A FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY SCALE FOR HUNGARIAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH

Zsuzsa Tóth

Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Piliscsaba, toth.zsuzsa98@yahoo.com

Abstract: This paper reports on the adaptation of a well-established foreign language anxiety scale for use in the Hungarian EFL setting; furthermore, the validation procedures aimed at testing the psychometric properties of the new instrument. Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale* (FLCAS) was adapted using the method of multiple translators and back translation, and the Hungarian version of the scale (HFLCAS) was tested for response validity. The HFLCAS was administered to 117 English major and 66 non-English major students, whose responses were factor-analysed to test the scale's construct validity. Reliability was assessed using the internal consistency method. The Hungarian FLCAS has been shown to be both reliable and valid in terms of the examined criteria. The results of factor analysis support Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) theoretical foreign language anxiety (FLA) construct, hitherto unexamined in the Hungarian EFL context.

Keywords: foreign language anxiety, foreign language classroom anxiety scale, adapted FLCAS, instrument validation, Hungarian EFL learners

1 Introduction

The role of anxiety in foreign or second language learning is a topic which has long been in the focus of second language (L2) researchers. As early as in the 1970s, a period marked by an upsurge of research focusing on the learner, anxiety – among other individual learner differences anticipated to affect language learning success – started to be examined as a potential factor influencing L2 achievement (Dörnyei, 2005; Horwitz, 1990). The past twenty years have seen a real increase in the number of studies dealing with anxiety in the L2 domain, which is attributable to the significant advances in the theory and measurement of L2-related anxiety since the mid-1980s (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; Young, 1991, 1994; MacIntyre, 1999; Horwitz, 2001). Attempts have been made to develop a firm theoretical basis for clarifying the construct of anxiety associated with foreign language learning, its development and maintenance, as well as its dimensions (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; 1991a; 1994). Instruments have been developed to measure general and skill specific types of language learning anxiety (Gardner 1985; Horwitz *et al*., 1986; Kim, 2000; MacIntyre, 1988/1999; Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999).

This paper reports on the adaptation of the best known and most widely used measure of L2-related anxiety – *the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale* (FLCAS) (Horwitz *et al.*, 1986) – for use in the Hungarian EFL setting. The FLCAS is based on a theoretical model of foreign language anxiety (FLA), which has introduced a new era in the study of anxiety in language learning. Horwitz *et al.*'s has been the first attempt to single out anxiety from the broader context of affective variables and provide a theoretical basis from which research focused directly on anxiety could proceed. The definition of FLA offered by Horwitz *et al.*

and the self-report anxiety scale based on this conceptualisation of anxiety in the L2 context have been instrumental in promoting research interest in the subject, leading not only to numerous empirical studies using this anxiety measure in various instructional settings but also to research aimed at testing and refining the theoretical construct of FLA (cf. Aida, 1994; Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, & Daley, 1998; Cheng, Horwitz, & Schallert, 1999; Ganschow, Sparks, Anderson, Javorsky, Skinner, & Patton, 1994; Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997; Liu, 2006; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989, 1991b; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 2000; Saito & Samimy, 1996; Sheorey, 2006).

The validation study reported here was conducted as part of the author's PhD dissertation research concerned with English major students' experience of FLA in their university English classes and other L2 situations (Tóth, 2007). The investigation was motivated by the realisation that while foreign language anxiety is a well-researched issue in the North American and Canadian setting, it has been a neglected, virtually un-researched area in the Hungarian EFL context. Apart from the practical aim of producing an instrument suitable for measuring Hungarian learners' feelings of FLA, the validation study also had a theoretical objective, which was to test Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) model of FLA in a hitherto unexamined ethnolinguistic and instructional setting.

The article first provides a theoretical background to the study, including (1) an overview of various approaches that have been used in the study of anxiety in L2 learning, (2) the definition of the theoretical FLA construct, and (3) a summary of previous research to test Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) model of FLA. Then it describes the participants of the investigation and the methodology of the adaptation and validation procedure. This is followed by the presentation and discussion of the results and, finally, the conclusions of the validation study.

