxiety has debilitating effects on language learning and performance even though it is not clear whether anxiety causes poor performance, or whether the reverse is true, with poor performance or its anticipation causing anxiety.

Gardner, Smythe, Clément, and Glikzman (1976) found that French class anxiety correlated negatively with speaking, aural comprehension, final grade, and parts of the Canadian Achievement Test in French. Also, E. K. Horwitz, M. B. Horwitz, and Cope (1986) reported that scores on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) were negatively correlated with students' expected and actual final grades. Moreover, MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) reported that students with high levels of "communicative anxiety" learned more slowly and recalled less than those with low levels of anxiety, and that classroom anxiety and French use anxiety negatively correlated with several measures of learning and performance. Later, MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) found significant negative correlations between anxiety and performance measures such as paragraph translation, self descriptions, and French achievement tests, claiming that foreign language anxiety was correlated with all stages of learning, not just output. Aida (1994) also reported a negative correlation between language anxiety and students' achievement in Japanese.

Interestingly, oral performance or speaking in public has been reported to produce the most anxiety among learners. Young (1986) found significant negative

correlations between the scores on an unofficial Oral Proficiency Interview and anxiety, though the correlations were no longer significant with the effect of ability controlled. Similarly, Gardner, Moorcroft, and MacIntyre (1987) found negative correlations between oral performance scores on a word-production task and French class anxiety, French use anxiety, and two measures of interpersonal anxiety. Young (1990) reported that speaking "on the spot" and "in front of the class" provoked the most anxiety from the students' perspectives. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) also found that 87% of the participants in their study perceived speaking as the most anxiety-provoking situation when they were asked to think about and describe in a written essay their relaxed versus anxious experiences in learning French. Young (1992), in her interviews with foreign language specialists, further noted that speaking was considered as the most anxiety-arousing experience. In another study of the effects of anxiety on oral exam performance, Phillips (1992) reported a significant inverse relationship between the students' expression of anxiety and their performance.

Like anxiety, motivation has also enjoyed popularity among second language researchers. Among the first studies to address language motivation, Gardner and Lambert (1959; Gardner, 1960, cited in Gardner & Lambert, 1972) investigated English-speaking high school students learning French in Montreal. In these studies, students with integrative motivation were more successful language learners than those with instrumental motivation, as evidenced by a high correlation between integrative motivation and oral proficiency. Also, Gardner and Smythe (1973), in their comparison of a group of "stay-in" students with a group of "drop-out" students, found that there were more students with integrative motivation in the stay-in groups than in the drop-out groups. Similarly, Gardner, Smythe, Clément, and Gliksmann (1976) reported that students with integrative motivation showed positive attitudes and interest in the French lesson.

However, some contradictory results have emerged from studies in other contexts. Gardner and Lambert (1972), in a study with high school students learning French in the United States, found that integrative motivation was only minimally related to proficiency in French. Moreover, other studies have reported that instrumental motivation is a more important factor for learners' achievement than integrative motivation. For example, Lukmani (1972) reported that non-westernized female learners of English in Bombay attained higher scores on a cloze test when they had instrumental motivation. Gardner and Lambert (1972) in their

study in the Philippines also found that instrumental motivation was a more significant determinant for language learning. These findings suggest that Gardner and Lambert's construct of integrative motivation is of limited relevance in some learning contexts, such as when EFL learners have no easy access to the target community. In a direct test of this suggestion, Wen (1991) reported that integrative motivation was not a significant predictor of foreign language achievement for learners who had little contact with members of the target language community. In addition, Dörnyei (1990) suggested that motivation in an ESL environment differs from motivation in an EFL environment. All these findings seem to point to the need for an alternative approach that better accounts for motivation in EFL contexts.

Exactly such an approach was being pursued by a prolific surge of theoretical and empirical developments about motivation in the field of general educational research. In this literature, learners were often described as being purposeful and motivated by achievement goals they were pursuing. Achievement goals refer to the reasons for engaging in academic tasks (Hayamizu, Ito, & Yoshizaki, 1989).

Recent research on achievement motivation has proposed several sets of contrasting goal orientations to account for differences in students' achievement behavior: task versus ego goals (Maehr, 1983; Maehr & Nicholls, 1980; Nicholls, 1984), learning versus performance goals (Dweck, 1986; Elliott & Dweck, 1988), and mastery versus performance goals (Ames & Archer, 1988). Because of the convergent relations among task, learning, and mastery goals, these perspectives have been integrated and classified as mastery goals (Ames & Archer, 1988). Similarly, ego and performance goals have been identified as performance goals.

