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This study examined the existence of listening anxiety and general foreign language anxiety, and then identified relationships between listening anxiety and learner background factors. A total of 253 EFL learners participated in the survey. Participants' anxiety was measured by the Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). The results suggested that foreign language learners do indeed experience anxiety in response to listening comprehension. A majority of the participants acknowledged having experienced listening anxiety in foreign language classrooms and real-life communication situations. A factor analysis performed on the FLLAS revealed two factors: Tension and worry over English listening, and Lack of self-confidence in listening. Correlation analyses revealed that listening anxiety is significantly related to both general foreign language anxiety and listening proficiency, the latter suggesting that listening anxiety interferes with foreign language listening. According to multiple regression analysis, Lack of self-confidence in listening served as the best predictor of listening proficiency among all the FLLAS and FLCAS factors. In addition, listening anxiety was found to be significantly related to two background factors, university major, and study with tutors or in private language institutes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Listening in a foreign language is an integrative language skill, including lexico-grammatical, phonetic, and cognitive complexities, as well as performance
features such as false starts, irregular pauses or hesitations, or unclear pronunciation and intonation. Moreover, when L2 learners are involved in listening activities, typically, they are not allowed to control the topic, speed, or volume of the speech (Snow & Perkins, 1979). Unlike reading comprehension in which the language learner can manage the input, listeners have fewer chances for repetition and correction in listening because the delivery rate of information is typically controlled by the producer. When language learners do not have appropriate listening competence, which includes quick judgment and appropriate timing, the signal, as the original listening input, decays rapidly and the listeners may fail in the simple decoding of discrete information, losing the first significant items of information. Therefore, listeners may experience helplessness and apprehension when they feel they are not able to control their intake of language.

In line with the above prediction, it is not difficult to find novice listeners who complain that they simply cannot keep up with the pace of listening activities. Since they still have few or no automatic processes, they are often unaware of even what aspects of the sound stream to pay attention to. As such listeners lag “farther and farther behind the speaker, they try even more desperately to decode, thus missing the redundancies of real discourse that could help” (Meyer, 1984, p. 343). Consequently, the listeners are forced into a frustrating ‘task overload’ failure, perhaps with serious anxiety.

The effect of anxiety on foreign or second language comprehension has been hardly mentioned until recently because most language courses have emphasized only speaking proficiency. Nord (1978) was one of the early researchers who intuitively suggested the existence of anxiety in listening comprehension. He pointed out that discrimination learning, such as listening, may be more difficult for an anxious person, and even maintained that anxiety, frequently brought on by ‘task overload,’ is one of the major obstacles to listening comprehension.

Later, several researchers who have been interested in listening skills have begun to agree that foreign language listening produces anxiety (Bacon, 1989; Lund, 1991; Young, 1992). They contend that listening tasks may cause students added apprehension because they are frequently unaware of who the speakers are, what their roles are, and how they interact. Krashen (in Young, 1992) mentioned that listening is also anxiety provoking when the input is incomprehensible. Listening anxiety may function as an affective filter, one component of Krashen’s Monitor theory, which “prevents input from being used for language acquisition” (Beebe,
Nagle and Sanders (1986) also proposed that a breakdown of the comprehension process might occur when there is “anxiety about failure to understand or being accountable for a response” (p. 21). Under high levels of anxiety or stress, only automatic processes function, since attention is narrowed to principal information at the expense of peripheral. Thus, anxious L2 listeners in novice levels of proficiency may miss important cues, not knowing which aspects of the soundstream to pay attention to. Asking students whether they became tense during classroom listening activities, Eastman (1991) suggested that those who claimed to be apprehensive while listening scored lower on a listening test than those who claimed to concentrate. It has been predicted that it is difficult for listeners under stress to activate automatic processes to comprehend foreign languages.

In anxiety studies, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) found strong anxiety in listening as well as speaking and testing situations. The results showed that highly anxious listeners were so apprehensive that they would not understand all the input. They experienced difficulties in both distinguishing the sounds and structures of a listening message, and comprehending the content of the extended utterances in L2. Some quantitative studies support the contention that listening anxiety is significantly negatively related to listening comprehension (Aneiro, 1989; Gardner, Lalonde, Moorcroft & Evers, 1987; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; MacIntyre, Noels & Clement, 1997).

However, because the focus of most of the above studies was not listening comprehension but overall second language skills, their findings cannot be regarded as clearly representative of listening anxiety in foreign language learning. In the previous studies, just a small part of the descriptions or analyses has been devoted to anxiety about listening comprehension with students’ listening anxiety typically measured by a micro scale with only a few items regarding general input anxiety. Some anxiety-related studies which have been conducted in Korea (Kim, 2000; Truitt, 1995) also gave few clues of the existence and sources of listening anxiety because they focused on speaking anxiety. Thus, a more detailed study is needed to identify and potentially overcome these problems, and this study will be devoted to examining a single construct, listening anxiety, and to developing a new scale to measure it. The research questions guiding the present study are as follows:

1. Do Korean EFL students report experiencing foreign language listening anxiety?
2. What are the underlying constructs of foreign language listening anxiety and general foreign language anxiety?
3. How is foreign language listening anxiety related to background factors?
4. What is the relationship between general foreign language anxiety and foreign language listening anxiety?

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A study was designed to examine listening comprehension anxiety in foreign language learning. This section describes the participants, instruments, and data collection procedures.

1. Participants

Two hundred fifty-three university students participated in this study during the spring semester of 2000. Eight subjects did not follow instructions and their data were thrown out, leaving a total sample of 245. Participants were drawn from six different classes at three middle-ranked universities in Korea. They ranged in age from 19 to 29, and the average age was 19.9. Of the 245 subjects, 211 (86.1%) were majoring in the humanities, 28 (11.4%) in the sciences, and 6 (2.4%) in engineering. The male-female ratio was 156:88 (with one not specified). The majority of the participants were sophomores (190), with 2 freshmen, 10 juniors, and 43 seniors.