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Approaches to the study of anxiety in second language learning

There have been essentially two basic approaches to the study of anxiety in the L2 domain. These are labelled (1) the *anxiety transfer*, and (2) the *unique anxiety* approach, which are reflective of different conceptualisations of L2-related anxiety (Horwitz & Young, 1991; MacIntyre, 1999). The assumption behind the first approach is that the anxiety experienced in an L2 context is simply the transfer of other forms of anxiety into the L2 domain. This means that individuals who are generally anxious or experience anxiety in certain types of situations are presumed to have a predisposition to also experience anxiety when learning or using a foreign language. In more specific terms, anxiety in the L2 context has been viewed either as (1) the manifestation of a general trait of anxiety – defined as anxiety-proneness, i.e., a tendency to experience anxiety in a wide range of situations (Spielberger, 1983), or (2) the transfer of some situation-specific anxiety – defined as anxiety experienced in certain well-defined situations, for instance when taking a test or speaking in public (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; MacIntyre, 1999). In line with such views of L2-related anxiety, studies adopting this approach used either measures of trait/state anxiety (e.g. the Manifest Anxiety Scale, Taylor, 1953; the State/Trait Anxiety Inventory, Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970; Spielberger, 1983)[1], or instruments measuring situation-specific

---

[1] State anxiety is the "moment-to-moment experience of anxiety" (MacIntyre, 1999, p.28), characterised by "subjective feelings of tension, nervousness, and worry, and by activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (Spielberger, 1983, p.1).

anxieties like test anxiety (Sarason & Ganzer, 1962) and communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1970) to investigate anxiety in the L2 domain.

In contrast, the assumption underlying the other approach is that language learning produces a *unique type of anxiety*. This theoretical perspective is based on Gardner's hypothesis that "a construct of anxiety which is not general but instead is *specific to the language acquisition context* is related to second language achievement" (1985, p.34) (my emphasis). In this conceptualisation, anxiety experienced in L2 contexts is seen as a situation-specific anxiety which is aroused by the experience of learning and using a second language. In line with this conceptualisation, the anxiety measures which studies adopting this approach employed were designed to tap specifically into the anxiety experienced in foreign language classes and/or L2 communication (e.g., the French Class/–Use, English Class/–Use Anxiety Scales Gardner, Clément, and associates have used since the 1970s as parts of the Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery, developed by Gardner, Clément, Smythe, & Smythe, 1979).

Of the two contrasting perspectives outlined above, the *unique anxiety* approach turned out to be the more fruitful one. Studies taking the *anxiety transfer* approach yielded inconsistent, contradictory results not only across but even within studies (MacIntyre, 1999). As pointed out in reviews of these early anxiety studies (Scovel, 1978; Young, 1991, 1994), some investigations indicated a negative (e.g., Bartz, 1974 in Young, 1994), while others a positive relationship between anxiety and L2 performance (e.g., Kleinmann, 1977), still others found no significant relationship between the two constructs (e.g., Westcott, 1973 in Young, 1994). Furthermore, some studies reported results difficult to interpret, for instance that anxiety was negatively related to one language skill but not to another (Swain & Burnaby, 1976; Tucker, Hamayan, & Genesee, 1976), or that anxiety positively related to one FL, negatively to another, and not related to a third one in the same study (Chastain, 1975). In short, studies adopting this approach were unable to present a clear picture of how anxiety related to L2 learning. One possible reason for the mixed and confusing results is that various studies adopting the *anxiety transfer* approach used different measures of anxiety, as described above, which in itself rendered comparisons across studies difficult (Young, 1994). More important than this, however, is the problem that none of these measures were specific to the anxiety aroused in L2 situations, in short, there was no harmony between the anxiety definition/measure and the actual variable to be measured (MacIntyre, 1999, Scovel, 1978; Young, 1994). By contrast, studies taking the *unique anxiety* approach, which used measures of anxiety specific to the L2 context, were uniform in consistently indicating an inverse relationship between L2-related (L2 class, L2 use) anxiety and various measures of L2 performance (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977, 1980; Gardner, Smythe, Clément, & Gliksman, 1976; Gardner, Smythe, & Lalonde, 1984). Actually, anxiety has been reported to be "the best single correlate of achievement" (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993, p.183). In sum, while the assumption that a general trait of anxiety or certain situation-specific anxieties transferred from other domains operate in language learning was not supported by empirical findings, the idea that a unique type of anxiety might be at work proved to be a more plausible hypothesis.