With a mastery goal, learners are oriented toward developing new skills, enhancing their level of competence, or achieving a sense of mastery based on self-referenced standards (Ames, 1992; Brophy, 1983; Meece, Blumenfield, & Hoyle, 1988). Moreover, learners' sense of efficacy with this mastery goal is grounded on the belief that effort will result in success (Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988). Central to a mastery goal is a focus on the intrinsic value of learning (Meece & Holt, 1993) as well as on effort as the path to achievement. In contrast to mastery goals, performance goals indicate that the task choice and pursuit process are built on learners' concerns about their ability level (Dweck, 1986). Ability is indicated by performing better than others, by surpassing norm-based standards, or by achieving success with minimal effort (Ames, 1992). Learners

with this type of achievement goal seek to maintain favorable judgments of their ability and to avoid negative evaluation (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Particularly important to a performance goal is an emphasis on the public recognition that a learner has achieved better than others (Meece et al., 1988).

To these two types of goal orientations, Meece et al. (1988) added a third category, work-avoidant goals. Learners who adopt this goal often finish their work with a minimal amount of effort, eliciting help from others or simply guessing at answers when they are expected to complete their work (Meece, et al., 1988; Meece & Holt, 1993). Hayamizu et al. (1989) also found three achievement goal tendencies but categorized them differently: a learning goal orientation, similar to Dweck's and others' mastery goals, and two performance goals, performance goal α and performance goal β . Learners with the performance goal α orientation, similar to Meece et al.'s (1988) ego-social goals, have a tendency to study in order to gain approval and avoid negative judgment from their parents, teachers, and peers. By contrast, learners with the performance goal β orientation work at their studies for practical reasons, such as achieving good grades, passing examinations, and advancing in school. The same goal patterns were also identified in Hayamizu and Weiner (1991). More recently, Nam Jung (1996) combined the classifications provided in Meece et al. (1988) and Hayamizu et al. (1989) into the four goal tendencies (mastery goals, performance α goals, performance β goals, and work avoidance) to investigate whether Korean high school students would have the same goal patterns as suggested by previous studies.

Among these different goal tendencies, mastery (learning) goals have often been associated with achievement. Hayamizu et al. (1989), using a median-split analysis, found that the group with high learning goal, low performance α goal, and low performance β goal obtained the highest achievement score. Likewise, Meece and Holt (1993), using a cluster analysis technique, reported that students had the highest achievement levels when their task-mastery goals were stronger than both ego-social and work-avoidant goals. These findings suggest that a mastery goal may have its strongest impact on academic achievement in the absence of competing goals.

However, other studies have suggested that performance goal orientations can enhance achievement. For instance, Hayamizu et al. (1989) found that even though a performance goal α orientation was negatively correlated with school achievement, performance goal β was positively correlated. Thus, students learning

for pragmatic reasons obtained better grades than students learning to gain approval from their parents, teachers, or peers. Also, in an investigation of the relationships among the four types of goal orientation (mastery, performance α , performance β , and work-avoidant goals) and academic achievement, Nam Jung (1996) reported that mastery, performance β , and work-avoidant goal orientations were significant predictors of academic achievement in English, but not performance goal α . The more the students pursued mastery and performance β goals, the higher the scores they obtained. On the other hand, the more the students sought work avoidance, the less they achieved. Students high or low in performance goal α did not differ in their achievement.

As evidenced by the rich literature described above, both anxiety and goal orientation have been considered important emotional or attitudinal variables in language learning, and yet, these two constructs have rarely been examined together. Anxiety and goal orientation may be interrelated, depending on contextual factors such as teaching methods, classroom procedures, grading, and instructors. Yet, little empirical research has been reported on the relationship between anxiety and motivation, particularly with regard to instructional contexts. The present study was designed to contribute to an understanding of learners' affective states associated with the academic context they encounter.

II. METHOD

1. Setting

The goal of this study is to examine the relationship between learner anxiety and goal orientation with regard to classroom context. Thus, it would seem important to begin by describing specific differences observed in the two classroom contexts¹⁾ used for this study, the reading/grammar-based, traditional classroom environment and the communicative classroom environment.

The reading classroom setting in this study seemed to conform to descriptions often made of traditional English language instruction, involving a teacher who controls the environment and students who take passive roles. Also, grammatical

1) There were two reading classes for the traditional context and four conversation classes for the communicative context.

rules, vocabulary, reading, and translation were emphasized rather than communicative skills such as listening or speaking. As is typical, students were provided with few opportunities to interact with their instructors, and the medium of communication was almost always the native language, in this case Korean.