2. Instruments

The instruments used in the study consisted of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS), a listening proficiency test (TOEFL), and a background questionnaire for personal background information. All the questionnaires were translated into Korean, and two Korean graduate students verified the accuracy through a back-translation process.
1) The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

Foreign language anxiety, defined as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128), was measured by the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). This scale is a self-report measure of learners’ anxiety in the foreign language classroom. The purpose of this scale is to measure general language anxiety as a specific reaction to language learning. The FLCAS uses 5-point Likert-type scales, which range from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree.'

2) The Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale

A new scale, the Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) was designed for this study to measure anxiety related to foreign language listening (Appendix). To develop this new affective instrument, the researcher followed the guidelines of Gable and Wolf (1993) and DeVellis (1991). The first step was to conduct a comprehensive review of the literature on listening comprehension and to interview EFL learners who would provide vivid descriptions of their listening anxiety and listening difficulties. Four Korean students with different levels of English proficiency were chosen, and they offered many of the belief statements to be used in the instrument. The adapted second language version of Wheeless’ (1975) Receiver Apprehension Test and the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS) by Saito, Horwitz, and Garza (1999), were also considered good sources for additional items. After the review and interviews, a pool of items for possible inclusion in the scale was generated on the basis of four basic categories: Fear of Spoken English, Process-related Anxiety, Lack of Self-confidence, and Concern about Insufficient Prior Knowledge.

The pool of items numbered 41 after certain items were eliminated based on a priori criteria such as questionable relevance or undesirable similarity to other items. There were some major considerations for improving item quality. The researcher tried to make items unambiguous and also avoided exceptionally lengthy items. A way to increase clarity of items was to take into consideration the reading difficulty level. Generally, short simple words and sentences were preferred, and semantic and syntactic factors were also considered. Some double-barreled items
were also avoided because an endorsement of the item might refer to either or both ideas. In order to avoid agreement bias, some negatively worded items were written describing low levels or absence of 'listening anxiety.' Sometimes such reversal in item polarity may be confusing to respondents, but confusion problems were not expected to be serious; in this study the 'FLCAS' questionnaire also included negatively worded items. The next step was to select a scaling technique and a response format. A 5-point Likert Scale was chosen because it has been widely used in instruments measuring opinions, beliefs and attitudes (DeVellis, 1991).

This initial item pool was reviewed by five Ph.D. students in Foreign Language Education who were knowledgeable about listening comprehension and language anxiety. The purpose of the review was to maximize the content validity of the scale, and a judgmental rating exercise was carried out to examine the extent to which the items truly reflected categories of listening anxiety. The content-validity rating form began with instructions regarding the rating task and then listed the categories. Then the judges were asked to assign each item to the category it best fit and to specify how strongly they felt about their assignment of the item to the category. For each item, the frequency and percentage of assignment to each category were calculated, and a criterion level of 80% agreement was set for an item to remain in a particular category without revision. On the basis of the information gathered through this rating procedure, some items were rewritten, or deleted. The panel members were next asked to comment on individual items as they saw fit, and a few insightful comments about why certain items were ambiguous. In order to evaluate the items' clarity and conciseness, the raters pointed out awkward or confusing items and suggested alternative wordings.

This instrument was then administered to a sample of 36 Korean ESL students and their spouses, all of whom were university or college graduates. This preliminary pilot was used to gather data for the examination of reliability and to evaluate the performance of the individual items so that appropriate ones could be identified to constitute the scale. The item evaluation was based on the following criterion: First, item-scale correlations were computed for each item, and items with very low values were considered for deletion. In order to double-check the tentative selection of items on the basis of the correlations, means and variances were inspected. Items associated with either very high or very low means and with relatively low variance were reviewed and eliminated. The SPSS Reliability program indicated the reliability of items if each respective item was deleted.
Ultimately, the deletion of eight items resulted in higher scale reliability, an alpha of .93, and 33 items remained in the final form of the instrument. Evidence of construct validity of the FLLAS was gathered in the main study by examining correlations with three other instruments, including the Trait Anxiety Scale, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale.

3) Listening Proficiency Test

In order to examine the relationship between subjects' anxiety and listening proficiency, an accredited 'TOEFL' test was administered. Since TOEFL tests are designed to measure a wide range of language proficiencies, and are therefore capable of assessing students at many levels of English proficiency (Walker, 1999), they have been frequently used as criteria to measure language proficiency of non-native English students.

4) Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ)

A background questionnaire was designed to investigate specific information about the subjects: Gender, age, experience in traveling or living in an English-speaking country, years of study, self-rated proficiency level, access to native speakers, frequency of watching TV or listening to radio in English, and motivation.

3. Data Collection

After two pilot studies, the main data were collected in Korea in the spring semester, 2000. Subjects were asked to read a consent form and then spend 30 minutes filling out questionnaires. Three different questionnaires to check the construct-validity were also administered, with each participant assigned to one of the three questionnaires. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was administered to 56 students, the Trait Anxiety Inventory to 92 students, and the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale to 84 students. For the next 30 minutes they all took a listening portion of a TOEFL test.
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first part of this chapter provides descriptive analyses of the FLLAS data collected. These analyses are followed by three inferential studies: Factor analyses for the FLLAS and FLCAS, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) to test the influence of background variables on the FLLAS and FLCAS scores, and correlation and regression analyses of the relationship between the FLLAS/FLCAS factor scores and listening scores.

1. Descriptive Analyses

In the present study, the FLLAS was constructed to measure anxiety related to foreign language listening. This section reports the preliminary analyses of the FLLAS scale.

1) Scale Analysis

The FLLAS is comprised of 33 items scored on a five-point Likert scale, with a theoretical range of 33 to 165. After the relatively few positively worded items were reversed and recoded as negatively worded, a higher score indicated a higher degree of listening anxiety. In this study, the total scores ranged from 63 to 156, with a mean of 107.62 and a standard deviation of 16.56. In order to allow for an easier conceptualization of degrees of listening anxiety, a mean scale score was also computed. On the basis of a 5-point response format, the mean score was 3.26, indicating slightly elevated levels of listening anxiety.