2.2 A theoretical model of foreign language anxiety

The theoretical model of foreign language anxiety Horwitz *et al.* (1986) proposed bridges the two approaches described above (MacIntyre, 1999). Like Gardner (1985), the proponents of the model conceptualise L2-related anxiety as a distinct type of anxiety

expressed in response to the unique experience of learning and using a language other than one's mother tongue (L1), distinguishing it from (1) a general trait of anxiety, which may show up in a large variety of circumstances, as well as (2) other, more general forms of anxiety. At the same time, arguing that this anxiety essentially has to do with performance evaluation in an academic and social context, Horwitz *et al.* (1986) draw parallels between L2-related anxiety and three related performance anxieties: (1) communication apprehension, (2) test anxiety, and (3) fear of negative evaluation, and suggest a three-part model, with these components as conceptual "building blocks" of the anxiety construct they called *foreign language anxiety* (p.31).

Communication apprehension is a type of shyness or fear associated with communicating with people (McCroskey, 1970). In the L2 domain it manifests itself in anxiety about speaking the target language (oral communication anxiety), especially speaking it in public ("stage fright"), and in apprehension about not understanding or misinterpreting L2 messages (receiver anxiety) (Wheeless, 1975). Test anxiety is defined as "the tendency to view with alarm the consequences of inadequate performance in an evaluative situation" (Sarason, 1978, p.214). In the language classroom it refers to worry over frequent testing, which may become a source of frustration for learners, as their proficiency is assessed while it is being acquired. Finally, the third aspect of FLA, fear of negative evaluation is "apprehension about others' evaluations, the avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively" (Watson & Friend, 1969, p.449). In the FL learning setting it may refer to academic evaluation, as well as to personal evaluations of the learners on the basis of their performance and competence in the L2.

Although the three anxiety constructs are regarded by Horwitz *et al.* (1986) as useful conceptual foundations for the description of L2-related anxiety, they do not view FLA as the simple transfer of these anxieties to language learning. They define FLA as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (1986, p.128). What makes FLA more than merely a combination of communication apprehension, social evaluative anxiety and test anxiety transferred to L2 learning is a unique metacognitive element, which manifests itself in learners' awareness that 'deprived' of their normal means of communication (i.e., the L1) they are to communicate via a language in which they do not have full competence. This may inherently entail feelings of inadequacy not only in terms of academic achievement but, because of the intimate relationship between language and self-expression, in terms of self-presentation as well (Schlenker & Leary, 1985). Aware of their linguistic limitations, language learners may experience a feeling of disparity between their "true" self and a more limited self they can present in the L2, which, in Horwitz *et al.*'s view, differentiates FLA from other academic anxieties.

This conceptualisation of FLA is consistent with theories emphasising the fundamental difference between learning a second language and learning other skills on the grounds that "language and self/identity are so closely bound, if indeed they are not one and the same thing, that a perceived attack on one is an attack on the other" (Cohen & Norst, 1989, p.76). Because of the strong link between self-expression through language and one's self-image, Guiora and associates argue for the existence of a different self in the foreign language, termed "language ego", which is based on the psychological experience shared by many language learners that "one *feels like a different person* when speaking a second language and often indeed acts very differently as well" (Guiora & Acton, 1979, p.199; see also Guiora, 1972) (my emphasis). According to Guiora (1972), acquiring a second language "demands

that the individual, to a certain extent, incorporate a new identity" (p.145), which is easier for some whereas more taxing for other people. Related to this is an idea expressed by Rardin (in Young, 1992), who suggests that language learning may produce *existential* anxiety in learners, in that they may feel "If I learn another language, I will somehow lose myself; *I, as I know myself to be, will cease to exist*", that is, learning a foreign language "touches the core of one's self-identity, one's self-image" (Young, 1992, p.168) (my emphasis). A third theory, describing second language acquisition as a *clash of consciousness*, also seems to refer to the same or very similar psychological experience (Clarke, 1976). All these theories are reflective of the view that learning a foreign language is a unique learning experience and highlight an important psychological phenomenon relevant for understanding the specific anxiety rooted in this experience (see also Stevick, 1976; Gardner, 1985; Williams, 1994; MacIntyre, 2002).