However, the reading courses observed for this study did show some deviation from traditional ways of teaching English. The students in this study were given chances to become active participants: they formed groups, and each group prepared a presentation on an individual chapter of the textbook assigned to that group. The students in each group were asked to work together and then to present their Korean translations of assigned chapters from the English textbook. However, the students were never given the chance to work in groups during regular class time, nor did they seem to choose to work together as a group outside of class. Instead, they apportioned their work by dividing the number of passages by the number of people in each group, and they then prepared translations individually. By contrast, in the communicative setting, the students were expected to participate regularly in group or pair work during class time to improve their listening and speaking.

Differences between the two classroom settings were also reflected in course syllabuses, quizzes, and grading policy. In addition, classroom procedures in the two contexts displayed some differences. Most noticeably, the amount of oral English used in each setting differed. Students in the reading classes were not given opportunities to speak English except when they read English passages aloud. In contrast, students in the conversation courses were encouraged to speak English as much as possible.

2. Instructors

The reading courses were taught by two Korean instructors. There were not many observed differences in their roles as teachers in the reading classes. Both teachers, either in the middle or at the end of students' presentations, provided additional comments or explanations in Korean on the sentence structure and meaning related to a reading passage. While giving the students opportunities to become active, the teachers still maintained control of the class, and they seemed to manage class work, exams, quizzes, and so forth with little communication with their students. Likewise, there were not many observed differences among the

conversation instructors in the way they managed the communicative classroom setting. All of the instructors made efforts to provide as much group or pair work as possible. They also helped students develop functional skills by focusing on listening and speaking activities. In addition, more interaction between instructors and students took place in the conversation classes.

The differences between reading instructors and conversation instructors may depend on whether the instructor was a native speaker of English. Native English instructors were assigned to only two of the four conversation classes under the assumption that the two classes were more advanced than the other two. The other two conversation classes were taught by the Korean instructors. Conversation instructors seemed to display different attitudes toward their classes. The two native English instructors were not as nervous about teaching conversation as the two Korean instructors. In fact, the native instructors seemed almost too comfortable with their English to be sincere about teaching conversation. One instructor, for instance, was observed carrying out listening exercises without the use of the tape recorder. For listening exercises, the instructor asked some of the students to come to the front and read out the scripts provided at the end of the textbook. Often, these students did not read loudly enough or mispronounced words, which inhibited the other students' comprehension. The instructor sat on the desk most of the time while talking to the students. His voice was not loud enough, and he seemed to be less enthusiastic about teaching English than the other native English instructor. The other native English instructor almost always moved around the classroom to help the students work in pairs or groups. She smiled most of the time and showed an active teaching style. She also seemed to be well prepared for her conversation course.

Unlike the native English teachers, the two Korean instructors seemed to experience anxiety about teaching English conversation, and one of them explicitly expressed such anxiety during the instructor interviews. These two Korean instructors seemed to follow the guidelines for a conversation course. These two Korean instructors seemed to be friendlier as conversation teachers than as reading class teachers. In the communicative setting, these instructors were observed to help and encourage the students to a larger extent than in the reading classes.

3. Subjects

Of the 76 college students enrolled in the summer English courses, 59 participants completed a series of questionnaires for the current study. All of the participants were women because the study was conducted at a women's university in Korea. The students were attending classes five times a week. Each day, they spent 90 minutes respectively in their English reading and conversation classes. Ten participants (17%) were sophomores, 16 (27%) were juniors, and 33 (56%) were seniors. In terms of overall GPA, 16 (27%) had a GPA above 3.0, 34 (58%) had a GPA in the range of 2.5-2.99, and 9 (15%) had less than 2.5.

When asked why they were taking the particular English course, only two students (3%) reported that it was because they enjoyed English language learning. Twenty-four students (41%) were taking the course because it was required for their majors. Another common reason for taking the course was to improve their overall GPAs (54%). For this reason, the majority of students (80%) were taking these English courses for a second time.

4. Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine how foreign language anxiety is associated with goal orientation with regard to different classroom contexts. The purpose is specified in the following research questions:

- 1) What are the students' responses to the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) across classroom contexts?
- 2) What are the students' responses to the Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (AMQ) across classroom contexts?
- 3) How is foreign language anxiety identified in its relationship with the four types of goal orientation, and achievement in the traditional classroom context?
- 4) How is foreign language anxiety identified in its relationship with the four types of goal orientation, and achievement in the communicative classroom context?
- 5) What are the goal factors that may predict foreign language anxiety in the traditional classroom context?
- 6) What are the goal factors that may predict foreign language anxiety in the communicative classroom context?

5. Testing Instruments

Research instruments were administered to the students learning English in both contexts using a booklet format. The booklet included the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS, Horwitz, 1983, translated by Truitt, 1995), the Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (AMQ, Hayarnizu et al., 1989 translated by Nam Jung, 1996), and a Background Information Questionnaire. Based on the results of earlier pilot studies, these instruments were slightly modified to fit this particular research setting. All measures were presented in Korean.

1) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

The English version of the FLCAS (Horwitz, 1983) was developed to measure anxiety specific to a foreign language classroom setting. The scale uses five-point Likert items, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. A high score in the FLCAS indicates a high level of foreign language anxiety. When Truitt (1995) developed the Korean version of the scale, she made some slight modifications to some of the items to fit the Korean context. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the FLCAS in Horwitz (1986) was .93 ($n=108$), whereas in Truitt (1995), it was .95 ($n=198$). The coefficients for this study were .95 ($n=59$) for the FLCAS in the conversation courses, and .94 ($n=57$) for the FLCAS in the reading courses.

2) Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (AMQ)

The Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (Nam Jung, 1996) was used to measure the students' achievement motivation. The scale is also scored on a five-point Likert scale using the following five choices: *never*, *rarely*, *sometimes*, *often*, and *always*. A high score on a goal factor signifies a higher tendency toward a particular goal.

With regard to reliability, Nam Jung (1996) reported estimates of internal consistency conducted on the Korean AMQ. Cronbach's alpha was .88 for the learning (mastery) goal, .88 for the performance α (ego-social) goal, .82 for the performance β (utilitarian) goal, and .70 for work avoidance. The reliability estimates calculated for this study indicated acceptable levels of internal consistency as well. The coefficients for the measures of mastery goals ranged

from .81 to .88. For the performance goal α subtest, the coefficients ranged from .84 to .87, and for the performance β goal subtest, the alpha ranged from .83 to .91. The alpha values for work avoidance ranged from .71 to .86.

3) Background Questionnaire

A background questionnaire was constructed to obtain the following information: year in school, academic major, overall GPA, and reasons for taking summer English courses.

6. Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaires were administered in both reading and conversation courses in the last week of the summer session. Each time it took approximately 30 minutes for the students to complete the questionnaires. A cover letter assuring the students of the confidentiality of their responses and of their right to refuse to participate was also provided. A number of class sessions were also observed to establish criteria for distinguishing one context from the other.

As for data analysis, descriptive statistics were computed on the students' responses to the FLCAS and AMQ. Moreover, correlation analyses were performed to examine the relationships among all the variables including measures of achievement. Scores from each context (C-GRADE: Conversation Grade and R-GRADE: Reading Grade) were also included as variables in the analyses. Multiple regression analyses were also conducted to identify goal factor that may predict foreign language anxiety in different classroom contexts.

III. RESULTS

1. Students' Responses to the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) Across Classroom Contexts

Descriptive statistics were computed on the participants' responses to foreign language anxiety in both learning contexts: reading and conversation classes. As shown in Table 1, the descriptive statistics reveal slight differences in the amount

of foreign language anxiety across the two contexts. Students in the communicative setting experienced slightly higher levels of anxiety than when they were in the traditional, reading-based setting.

TABLE 1
Means, SDs, and Range of the FLCAS Scores

Context	Mean	SD	Range
Reading	3.0	.53	1.5-4.2
Conversation	3.2	.59	2.0-4.5

The frequencies of responses in percentages, means, and standard deviations for some of the items that show differences in students' emotional reactions to the two classroom contexts are summarized in Table 2.²⁾ The subjects of this study seem to display different responses for the two classroom settings. More than 40% of the students in the conversation classes either agreed or strongly agreed to the items above. Also, as shown in Item 12, 47% of the students in the conversation classes experienced anxiety up to the point that they forgot things.³⁾ The students, when they were in the conversation courses, experienced anxiety more frequently about speaking English, as also indicated in the higher mean scores (Item 1, and 27). They felt anxious when they were called on to respond in class (Item 3, and 20), when they were not able to comprehend (Item 4), or when they compared themselves with others (Item 23).

TABLE 2
Frequencies of the FLCAS Responses in Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations (for Item 1, 3, 4, 12 20, 23, 26, and 27)

FLCAS Items	Context						Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my class.	R	12	39	36	10	3	2.5	.95
	C	9	22	24	41	5	3.1	1.1

- 2) The columns labelled 1 through 5 represent the five-point Likert scale, respectively: 1 (*Strongly Disagree*), 2 (*Disagree*), 3 (*Neutral*), 4 (*Agree*), and 5 (*Strongly Agree*). SD represents *Standard Deviation*. R represents *Reading*, and C represents *Conversation*.
- 3) The numbers under Column 1 (strongly disagree) through Column 5 (strongly agree) represent percentages of the students' responses to the items. For example, with regard to the communicative context, 47% of the students agreed (32%) or strongly agreed (15%) with Item 12.