As benchmark criteria for assessing the quality of the questionnaire, reliability and validity analyses of the FLLAS were conducted. Both an internal consistency analysis and a test–retest analysis were utilized to estimate the reliability. The present study, using 238 students of English, yielded an internal consistency coefficient of .90, using Cronbach's alpha and .91, using the standardized item alpha, with all items producing significant corrected item-total scale correlations. The reliability coefficient in the test–retest procedure was .84 (p < .001) over four weeks, indicating that the FLLAS measures a person's level of listening anxiety in foreign language with high accuracy at different times. Both methods showed that the FLLAS was quite reliable and consistent for Korean university students.
Validity of the FLLAS, as a new measure of individual affective factors, was also an important consideration in this study. Content validation received the highest priority during the process of instrument development, as described with respect to the rating procedures. In order to determine the construct validity of the scale, the correlation of the test scores with various criteria or with other tests were used as sources of information. If two scales measure the same construct, they should be positively correlated; this predicted correlation between two scales is referred to as convergent validation. The criteria used for convergent validation in this study were the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS), and the Trait Anxiety Inventory (TAI). These three scales have been used as representative measurement instruments of anxiety by a number of researchers (Horwitz et al., 1986; Saito, Horwitz & Garza, 1999; Spielberger, 1983). The correlation coefficient with the FLCAS was .71 \((p = .000, N = 232)\), with the FLRAS .55 \((p = .000, N = 84)\), and with the TAI .28 \((p = .006, N = 92)\).

As the FLCAS and the FLRAS were designed to measure language anxiety, the moderate or high correlations seen between the two measures and the FLLAS support its construct validity. Particularly, the high correlation between the FLLAS and the FLCAS indicated that listening apprehension is deeply related to general foreign language anxiety. Because the FLRAS is designed to measure comprehension anxiety, it was not surprising to find that it was moderately associated with listening anxiety. On the other hand, a correlation with the TAI was low, though significant, perhaps because this inventory was designed only to assess general anxiety. This result suggested that listening anxiety can be discriminated from general personality-type anxiety.

The internal consistency also supplied evidence of construct validity. If a scale has a high index of internal consistency, the items should be substantially intercorrelated, an indication that they are working together to measure the same underlying variable. The reported high index of internal consistency (.90) provided acceptable evidence of construct validity for this scale.

In addition to content and construct validity, it is necessary to ensure that the measurement instrument is not measuring what it is not supposed to measure. The most pervasive measurement problem in this respect is respondent perceptions regarding social desirability. If subjects are strongly motivated to present themselves in a way that society regards as positive, item responses may be
distorted. In order to check this tendency, the short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD) was also administered to 56 participants in this study. The mean score was 5.45 with a standard deviation of 2.43. The result showed that the FLLAS was not significantly related to the MCSD ($r = -0.09, p = .518$), suggesting that the FLLAS was independent of social desirability.

2) Item Analyses

The preliminary analysis of the FLLAS indicated that the results of 18 items were strongly reflective of listening anxiety. In those items, the students reported more than 50% agreement or disagreement, both of which endorsed serious apprehension in foreign language listening.

The majority of participants in this study agreed with items regarding nervousness, tension, frustration, and uneasiness in listening comprehension, indicating that a fair amount of anxiety exists in foreign language listening in this population. They agreed or strongly agreed with statements indicative of manifestations of listening anxiety such as “Listening to new information in English makes me uneasy” (53%), and “If I let my mind drift even a little bit while listening to English, I worry that I will miss important ideas” (78%). They also expressed low levels of self-confidence about listening. They reported that they did not feel confident when they were listening in English (61%), and disagreed that English stress and intonation seemed familiar to them (70%). Fifty-four percent of subjects complained, “When listening to English, I often understand the words but still can’t quite understand what the speaker means” (54%). It is probable that they cannot easily proceed beyond simple sound discrimination in listening comprehension because they are not comfortable with the different rhythmic characteristics of English.

However, the fundamental phonetic differences between English and Korean cannot completely explain the nature of their listening apprehension. These foreign language listeners are extremely sensitive to physical conditions of listening situations, subtle differences in pronunciation, and various speech rates. A large portion of the subjects reported, “It’s difficult for me to listen to English when there is even a little bit of background noise” (76%), “When someone pronounces words differently from the way I pronounce them, I find it difficult to understand” (72%), and “When a person speaks English very fast, I worry that I might not understand
all of it” (73%). Moreover, they showed a great deal of concern about their lack of background knowledge, “I am nervous when I am listening to English if I am not familiar with the topic” (74%).

Responses to some of the items highlighted the uniqueness of listening anxiety, compared with other foreign language anxiety. It seemed that EFL learners were not accustomed to conditions in which listeners cannot control the speed of delivery or ask for repetitions. Most reported, “I get nervous if a listening passage is read only once during English listening tests” (76%). The students agreed that they got worried when they could not listen to English at their own pace (58%) or when they had little time to think about what they heard in English (53%).

It is interesting to consider strategy-related facets of comprehension anxiety. Although students got annoyed when they could not catch a key word of an English listening passage (54%) and when they came across words that they did not understand (61%), most disagreed that they were worried when they could not watch the lips or facial expression of a person who was speaking (62%). Thus, it does not appear that most of these students depended on non-verbal cues to help them with listening comprehension.

In spite of all the difficulties and apprehension they perceived in listening, participants rejected the statement, “I would rather not have to listen to people speak English at all” (61%). This response showed their high levels of motivation regarding foreign language listening. More than half of the participants reported they did not tend to think that everyone else except them understood very well what an English speaker might say (56%). It appeared they believed that other classmates also suffered from lack of proficiency in English listening and that they might experience similar listening anxiety.