2.3 Testing and refining the theoretical FLA construct

The development of a theoretical model of FLA was an important step forward in the study of anxiety in language learning. Although Gardner, Clément and associates' research was also guided by the tacit assumption that language learning produces a unique type of anxiety, as evidenced by the use of measures of anxiety specific to L2 situations in their studies, the concern of that line of research, as MacIntyre & Gardner (1989) pointed out "has been with larger issues of attitudes and motivation, rather than the more specific role of any single construct such as anxiety" (p.42). Therefore, Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) has been the first attempt to single out anxiety from the broader context of affective variables and provide a theoretical basis from which research focused *directly* on anxiety could proceed. This section looks at the findings of studies aimed to test and refine the theoretical FLA construct.

Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) theory of an anxiety particular to language learning has been generally upheld by research examining the relationship between L2-related and other types of anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; Young, 1991, 1994; MacIntyre, 1999; Horwitz, 2001). To start with, it is supported by the construct validation study of their Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, 1986), in which correlations between the FLCAS and well-established measures of trait-anxiety, communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety were found to be low enough to demonstrate that FLA can indeed be distinguished from these related constructs. Specifically, the correlation of the FLCAS with the Trait scale of the STAI (Spielberger, 1983) obtained r = .29; with the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (McCroskey, 1970) r = .28; with the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Watson & Friend, 1969) r = .36, and with the Test Anxiety Scale (Sarason, 1978) r = .53. These results lend support to the conceptualisation of FLA as a distinct form of anxiety rather than merely a manifestation or transfer of other anxieties (see also Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993).

The same conclusion was reached by MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) in a study aimed to evaluate Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) FLA model. They found a g*eneral anxiety* factor to be independent of a c*ommunicative anxiety* factor whose L2 subcomponent bore very close resemblance to Horwitz et al.'s FLA construct. What is more, only the latter turned out to be related to L2 vocabulary learning, which is further evidence that it is a specific, not some general anxiety that is to be associated with language learning, which is also in line with earlier findings (Gardner, Moorcroft, & MacIntyre, 1987; Lalonde & Gardner, 1984). These results were replicated by a follow-up factor analytic study employing 23 scales measuring different types of anxiety – including measures of trait anxiety, state anxiety, audience

anxiety, communication apprehension, interpersonal anxiety, novelty anxiety, math anxiety, French test anxiety, French use and French classroom anxiety –, which also found that *language* anxiety was clearly separable from *social evaluative* as well as *state* anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991b).

As for the constituents of FLA, however, MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) found that one of the three components of the original model, test anxiety, loaded on the *general anxiety* factor, which made them conclude that it is to be seen as a general problem rather than one specific to the foreign language classroom. This finding is congruent with the factor solution of a study explicitly testing Horwitz *et al.*'s model by validating a version of the *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale* for learners of Japanese as a foreign language (Aida, 1994). Again, it was test anxiety that did not emerge as an important component, which made the author suggest that items reflective of this component could be removed from the scale. In contrast, MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b) found that the *language anxiety* factor received high loadings from two L2-related test anxiety scales, as well as an appreciable loading from a general test anxiety scale.

This apparent inconsistency of research findings concerning the test anxiety component of Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) theory calls for further research. It seems that the definition of FLA as a distinct anxiety form specific to language learning is supported by empirical findings, but further investigations are needed to re-examine the original three-part model and clarify the relationship of test anxiety to FLA, as suggested by MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a) and Aida (1994). The study reported on here takes a step in that direction. It makes a contribution to testing Horwitz *et al.*'s construct of FLA by validating an adapted FLCAS for university students of English in a Hungarian EFL setting. It examines whether the underlying structure of the Hungarian version of the FLCAS reflects the three kinds of anxiety proposed as components of the theoretical FLA construct.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