3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in English class.	R	5	24	44	24	3	3.0	.91
	C	3	17	31	37	12	3.4	1.0
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.	R	12	32	32	19	5	2.7	1.1
	C	0	32	29	31	9	3.2	.98
12. In English class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	R	5	32	44	15	3	2.8	.89
	C	2	20	31	32	15	3.4	1.0
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in English class.	R	2	24	42	27	5	3.1	.88
	C	0	25	32	32	10	3.3	.96
23. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.	R	5	24	51	17	3	2.9	.86
	C	3	17	39	37	3	3.2	.89
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes.	R	7	36	31	24	3	2.8	1.0
	C	3	29	22	37	9	3.2	1.1
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English class.	R	3	31	34	27	5	3.0	.96
	C	2	22	31	32	14	3.3	1.0

However, for some of the items, the students' responses did not greatly differ across the contexts (See Table 3). More than a half of the students reported experiencing anxiety over "speaking without preparation," regardless of the learning context (Item 9, and 33). In other words, "preparation" was a factor causing anxiety in both classroom contexts. Also, "volunteering" was anxiety-producing to about 40% of the students, regardless of the learning context (Item 13), and about 50% of the students in both classroom contexts expressed anxiety over public speaking (Item 24).

TABLE 3
Frequencies of the FLCAS Responses in Percentages, Means,
and Standard Deviations (for Item 9, 13, 24, and 33)

FLCAS Items	Context	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	SD
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English class.	R	2	25	24	41	9	3.3	1.0
	C	3	20	20	39	17	3.5	1.1
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.	R	2	20	37	36	5	3.2	.89
	C	2	24	37	31	7	3.2	.93
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.	R	0	15	32	44	5	3.4	.82
	C	0	12	37	41	10	3.5	.84
33. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	R	2	15	25	49	9	3.5	.92
	C	2	17	19	48	15	3.6	1.0

2. Students' Responses to the Achievement Motivation Questionnaire (AMQ) Across Classroom Contexts

Descriptive analyses were also performed on the students' responses to the items in the AMQ for each classroom setting. To examine the differences in goal factor scores across the learning contexts, an overall comparison was made based on the mean scores. Table 4 summarizes the mean scores (and standard deviations) of each goal across the contexts.

TABLE 4
AMQ Means (SDs) across the Contexts

Goal Factors	Reading	Conversation
Mastery	2.7 (.64)	2.6 (.63)
Performance α (Ego-social)	2.7 (.73)	2.7 (.76)
Performance β (Utilitarian)	3.9 (.69)	3.9 (.69)
Work Avoidance	2.4 (.69)	2.4 (.73)

As shown in Table 4, there is little difference in mean scores between the reading and conversation courses. As a matter of fact, all the goal factors except the mastery goal have exactly the same scores across the learning contexts. An important aspect to note from the table is the high scores for the performance β (utilitarian) goal relative to the scores for other goals. The utilitarian goal was expected to be more salient than the other types of goal orientation regardless of the learning contexts, and this expectation was fulfilled. One of the reasons for the higher tendency toward the utilitarian goal was probably because 80% of the participants in this study were retaking English courses to improve their grades. These students were learning English in order to improve their GPAs.

3. Foreign Language Anxiety in its Relationship with the Four Types of Goal Orientation and Achievement in the Traditional Classroom Context

A correlation matrix (See Table 5) was obtained to explore the relationship among foreign language anxiety (FLA), the four types of goal orientation, and achievement in the traditional classroom setting. Foreign language anxiety in the

reading classes (FLAR) had a significant positive correlation ($r = .35, p < .01$) with work avoidance. In other words, students experiencing high anxiety more often tended to avoid English learning tasks or vice versa. As for the relationship among the four goal factors, significant positive relationships were found between the mastery goal and performance goal α ($r = .47, p < .01$), and between performance α and β goals ($r = .30, p < .05$).

Foreign language anxiety in the reading courses correlated negatively with grades indicating achievement ($r = -.27, p < .05$). Thus, the students with higher levels of anxiety were likely to attain lower grades and vice versa. In light of goal orientation, students with higher performance goal β were apt to obtain better grades, as indicated in the positive correlation between performance goal β and the grades from the reading courses ($r = .35, p < .01$). On the other hand, students with higher tendency toward work avoidance were likely to achieve less, as shown in the negative correlation between work avoidance and the grades ($r = -.39, p < .01$).