2. Inferential Analyses

This section reports the results of the factor analyses, MANOVA, and correlation and regression analyses.

1) Factor Analysis of the FLLAS

The initial run of Principal Components Analysis produced nine factors with eigenvalues greater than one, but the scree test indicated that two factors might be
most appropriate. These two extracted factors accounted for 33 percent of the total variance. By examining the unrotated loadings, the need was noted for a factor matrix rotation. Thus, the Varimax rotation (Kaiser, 1960) was performed in an attempt to achieve simple structure with orthogonal (uncorrelated) factors. This method was chosen because it is not only good for further analysis in terms of eliminating multicollinearity, but also helpful in interpreting the resulting factors (Stevens, 1996). After the rotation, the first factor included 18 items that explained 17 percent of the variance, whereas Factor two included 14 items that explained 16 percent.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. My thoughts become jumbled and confused when listening to important information in English.</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Listening to new information in English makes me uneasy.</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I feel tense when listening to English as a member of a social gathering or when imagining a situation where I listen to English as a member of a social gathering.</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I fear I have inadequate background knowledge of some topics when listening in English.</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am nervous when I am listening to English if I am not familiar with the topic.</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I get worried when I have little time to think about what I hear in English.</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am nervous when listening to an English speaker on the phone or when imagining a situation where I listen to an English speaker on the phone.</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. It frightens me when I cannot catch a key word of an English listening passage.</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If a person speaks English very quietly, I am worried about understanding.</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I get upset when I'm not sure whether I understand what I am listening to English.</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For Factor 1, standardized item alpha=82

Factor 1 obtained moderate to high loadings from 10 variables and was assigned a label of ‘Tension and worry over English listening.’ As seen in Table 1, most
items focused on EFL students' negative emotions about English listening. The two highest loadings came from the items "My thoughts become jumbled and confused when listening to important information in English" and "Listening to new information in English makes me uneasy." While these two represented general listening anxiety, the rest of the items described more specific feelings and circumstances in which the anxiety prevails. Of these, some were concerned with situation-related listening apprehension. In items 27 and 26, the subjects reported tension and nervousness when they listened to English in a social gathering or on the phone. Other items dealt with process-related listening anxiety resulting from lack of prior knowledge or missing a key word. These items, such as "I fear I have inadequate background knowledge of some topics when listening in English" and "It frightens me when I cannot catch a key word of an English listening passage," appeared to indicate a connection between listening comprehension strategies and listening anxiety. Means for Factor 1 items, with the exception of item 16, showed that a majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed with the items about 'tension and worry over English listening.'

**TABLE 2**

**Lack of Confidence in Listening**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. A I feel confident when I am listening in English.</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When I'm listening to English, I usually end up translating word by word without understanding the contents.</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. A English stress and intonation seem familiar to me.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A It's easy to guess about the parts that I miss while listening to English.</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When listening to English, it is difficult to differentiate the words from one another.</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. B I get worried when I can't listen to English at my own pace.</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I would rather not have to listen to people speak English at all.</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When listening to English, I tend to get stuck on one or two unknown words.</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Item which is negatively loaded on the factor
B: Item which loaded greater than .35 on two factors
Note: For Factor 2, standardized item alpha=.811
Factor 2 (Table 2) was labeled ‘Lack of confidence in listening,’ because most items included in this factor indicated low self-confidence in English listening, as well as experiences of failure in conversations or listening activities. This factor obtained high loadings on two items, “I feel confident when I am listening in English” and “English stress and intonation seem familiar to me,” both of which were reverse-coded for this analysis. The students also reported that they tended to end up translating word by word without understanding content (Item 19) or get stuck on one or two words (Item 1), with the same result. Sometimes, it was difficult for them even to differentiate one word from another, let alone use the higher strategy of guessing (Items 10 and 6). Item 21 had moderate loadings on both factors, all of which were significant, which made it difficult to determine which factor the item might apply more logically to. The means of these items indicated that most of the subjects suffered from low confidence in listening to English.

2) Factor Analysis of the FLCAS

As with the FLLAS, a principal component analysis was performed on the items of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale. Seven factors were obtained with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Application of the scree test and consideration of interpretability, however, indicated that a five-factor solution was most appropriate. The five extracted factors accounted for 52% of the total variance. After the varimax-rotation, those items that attained a factor-loading value of at least .50 were included in the specification process of each factor. However, examination of the five factors indicated that several items significantly loaded on more than one factor with a loading of .50 or greater, suggesting that the factors are not totally exclusive. The five factors are 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.

3) Multivariate Analysis of Variance

MANOVA was used to compare mean differences in anxiety variables with students’ background information as independent variables. In the present study, six demographic variables were used as independent variables: 1) gender, 2) major, 3)
grade level, 4) experience traveling or living in English-speaking countries, 5) experience in ESL classes conducted in English, and 6) study in private language institutes or with private tutors. Because six independent variables in the same MANOVA analysis may produce unequal and small cells, six separate MANOVAs were done on the six independent variables.

For the dependent variables, the factor scores from the previous Principal Components Analysis were used. Instead of using a large number of dependent variables (about 66 items from two questionnaires), composite variables were utilized as the main constructs to represent the data, as suggested by Stevens (1996). In addition to the total FLLAS score and the total FLCAS score, therefore, the two FLLAS factor scores and the five FLCAS factor scores were used as dependent variables.

Because of unequal sample sizes, a Box's test, which is used to check the assumption of homogeneity of the variance/covariance matrices, was applied in each MANOVA analysis. The test is very sensitive to the presence of non-normality. According to Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998), a significance level of .01 or less is usually used as an adjustment for the sensitivity of the statistic. The Box tests for the six MANOVAs were not significant with greater than .01 of p values, suggesting that there was insufficient evidence to indicate that the assumption of homogeneity of variance/covariance matrices had been violated. After confirming no violation of the homogeneity assumption, all six MANOVA were computed. In the event that the MANOVA was significant, univariate ANOVA were performed in order to determine which of the variables were contributing to the overall difference.