The study was conducted at the School of English Studies of Pázmány Péter Catholic University (PPCU) in Hungary. The participants were English majors in their first year of study (N = 117). The majority of these students were women, with a male-female ratio of 27:90 (76.9 % female). Their ages ranged from 18 to 24, with an average age of 19.37 (SD = 1.17). They had studied English for an average of 8.41 years (SD = 2.66), with a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 14 years, and achieved an average of 516,5 scores on the TOEFL, with a minimum of 403 and a maximum of 630. The majority of these learners (71.8 %) had never visited an English-speaking country, and only a tiny minority (8.5 %) had spent considerable time (a year or more) in the target language environment. The remaining 19.7 % of the participants had only stayed for a few weeks or months (not exceeding six months) in either Great-Britain or the USA.

In addition to the 117 English majors in the focus of the investigation, 66 non-English majors, taking English classes at PPCU either to satisfy the university's language requirement or simply out of personal interest, also completed the adapted anxiety questionnaire. The purpose of involving them in the survey was to have a comparison group representing a non-English specialist population. Of the 66 students taking the survey, 54 were female, and 12

were male, and their age range was 18-39. With regard to length of study of the English language, they had an average of 6 years; in terms of level, 60 of them were enrolled for pre-intermediate, and 6 for advanced English. As for time spent in a target language country, the picture was very much the same as for the English-majors: 88 % of the students had never been to an English-speaking country, and only 2 of them had spent considerable time (1 year) there.

3.2 The original instrument

Horwitz *et al*.'s (1986) *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale* is a 33-item Likert-type scale with five possible responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". It is meant to assess the degree of foreign language anxiety experienced in language classrooms, as manifested in negative performance expectancies and social comparisons (a sample item is 23: "I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do"), psycho-physiological symptoms (e.g., 20: "I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class"), and avoidance behaviours (e.g., 17: "I often feel like not going to my language class"). The items of the self-report questionnaire are reflective of the three anxieties that are regarded as conceptually important aspects of FLA according to Horwitz *et al*.'s (1986) theory: communication apprehension (a sample item is 27: "I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class"), fear of negative evaluation (e.g., 31: "I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language"), and test anxiety (e.g., 21: "The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get").

3.3 Procedures

The original instrument was adapted to suit the Hungarian EFL setting applying the method of *multiple translators* and *back translation*, as recommended by Brislin (1980). Prior to administration, the Hungarian FLCAS was tested for *response validity* by conducting think-aloud protocols with three English majors. The students were asked to read out each item and verbalise their thoughts while responding to them. They were encouraged to highlight questions they found ambiguous, difficult to understand, or whose wording they did not like, and make general comments on the scale. The participating pre-test[2] method (Converse & Presser, 1986) was used, so as to observe respondents' reactions such as hesitations and uncertainties, and see whether their actual choices corresponded to the explanations offered for them. The think-alouds were conducted in Hungarian and tape-recorded with the participants' consent. The sessions lasted 30-60 minutes. The transcribed recordings were analysed qualitatively, comparing subjects' responses item by item.

As for administration, in order to maximise the response rate, *group administration* was opted for, as recommended by Dörnyei (2003). The 117 English majors completed the questionnaire during their language practice classes. To motivate more truthful and thoughtful answers, the questionnaire was administered by the researcher herself, who explained the purpose and potential usefulness of the survey, made it clear to the participants that the

---

[2] In what Converse and Presser (1986) call the *participating pretest,* the respondents are told that this is a practice run (a questionnaire under construction) and are asked to explain their reactions and answers to the interviewer/investigator.

questionnaire was not a test, and that their responses would be used for research purposes only. For the 66 non-English majors the instrument was administered by their class teachers.