TABLE 5
Correlations among FLA, Goal Orientation, and
Achievement (R-GRADE) in the Traditional Context

Variables	R-GRADE	FLAR	MR	P α R	P β R	WAR
R-GRADE						
FLAR	-.27*					
MR	.06	-.24				
P α R	.10	.13	.47**			
P β R	.35**	.01	.02	.30*		
WAR	-.39**	.35**	-.04	.24	-.19	

NOTES:

1. R-GRADE: Reading Grade
2. FLAR: Foreign Language Anxiety in the Reading classes
3. MR: Mastery goal in the Reading classes
4. P α R: Performance goal α in the Reading classes
5. P β R: Performance goal β in the Reading classes
6. WAR: Work Avoidance in the Reading classes
7. * : Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
8. **: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4. Foreign Language Anxiety in its Relationship with the Four Types of Goal Orientation and Achievement in the

Communicative Classroom Context

As shown in Table 6, foreign language anxiety (FLA) in the communicative setting (FLAC) had a significant negative correlation ($r = -.44, p < .01$) with the mastery goal. That is, students with higher anxiety were likely to be less oriented toward the mastery goal. Mastery goal orientation in the conversation courses was strongly correlated with performance goal α ($r = .47, p < .01$), as in the reading classes. On the other hand, a negative correlation was found between the mastery goal and work avoidance ($r = -.27, p < .05$). Thus, students pursuing mastery goals were less likely to display work avoidance. Also, two performance goals had a significant positive relationship ($r = .35, p < .01$) with each other.

Foreign language anxiety in the conversation courses correlated negatively with grades (or achievement) ($r = -.44, p < .01$). In other words, the students with higher levels of anxiety received lower grades and vice versa. In terms of goal orientation, the mastery goal ($r = .32, p < .05$) and performance goal β ($r = .27, p < .05$) correlated positively with the grades from the conversation courses. That is, students with high mastery and performance β goals were likely to obtain better grades. On the other hand, work-avoidant goals negatively correlated with the grades from the conversation courses ($r = -.27, p < .05$). In other words, students with a higher tendency toward work avoidance were likely to achieve lower grades.

TABLE 6
Correlations among FLA, Goal Orientation, and
Achievement (C-GRADE) in the Communicative Context

Variables	C-GRADE	FLAC	MC	P α C	P β C	WAC
C-GRADE						
FLAC	-.44**					
MC	.32*	-.44**				
PαC	.14		.47**			
PβC	.27*	.13	-.06	.35**		
WAC	-.27*	.22	-.27*	.05	-.11	

NOTES:

1. C-GRADE: Conversation Grade
2. FLAC: Foreign Language Anxiety in the Conversation classes
3. MC: Mastery goal in the Conversation classes
4. P α C: Performance goal α in the Conversation classes
5. P β C: Performance goal β in the Conversation classes
6. WAC: Work Avoidance in the Conversation classes
7. * : Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
8. ** : Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

5. Goal Factors Predicting Foreign Language Anxiety in the Traditional Classroom Context

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the role of the four goal factor scores in predicting foreign language anxiety in the reading classes. Each predictor was adjusted for the other three predictors in the model. When the effects of the other three predictor variables were partialled out, foreign language anxiety in the traditional setting was predicted by mastery goal scores (Beta = $-.37$, $p < .01$) and also by work avoidance scores (Beta = $.28$, $p < .05$), as indicated in Table 7. That is, students with low mastery goals and high work-avoidant goals are likely to experience high levels of anxiety.

TABLE 7⁴⁾
Multiple Regression Analysis for Anxiety and Goal Factors
in the Traditional Context

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig. level
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	2.8	.55		5.1	.00
MR	-.31	.11	-.37**	-2.7	.01
P α R	.17	.11	.24	1.6	.12
P β R	.003	.10	.00	.02	.98
WAR	.22	.10	.28*	2.1	.04

6. Goal Factors Predicting Foreign Language Anxiety in the Communicative Classroom Context

By controlling for the effect of the other three predictor variables, foreign language anxiety in the communicative setting was predicted by mastery goal scores (Beta = $-.59$, $p < .01$) and by performance goal α scores (Beta = $.31$, $p < .05$). An interesting finding was that performance α (ego-social) goal scores predicted anxiety in the communicative setting. This ego-social goal may be, to some extent, related to "fear of negative evaluation," a subcomponent of foreign language anxiety. In other words, students who focused more on performance and

4) Bs are the raw regression coefficients that define the prediction equation: ANXIETY in Traditional Context = $2.8 + .31MR + .17P\alpha R + .003P\beta R + .22WAR$. Ts are the statistical values for the null hypothesis: $B = 0$.

avoided negative judgment and rejection from their instructors or peers tended to express anxiety more often in the conversation courses.