(1) MANOVA by Major

Because most subjects were majoring in the humanities, the categories of major (humanities, sciences, and engineering) were recoded into 'Humanities' and 'Non-humanities.' This recoding was helpful to eliminate empty or small cells in the analysis.

The multivariate analysis tested the null hypothesis that population means for the set of two anxiety variables between humanities and non-humanities majors are equal. In Table 3, the multivariate statistics showed significance at the .01 level, indicating that students from different majors differed on the FLLAS, the FLCAS, and the factor scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>9 / 221</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>9 / 221</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>9 / 221</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>9 / 221</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FLLAS</td>
<td>562.841</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>562.841</td>
<td>2.090</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 1</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 2</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FLCAS</td>
<td>43.616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.616</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 1</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 2</td>
<td>5.442</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.442</td>
<td>5.496</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 3</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 5</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the overall difference due to major, univariate F tests were subsequently performed for each of the nine variables. ANOVA results indicated that there were significant effects of major on FLC 2 (Concern about success in classes) and FLC 4 (Negative attitudes regarding English classes).

Table 5 gives the means of the responses of humanities and non-humanities majors. On the measure of concern about success in classes (FLC 2), non-humanities students had a higher level of apprehension about success in English classes than humanities students. On the other hand, on the measure of negative attitudes regarding English classes (FLC 4), humanities students showed a higher level of aversion to English classes than non-humanities participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLLAS</th>
<th>FLCAS</th>
<th>FLL1</th>
<th>FLL2</th>
<th>FLC1</th>
<th>FLC2</th>
<th>FLC3</th>
<th>FLC4</th>
<th>FLC5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hum</td>
<td>108.20</td>
<td>104.07</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NonH</td>
<td>103.69</td>
<td>102.81</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Hum=humanities; NonH=non-humanities
Table 5 presents the means of the male and female participants on the FLLAS/FLCAS total scores and seven factor scores of the FLLAS/FLCAS. The FLLAS total score ranged from 63 to 156, with a mean of 107.62 and a standard deviation of 16.56. Similarly, the FLCAS total score ranged from 43 to 163, with a mean of 103.86 and a standard deviation of 19.78. All factor scores (FLL1 through FLL2 & FLC 1 through FLC 5) had a mean of zero and standard deviation of one.

(2) MANOVA by study in private language institutes or with private tutors

A multivariate analysis was performed to determine if experiences studying in a private language institute or with tutors had an overall, significant effect on the anxiety variables. Results of the tests indicated that there were significant overall differences due to the experiences ($p = .002$).

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>9/221</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>9/221</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>9/221</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>9/221</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FLLAS</td>
<td>581.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>581.266</td>
<td>2.159</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 2</td>
<td>3.919</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.919</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FLCAS</td>
<td>2716.670</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2716.670</td>
<td>7.029</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 1</td>
<td>7.900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.900</td>
<td>7.978</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 2</td>
<td>3.720</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.720</td>
<td>3.723</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 3</td>
<td>4.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.873</td>
<td>5.172</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 4</td>
<td>7.284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.284</td>
<td>7.527</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 5</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ANOVA was subsequently performed for each of the nine variables. Follow-up univariate tests revealed that the differences occurred on several
variables: FLL2 (Lack of confidence in listening), total FLCAS, FLC 1 (General speaking anxiety), FLC 3 (Discomfort in English classes), and FLC4 (Negative attitudes regarding English classes).

The students who had not studied in private language institutes or with private tutors showed a lack of confidence in English listening as well as high general foreign language anxiety. Specifically, they exhibited a higher level of general speaking anxiety, and they seemed to feel uncomfortable in English classes and even dislike the classes.

The results suggest that private language institutes in Korea have influence on university students in a statistically significant way. Many students have not been satisfied with their English education under the current school system, and have enrolled in language academies, expecting more thorough training. On the other hand, students from poorer families who could not afford tutors or study in institutes, may have felt that they were at a disadvantage because others had special classes. Therefore, it is natural that those students who have not studied in the institutes tended to show lower levels of confidence in listening and also higher levels of apprehension in English classes. It seems that students with higher levels of apprehension in English classes and lower confidence in listening lacked faith in the adequacy of their school English classes and found them distressing.

**TABLE 8**

Comparison of Means for Students Who Had Studied in a Private Language Institute or with Tutors and Those Who Had Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FLLAS</th>
<th>FLCAS</th>
<th>FLL1</th>
<th>FLL2</th>
<th>FLC1</th>
<th>FLC2</th>
<th>FLC3</th>
<th>FLC4</th>
<th>FLC5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105.38</td>
<td>99.14</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108.72</td>
<td>106.37</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other multivariate tests of significance did not show significance at the .05 level, indicating that gender, grade level, experience with ESL classes conducted in English, and experience in traveling or living abroad did not play a significant role in language anxiety.

4) Correlations and Multiple Regression

Correlation analyses and multiple regression analyses were performed to examine the relationships among general foreign language anxiety, listening anxiety, and
background factors.

(1) Correlations of anxiety scores, listening scores, and background scores

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were used to determine whether statistically significant relationships existed among the nine anxiety variables: The total FLLAS score, the total FLCAS score, the two FLLAS factor scores (FLL1 through FLL2) and the five FLCAS factor scores (FLC1 through FLC5). The observed relationships between the variables of interest are reported in Table 9.

The total FLLAS score had a significantly high correlation \( r = .71, p < .01 \) with the total FLCAS score. That is, EFL students with higher listening anxiety were likely to be more anxious in foreign language classrooms. Significant positive relationships were also found between the total FLLAS score and the two FLLAS factor scores, and between the total FLCAS score and the five FLCAS factor scores. As would be expected, the total FLLAS score had much higher correlations with the FLLAS factor scores than with the FLCAS factor scores. On the other hand, the total FLCAS score had moderate correlations with the two FLLAS factor scores, and moderate to slightly high correlations with the five FLCAS factor scores.