To estimate the *reliability* of the Hungarian FLCAS, the internal consistency method was chosen. Internal consistency was measured with the help of Cronbach alpha. The internal consistency coefficient of the questionnaire completed by the 117 English and 66 non-English majors was computed with the help of SPSS 10.0 for Windows (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). To establish the *construct validity* of the Hungarian FLCAS factor analysis was used. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with direct oblimin rotation was performed on the 33 items, with the following factor extraction criteria: (1) minimum Eigenvalue of 1, and (2) each factor to account for at least 3 % of the total variance.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 The adaptation of the FLCAS

The method of multiple translators and back translation (Brislin, 1980), which guided the adaptation of the original anxiety scale, has a twofold purpose: to make sure that the adapted instrument is equivalent of the original one, and, at the same time appropriate for the new context, both in terms of content and language. To meet these objectives the following steps were taken. First, the author translated the questionnaire into Hungarian herself. The words *language/foreign language* used in the FLCAS were consistently replaced with *English*, and the language spoken in class was specified as English. For example, the original item 18 "I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class" was modified to "I feel confident when I speak English in the English class"/"Magabiztosnak érzem magam, amikor angolórákon angolul beszélek". As demonstrated by the Hungarian version of this item, the original singular form (foreign language class) often appears in the plural in the Hungarian FLCAS (angolórákon, angolórákra, etc.), as English majors have various language practice classes, what is more, English is used as the medium of instruction for other, non-language-focused classes, like literature, etc., as well. In terms of style, the vocabulary was selected so as to suit the university context. For example, "It wouldn't bother me to take more foreign language classes" (item 5) was translated as "Egyáltalán nem aggódnék, ha több nyelvórát kellene felvennem angolból", in which *felvenni* is typically used by university students, and the style is informal.

The questionnaire was also translated by two EFL teachers, who both teach university students. As a second step of the procedure, the three translations were compared in order to produce an improved Hungarian version. In selecting the "best" alternative, intuition was relied on. In several cases, the combination of elements from the three versions seemed the best solution. Consider item 6 as an example. Sentences (a), (b), and (c) are the potential Hungarian versions of the original item, and sentence (I) is the improved alternative.

During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.

    (a) *Azt veszem észre magamon az angolórán, hogy olyan dolgokon jár az eszem, **melyeknek semmi köze** az órához.*
    (b) *Angolórákon gyakran elkalandozom, s **gondolataim** egyáltalán nem a kurzus témái körül forognak.*

(c) ***Angolórákon arra leszek figyelmes****, hogy az **órai anyaggal** semmilyen kapcsolatban sem lévő dolgokra gondolok.*
(I) **Angolórákon arra leszek figyelmes, hogy olyan gondolatok járnak a fejemben, melyeknek semmi köze az órai anyaghoz.**

As a third step of the adaptation procedure, the improved Hungarian version of the FLCAS was given to other two EFL teachers, not familiar with the original scale, who were asked to translate it back into English. These two sets of English sentences were then compared to the original items of the scale to make sure that nothing had been lost in the translation into Hungarian. If some discrepancy was found, alterations were made accordingly. Item 13 is a good example for this.

It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.

(a) *Zavarban vagyok attól, hogy önként jelentkezzek az angolórán.*
(b) *Angolórán annyira zavarban vagyok, hogy önként nem vállalkozom válaszadásra.*
(c) ***Feszélyez, hogy önként megszólaljak az angolórán.***

BT: *I feel uneasy (about) speaking in the lesson without being called upon.*
BT: *I am too embarrassed to volunteer to speak in an E. lesson.*

M: Feszélyez, hogy **önszántamból válaszoljak az angoltanár kérdéseire**.

Version (c) of the original item sounded like a good Hungarian alternative, however a comparison with the backtranslated sentences (BT) made it clear that the original *volunteer answers* had become *volunteer to speak*/önként *megszólaljak*, which is, obviously, not exactly the same. Therefore, sentence (c) was changed to the one marked with M (modified). Eight of the 33 Hungarian items were altered at this stage. The modifications were only slight ones, with item 13 above calling for the relatively most considerable change. These improvements resulted in the first version of the Hungarian FLCAS (Appendix A).

4.2 Response validity

Prior to administration, the Hungarian FLCAS was tested for response validity using think-alouds. As a result of this procedure, further modifications were made to the instrument. Two types of problems surfaced in the think-alouds: (1) ambiguous items, and (2) wording issues, with three items falling into each category. An example for both of them is given below (for the other problematic items see Appendix B).
Item 9 was one of the items respondents found ambiguous. The Hungarian phrase *felkészülés nélkül* was interpreted not only as spontaneous speech, as intended, but was also associated with preparation for classes at home. Therefore, it was modified to the sentence marked with M.