Table 85)
Multiple Regression Analysis for Anxiety and Goal Factors
in the Communicative Context

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig. level
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	3.9	.64		6.1	.00
MC	-.55	.14	-.59**	-4.1	.00
P α C	.24	.12	.31*	2.1	.04
P β C	-.01	.11	-.01	-.10	.92
WAC	.03	.10	.04	.32	.75

IV. DISCUSSION

As described in the findings of the study, mean scores computed on the FLCAS items differed according to the classroom context. Anxiety-provoking factors or situations reported on the FLCAS items indicated the role of classroom contexts. For example, classroom procedures in the communicative setting, such as speaking spontaneously, speaking in front of peers, being called on to respond, or fear of negative evaluation, were often associated with anxiety. This finding was also identified in previous studies (Horwitz et al., 1986; Young, 1990, 1991, 1992).

Interestingly, some contextual factors were observed to influence anxiety in both contexts. That is, students expressed anxiety in both classroom contexts as to volunteering and speaking without preparation. The finding supports Horwitz et al.'s (1986) claim that second language learners have inherent anxiety. According to Horwitz et al. (1986), learners' self-identity or self-concept is often challenged by their limited ability to express themselves. In other words, simply because language learners cannot present themselves authentically in the target language, they are likely to experience anxiety.

Unlike foreign language anxiety, the students' goal patterns were consistent,

5) Bs are the raw regression coefficients that define the prediction equation: ANXIETY in Communicative Context₁ = 3.9 + .55MC + .24P α C + .01P β C + .03WAC. Ts are the statistical values for the null hypothesis: B = 0.

regardless of the classroom context. The performance β (utilitarian) goal was salient among these Korean students; in other words, regardless of the classroom setting, students displayed a higher tendency toward this utilitarian goal than any other goal. This finding is perhaps because about 80% of the students were taking these courses for a second time, and 54% of the students were taking the courses to improve their grades.

As for the results from the correlation analyses, foreign language anxiety in the reading courses correlated positively with work avoidance; that is, students with higher anxiety tended to avoid work more often in the traditional context. In the communicative setting, foreign language anxiety was found to have a significant negative correlation with the mastery goal. Thus, students with high levels of anxiety were likely to display less mastery goal orientation.

Moreover, as to the relationships between achievement and these affective variables, achievement was found to have a negative correlation with anxiety in both contexts. This negative correlation between anxiety and achievement seems to indicate the debilitating effects of anxiety on achievement. The same result was also found in Horwitz et al. (1986), where the scores on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) were reported to have negative correlations with actual final grades as well as expected grades. Similarly, Aida (1994) found a negative correlation between foreign language anxiety and achievement in Japanese.

This study also found a positive correlation between the performance β (utilitarian) goal and achievement, and a negative correlation between work avoidance and achievement, regardless of the learning context. On the other hand, a positive correlation between mastery goals and achievement was found only in the communicative context. These correlations were also addressed in Hayamizu et al. (1989), Meece and Holt (1993), and Nam Jung (1996).

The study also found from the multiple regression analyses that the mastery goal and work avoidance predicted anxiety in the reading classes. In contrast, the mastery and performance α (ego-social) goals were found to predict anxiety in the conversation classes. The performance α (ego-social) goal, where students learn to gain positive reinforcement or avoid negative judgment, seems to be related to "fear of negative evaluation" (Horwitz et al., 1986). A communicative classroom context may give rise to more occasions when students would experience the frustration of presenting themselves in ways that do not match their self-concept

(Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Moreover, communicative classroom activities often involve outward self-expression in front of peers. The outward self-expression often leads second language learners to feel self-conscious and anxious. This self-consciousness seems to foster performance goal α . Mizuno (1992) also found this performance α goal orientation was common among Japanese students, who were found to be concerned about what others would think of them.

This study has several limitations that should be considered in the interpretation of the results. First, this study was based on a sample of 59 female college students learning English at one school. These subjects may not be representative of Korean college students. Moreover, the findings of this study may be limited in that it only examined the affective experiences of female students. Another limitation is perhaps that student achievement was measured via final grades from each course. However, since these achievement measures were not based on the results from the identical tests or exams, they were not comparable across the contexts.

V. IMPLICATIONS

As suggested in Phillips (1992), anxiety influences learners' attitudes toward language learning. Thus, teachers should consider anxiety as an important factor in foreign language classroom and be aware of the possible effects of anxiety. Teachers can provide a low-anxiety classroom environment by tailoring classroom activities to the affective needs of students (Young, 1991). It has been suggested that anxiety is lowered when students do pair or group work, play games, and have personalized classroom experience. In addition, as reported in Koch and Terrell (1991), personalized activities and techniques in the communicative setting will increase the comfort level among language learners.