**TABLE 9**

Correlations among Anxiety Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FLLAS</th>
<th>FLCAS</th>
<th>FLL1</th>
<th>FLL2</th>
<th>FLC1</th>
<th>FLC2</th>
<th>FLC3</th>
<th>FLC4</th>
<th>FLC5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLLAS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLCAS</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL1</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL2</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC1</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC2</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC3</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC4</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC5</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01 (2-tailed)

Between the sets of the FLLAS factor scores and the FLCAS factor scores, there were usually low to moderately significant correlations. For example, FLL 1
(Tension and worry over English listening) had correlations of .33 ($p < 0.01$) with FLC 1 (General speaking anxiety), .27 with FLC 2 (Concern about success in classes), and .37 with FLC 5 (Anxiety in understanding speech of English teachers). FLL 2 (Lack of confidence in listening) also showed low to moderate correlations with all of the FLC factor scores except FLC 5. Overall, a small amount of variance (with 14% at the most) was found in common among the FLCAS and the FLLAS subcomponents. Therefore, this result proposed that the FLCAS is relatively independent from the FLLAS.

Table 10 shows a correlation matrix of the total FLLAS score and the background factors of self-rated listening proficiency, frequency of contacts with native English speakers, frequency of watching TV or movies or listening to the radio or tapes in English, frequency of watching TV or movies without looking at the Korean subtitles, motivation levels, and self-rated anxiety levels in English listening. These six background information variables were measured on the basis of a five-point Likert type scale. A higher score on this scale indicates a high level of proficiency, anxiety, motivation, or frequency.

**TABLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FLLAS</th>
<th>SRLP</th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>A/V</th>
<th>NOCAP</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>SRANX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLLAS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRLP</td>
<td>-0.45*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/V</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCAP</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRANX</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01 (2-tailed)
SRLP: self-rated listening proficiency
FOC: frequency of contacts with native English speakers
A/V: frequency of listening to the radio or tapes or watching TV or movies in English
NOCAP: frequency of watching TV or movies without looking at the Korean subtitles
ML: motivation levels
SRANX: self-rated anxiety-provoking level in English listening

Significant negative correlations were observed between the total FLLAS and self-rated listening proficiency ($r = -0.45$, $p < .01$). Thus, students with higher levels of listening anxiety were likely to report lower levels of listening proficiency and
vice versa. This result predicts a relationship between the total FLLAS score and TOEFL listening test score, an actual measure (as opposed to self-report) of listening proficiency. The correlations between the total FLLAS score and FOC, A/V, NOCAP were significantly negative with r's in the range of -.19 to -.30 (p < .01). That is, students with high listening apprehension were less likely to make contact with native speakers, listen to the radio or tapes in English, or watch TV or movies without looking at the captions. As for motivation, students anxious about listening were apt to be less motivated, as indicated in the negative correlation between FLLAS and ML (r = -.30, p < .01).

The correlation (r = .39, p < .01) between FLLAS and SRANX indicated that the anxiety level measured by the FLLAS was moderately correlated with the self-reported level. The self-rated anxiety level had lower negative correlations with other background variables than the FLLAS level had.

The correlation analyses revealed significant positive correlations among background factors with r's in the range of .14 - .54, except for the relationships between SRANX and the other background variables. However, most coefficients were too low to be noteworthy here.

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anxiety scores</th>
<th>Listening proficiency score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLLAS</td>
<td>-.364**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 1</td>
<td>-.145*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 2</td>
<td>-.379**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLCAS</td>
<td>-.356**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 1</td>
<td>-.190**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 2</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 3</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 4</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 5</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01 (2-tailed)

In terms of listening anxiety, the FLLAS (r = -.364, p < .01) and FLCAS (r = -.356, p < .01) correlated negatively with listening proficiency measured by the TOEFL test. That is, students with both high listening anxiety and high general
language anxiety were likely to be less proficient listeners and vice versa. Most of the subcomponents in the FLLAS and FLCAS showed consistent negative relationships, but oddly, no significant relationship was seen between listening score on TOEFL and FLC 5 (Anxiety in understanding speech of English teachers). This would indicate that the FLC 5 has little relationship with listening proficiency whereas the factor seemed to be highly related to foreign language listening.

Although negative correlations were found between listening proficiency and the overall FLLAS and the overall FLCAS, caution must be taken when attempting to explain the relationships. Since a relationship exists between the total FLLAS score and the total FLCAS score ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), partial correlation should be used to statistically control the effect of each predictor.

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening Proficiency Scores</th>
<th>FLLAS w/FLCAS controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 225)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *p < .05, **p < .01 (2-tailed)

When the effect of the total FLCAS score was partialed out, the partial correlation between the total FLLAS score and listening scores was still significant ($r = -.14$, $p < .05$). Even though there was really a correlation between the total FLLAS and listening proficiency, the correlation considerably decreased from -.36 to -.14 in the partial correlation. This coefficient of -.14 is a correlation not affected by total FLCAS score. This result indicates that the relationship between foreign language listening anxiety and listening proficiency was independent of the effects of general foreign language classroom anxiety. However, listening anxiety on its own accounted for just a small amount of variance (about 2%) in listening ability.

(2) Results of multiple regression analysis

Multiple regression analysis is a statistical procedure that is used to analyze the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables. The objective of the analysis is to use the independent variables whose values are known to predict the single dependent variable selected (Hair et al., 1998).

Stepwise multiple regression was performed in order to determine whether or not any combination of the FLCAS and FLLAS factors could predict Korean university
students' listening proficiency. This analysis was conducted with TOEFL listening scores as the dependent variable and the anxiety scores (the two FLLAS factor scores and the five FLCAS factor scores from the Principal Component Analysis) as independent variables. Because the factors in each scale were basically uncorrelated by construction, there was no multicollinearity problem for this analysis. Both variables that remained in the equation and their level of significance were reported in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**  
Multiple Regression Analysis of Listening Proficiency on the FLLAS and FLCAS Factor Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL 2</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 2</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC 3</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple regression analysis revealed that three anxiety factors contributed significantly to the prediction of listening proficiency. As displayed in Table 13, FLL 2 (Lack of confidence in listening) was the most important predictor for explaining the greatest amount of variance in listening scores. Other contributing factors were FLC 2 (Concern about success in classes) and FLC 3 (Discomfort in English classes). The other four predictor variables were not entered into the regression equation as they failed to meet the statistical significance criterion.

**TABLE 14**  
Analysis of Variance of the Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>795.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>265.10</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3468.77</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4264.05</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of variance in the regression model, which included the three factor scores (FLL 2, FLC 2, and FLC 3) as predictors of the listening proficiency scores,
is reported in Table 14. In terms of practical significance, the $R^2$ for this model was .187, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .176, indicating that the three factor scores accounted for about 17.6% of the variance in the listening proficiency scores.

**TABLE 15**  
Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>$R$ Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Predictors in Model 1: FLL 2 (Lack of confidence in listening)  
Predictors in Model 2: FLL 2, FLC2 (Concern about success in classes)  
Predictors in Model 3: FLL 2, FLC2, FLC3 (Discomfort in English classes)

According to these results, one subcomponent of the FLLAS, the dimension that taps confidence in listening, showed the greatest predictive ability for English listening proficiency. The two subcomponents of the FLCAS, FLC 2 (Concern about success in classes) and FLC 3 (Discomfort in English classes), also proved to be useful for predicting listening ability to a certain extent. Therefore, the regression model suggests that students who are not confident in listening and who worry about success and feel uncomfortable in English classes tended to have lower levels of listening proficiency in foreign language.

Interestingly, the other subcomponent FLL 1 (Tension and worry over English listening) did not show any predictive ability for listening proficiency. Consistent with the correlation analysis, the last component of FLCAS, FLC 5 (Anxiety in understanding speech of English teachers), had no statistically significant utility in predicting listening scores. This result implies that this fifth factor of the FLCAS, “Anxiety in understanding speech of English teachers,” deals with a specific kind of listening apprehension concerning mainly foreign language classroom situations, rather than general anxiety about foreign language listening.

**IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The FLLAS scores suggested that learners do experience anxiety in response to foreign language listening. These results provided more concrete, empirical evidence
of listening apprehension, the existence of which has been suggested by previous listening or anxiety researchers.

Factor analysis performed on the FLLAS revealed two orthogonal factors, one having to do with Tension and worry over English listening, and the other with Lack of self-confidence in listening. The first factor is associated with the negative aspects of fear and frustration in foreign language listening. Specifically, such feelings occurred when listeners missed key words, had little processing time, or did not have sufficient prior knowledge. On the other hand, low confidence, the second factor of the FLLAS, played a significant role in foreign language listening anxiety. Correlation analysis verified the importance of self-confidence, revealing that students' self-rated proficiency levels in English listening \( r = -.45 \) were correlated more highly with their FLLAS scores than their actual scores on the TOEFL listening test \( r = -.35 \). Therefore, learners' self-perception of proficiency appears to be a better predictor of the levels of listening anxiety than is their actual proficiency.

The correlation between the FLLAS and the FLCAS \( r = .71 \) indicated that listening anxiety, as a language-skill-specific anxiety, is significantly related to general foreign language anxiety. However, the squared correlation \( r^2 = .50 \) showed that about half of the variance of the FLLAS was not explained by variation in the FLCAS. Thus, the two constructs seem to be not only associated, but also relatively independent. It must be noted that the remaining half of the variance might be accounted for by other unknown factors or by sampling error, and may fall within the limits of the measures' reliabilities.

The results of the correlation and multiple regression analyses suggested the possibility that listening anxiety actually interferes with foreign language listening. Although a causal relationship cannot be assumed between anxiety and listening ability, there was seen to be a moderate association \( r = -.36 \) between the two constructs. According to multiple regression analysis, the second FLLAS factor (Lack of self-confidence in listening) served as the best predictor of listening proficiency among all the FLLAS and FLCAS factors. Therefore, the FLLAS seems to be an appropriate scale for analyzing listening anxiety and to have actual predictive validity.

Several interesting results of the MANOVA point to relationships between background factors and foreign language listening anxiety. Overall, humanities students showed higher levels of foreign language anxiety and listening anxiety
than non-humanities participants, including a significant difference in Factor 4 (Negative attitudes about English classes). As humanities majors in Korea are often required to take more language-related courses (particularly English communication classes) than non-humanities students, or have to choose optional language courses in order to acquire certificates related to English proficiency or to pass English proficiency tests such as TOEIC or TOEFL, they may experience more anxiety in English classes and have higher levels of aversion to English study. On the other hand, it is interesting to note, non-humanities students had significantly higher levels of apprehension than humanities students about success in English classes. With relatively less experience with language courses, perhaps, non-humanities majors feel they cannot compete with humanities students, and are more concerned about potential failure in the English classes.

Another significant difference found in this study was between those who had studied in a private language institute or with tutors, and those who had not. These results suggest that Korean students who depend on private classes and tutors, which is the most common way to improve communicative skills in Korea, seem to more easily overcome general foreign language anxiety and listening anxiety. Surprisingly, other apparently important background factors, such as experience living abroad or experience in ESL classes conducted in English, had no effect on levels of anxiety.