Also, it seems imperative that teachers be aware of the inherent anxiety among second language learners. Teachers should understand that second language learners are likely to experience anxiety in the process of representing themselves in the target language. Teachers, therefore, should not attribute learners' poor test performance to the lack of language aptitude, ability, or motivation. Teachers should help students cope with anxiety-provoking situations by teaching them some anxiety management strategies. Teachers can also make the learning environment less stressful by incorporating meaningful tasks and activities into

classroom instruction.

As to goal orientation, the subjects of this study exhibited the highest tendency toward the performance β (utilitarian) goal. Hayamizu et al. (1989) argued that this utilitarian goal seems to display more positive aspects of performance goal tendencies, a finding which was not present in the previous studies (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Meece et al., 1988). Mastery goals were found to help students generate positive attitudes and beliefs about language learning (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986). Learners with mastery goals were also found to use more effective learning strategies (Ames & Archer, 1988). In order to foster mastery goals, teachers should make efforts to provide personalized instruction and use more authentic materials. This practice will lead students to have intrinsic interest and enjoyment in language learning and to acquire mastery goal orientation or intrinsic motivation.

Teachers also have the responsibility to create a learning environment where social comparisons are minimized. The focus on social comparison can increase fear of negative evaluation. Social comparisons can also lead to a high tendency toward performance goal α , and as a result students end up learning languages only to gain positive approval and avoid rejection from their peers, teachers, and parents. Therefore, teachers should be sensitive to the negative influences of social comparisons and foster mastery goals to help their students become intrinsically motivated toward language learning.

Lastly, it seems imperative for teachers to understand anxiety and motivation toward foreign language learning from students' perspectives and develop L2 syllabuses, teaching methods, and activities accordingly. That is, teachers should design classroom procedures and activities, which can contribute to lowering anxiety and enhancing motivation and interest toward learning.

REFERENCES

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 155-168.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 261-271.

- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260-267.
- Brophy, J. (1983). Conceptualizing student motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 18*, 200-215.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 45-78.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040-1048.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 5-12.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1960). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gardner & W. E. Lambert (Eds.), *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning* (pp. 199-216). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gardner & W. E. Lambert (Eds.), *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning* (pp. 191-197). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C., Moorcroft, R., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1987). *The role of anxiety in second language performance of language dropouts* (Research Bulletin No. 657). Ontario: University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1973). Motivation and second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 31*, 218-230.
- Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clément, R., & Glikzman, L. (1976). Second language acquisition: A social psychological perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 32*, 198-213.
- Hayamizu, T., Ito, A., & Yoshizaki, K. (1989). Cognitive motivational processes mediated by achievement goal tendencies. *Japanese Psychological Research, 31*, 179-189.
- Hayamizu, T., & Weiner, B. (1991). A test of Dweck's model of achievement goals as related to perceptions of ability. *Journal of Experimental Education, 59*.

226-234.

- Horwitz, E. K. (1983). *Foreign language classroom anxiety scale*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, *70*, 125-132.
- Koch, A. S., & Terrell, T. D. (1991). Affective reactions of foreign language students to natural approach activities and teaching techniques. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 109-126). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lukmani, Y. M. (1972). Motivation to learn and learning proficiency. *Language Learning*, *22*, 261-273.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, *39*, 251-275.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused essay technique. *Modern Language Journal*, *75*, 296-304.
- 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.
- Maehr, M. L. (1983). On doing well in science: Why Johnny no longer excels, why Sarah never did. In S. G. Paris, G. M. Olson, & H. W. Stevenson (Eds.), *Learning and motivation in the classroom* (pp. 179-210). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Maehr, M. L., & Nicholls, J. G. (1980). Culture and achievement motivation: A second look. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in crosscultural psychology* (pp. 221-267). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Meece, J. L., Blumenfield, P. C., & Hoyle, R. H. (1988). Students' goal orientations and cognitive engagement in classroom activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*, 514-523.
- Meece, J. L., & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students' achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*, 582-590.
- Mizuno, R. (1992). Comparing causal beliefs of Japanese and Japanese-American senior high school students in mathematical achievement. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *34*, 103-109.
- Nam Jung, Y. (1996). *Cultural and contextual influences on goal orientations and*

- the relationships among goal orientations, learning strategies, and achievement: A study of Korean high school students learning English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review*, 91, 328-346.
- Philips, E. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *Modern Language Journal*, 76, 14-26.
- Wen, X. (1991). *The relationship between motivation and expectancy factors and foreign language achievement.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Kansas.
- Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals*, 19, 439-445.
- Young, D. J. (1990). An investigation of students' perspectives on anxiety and speaking. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 539-553.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 426-437.
- Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio, Terrel, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 157-172.