The findings of this study have both theoretical and practical implications. The present study offers evidence to support the theory that listening anxiety does exist in foreign language learning, and that it has an inverse relationship with listening competence. Although studies have presented evidence of the significance of foreign language anxiety, they have tended to focus on performance side (i.e., speaking or writing anxiety). However, since the comprehension skill is a basic requirement for communication, the whole picture of foreign language anxiety cannot be understood without discussing the role of listening apprehension. Thus, labeling listening anxiety as a factor would be a fundamental step toward understanding foreign language learners’ fear and frustration in communication. The next effort should be devoted to recognizing any debilitating effects of listening anxiety. The present findings imply that listening anxiety has the potential to hinder efficient cognitive processing of the incoming aural input, consistent with an information-processing perspective of anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991).

This study also has important implications for listening theory in foreign
language learning. Most of the studies on listening have emphasized the influences of background knowledge, learning strategies, and language proficiency. However, a criticism of those studies is that they have not considered listeners' points of view or emotional states (Lynch, 1998). When L2 models of listening incorporate these elements into their design, better and more comprehensive descriptions of the cognitive, socio-cultural, and affective factors related to listening in the L2 will likely be generated.

Practically, the high levels of foreign language listening anxiety reported in this study by Korean EFL university students suggest that L2 listening teachers should attempt to be more sensitive to students' emotions, and work to develop methods to manage and alleviate anxiety in the classroom. Therefore, the ideal teacher for listening-based language instruction should be a warm and compassionate person whose manner would help to alleviate anxiety, and who would try to foster a positive attitude toward the target language and the native speakers of the languages. Rather than reprimand L2 listeners for lack of effort, instructors should diagnose learners' listening problems, and help them practice listening sub-skills tailored for each level.

Many Korean students tend to spend a great deal of money and time on private education because they do not believe in the efficiency of their formal high school or university English classes. For the formal educational system of Korea to better serve and prepare its students of English, an aggressive reform of the methods of teaching and evaluating listening comprehension should be instituted, with an emphasis on development of strategy-use, and with learner processes regularly evaluated, utilizing active learner input. Furthermore, pre-service and in-service training of English teachers should incorporate developing ways to ease student discomfort. Specific activities or techniques for managing foreign language anxiety should be presented; these might include practice of self-talk, incorporation of language games or relaxation exercises, encouragement of language clubs or support groups, or student journal-writing regarding the language process.

Certain limitations of this study should be considered when interpreting the results. First of all, it is difficult to precisely measure affective variables because subjects may not provide honest responses regarding their experiences. Second, using only one measure of comprehension, a TOEFL test, may not have been sufficient to accurately measure the listening proficiency of the students. Use of other long-term measures such as final grades based on standardized achievement
tests might have affected, to some extent, the findings.
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**APPENDIX**

The Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS)

The following statements apply to how various people feel about listening to native speakers of English speak English. Indicate if these statements apply to how you feel by writing the number of the item that best indicates your choice.


1. When listening to English, I tend to get stuck on one or two unknown words.
2. I get nervous if a listening passage is read only once during English listening tests.
3. When someone pronounces words differently from the way I pronounce them, I find it difficult to understand.
4. When a person speaks English very fast, I worry that I might not understand all of it.
5. I am nervous when I am listening to English if I am not familiar with the topic.
6. It's easy to guess about the parts that I miss while listening to English.
7. If I let my mind drift even a little bit while listening to English, I worry that I will miss important ideas.
8. When I'm listening to English, I am worried when I can't watch the lips or facial expression of a person who is speaking.
9. During English listening tests, I get nervous and confused when I don't understand every word.
10. When listening to English, it is difficult to differentiate the words from one another.
11. I feel uncomfortable in class when listening to English without the written text.
12. I have difficulty understanding oral instructions given to me in English.
13. It is hard to concentrate on what English speakers are saying unless I know them well.
14. I feel confident when I am listening in English.
15. When I'm listening to English, I often get so confused I can't remember what I have heard.
16. I find that I have inadequate background knowledge of some topics when listening in English.
17. My thoughts become jumbled and confused when listening to important information in English.
18. I get worried when I have little time to think about what I hear in English.
19. When I'm listening to English, I usually end up translating word by word without
understanding the contents.
20. I would rather not have to listen to people speak English at all.
21. I get worried when I can’t listen to English at my own pace.
22. I keep thinking that everyone else except me understands very well what an English speaker is saying.
23. I get upset when I’m not sure whether I understand what I am listening to English.
24. If a person speaks English very quietly, I am worried about understanding.
25. I have no fear of listening in English as a member of an audience.
26. I am nervous when listening to an English speaker on the phone or when imagining a situation where I listen to an English speaker on the phone.
27. I feel tense when listening to English as a member of a social gathering or when imagining a situation where I listen to English as a member of a social gathering.
28. It’s difficult for me to listen to English when there is even a little bit of background noise.
29. Listening to new information in English makes me uneasy.
30. I get annoyed when I come across words that I don’t understand while listening to English.
31. English stress and intonation seem familiar to me.
32. When listening to English, I often understand the words but still can’t quite understand what the speaker means.
33. It frightens me when I cannot catch a key word of an English listening passage.

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

In this section, you will find 33 statements which refer to how you feel about your English classes. There are no right or wrong responses to these statements. We are simply interested in your feelings. Please give your first reaction to each statement, and circle the number corresponding to the answer you have chosen.


1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking English in my English classes.
2. I don’t worry about making mistakes in English classes.
3. I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in English classes.
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 classes, 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 classes.
9. I start to panic when I have to speak in English without preparation in English classes.
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my English classes.
11. I don’t understand why some people get so upset over English classes.
12. In English classes, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English classes.
14. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.
15. I get upset when I don’t understand what the English teacher is correcting in English.
16. Even if I am well prepared for English classes, I feel anxious about them.
17. I often feel like not going to my English classes.
18. I feel confident when I speak English in English classes.
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’m going to be called on in English classes.
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 classes.
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 classes move so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my English classes than in my other classes.
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in my English classes.
28. When I am on my way to English classes, I feel very sure and relaxed.
29. I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the English teacher says in English.
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn in order 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: tertiary education, adult education, general education
Key words: listening, psycholinguistics, anxiety
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