I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.

*Pánikba esem, ha angolórán **felkészülés nélkül** kell megszólalnom.*
(M) *Pánikba esem, ha az angolórán **váratlanul** kell megszólalnom**, anélkül, hogy arra előre felkészülhettem volna**.*

An example of the wording problems is item 11 below. Although the three respondents did not appear as particularly anxious individuals, all of them rejected the statement, claiming they do understand why people can get upset over English classes. Therefore, the phrase *nem értem* was replaced with *számomra érthetetlen*, as the latter seems to suggest "it is something that does not apply to me/not an issue for me" rather than "I'm not capable of grasping it".

I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.

     Nem értem, *hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.*
     (M) **Számomra érthetetlen**, *hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.*

This phase of the validation procedure resulted in the final form of the instrument (Appendix C).

4.3 Reliability and construct validity

The reliability of the Hungarian FLCAS was assessed using the internal consistency method. The internal consistency coefficient of the questionnaire completed by the 117 English majors turned out to be .93 (M = 84.36 and SD = 19.26), which result indicates that the Hungarian adaptation of Horwitz *et al.*'s (1986) FLCAS is satisfactorily reliable.[3] In fact, its alpha coefficient for this administration coincided with that of the original scale (Horwitz, 1986). To test the new instrument's reliability with another population, an internal reliability check was also computed on the data obtained from the 66 non-English majors. Cronbach's alpha measured on the non-English specialist university students was .92, which confirms that the instrument is reliable with a different population as well.

To establish the construct validity of the Hungarian FLCAS factor analysis was used. The initial run produced eight factors with the Eigenvalue greater than one, and the rotation failed to converge, therefore this eight-factor solution of the PCA will be discussed first. Factor loadings, communalities, initial Eigenvalues and percents of the variance are shown in Table 1. The eight extracted factors accounted for 68.5 % of the total variance.

The first factor, accounting for 35.2 % of the variance, received acceptable loadings (>.3) from thirty of the thirty-three items of the scale. Out of the thirty items, sixteen loaded on this factor very strongly, evidenced by high loadings (>.6), and eleven appreciably (.4 −.6). Items with the highest loadings (>.7) are indicative of (a) anxiety related to speaking English in a classroom context (items 27, 9, 18, 24, 1)[4]; (b) fear of negative evaluation, evidenced by (1) anxiety over being called on (items 20, 3) and (2) feelings of being less competent than others in the target language (TL) (items 7, 23); and (c) self-perceived anxiety level in the English class, e.g. "Angolórán feszültebb és idegesebb vagyok, mint más órákon", (items 28, 26, 12). Items with loadings .4 −.6 are reflective of (a) test anxiety (items 10, 2, 8, 19, 21), (b) receiver anxiety (items 4, 29), and (c) apprehension about communicating with native speakers of English (items 32, 14), with the latter two as aspects of communication apprehension. As all the theoretical elements of FLA are represented in this factor by at least

---

[3]The results given refer to analysis performed on 116 subjects, as one of the respondents left one question unanswered.
[4]The items appear in the order of the strength of their loadings, starting from the highest one.

appreciable, or high factor loadings, Factor 1 was assigned the label *Global FLA*, with strong speaking apprehension and fear of negative evaluation constituents.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	h²
1	.705**								.646
2	.552*				.339		.379		.661
3	.756**								.785
4	.536*			.334				.316	.556
5	.335		.497*				-.387		.706
6		-.315	.558*				.411*	.346	.780
7	.759**								.735
8	.469*	.390			.488*				.642
9	.765**								.819
10	.583*	.311							.550
11	.403*	.308				.367	.393		.606
12	.716**								.594
13	.670**								.655
14	.501*	-.475*	-.375						.777
15				.696**					.626
16	.517*	.309				.313			.599
17	.313		.700**						.737
18	.721**			-.323					.728
19	.425*			.473*		-.364			.636
20	.762**								.794
21	.335	.516*							.528
22			-.542*			.428*			.671
23	.752**					-.393			.797
24	.717**								.678
25	.615**	.349							.686
26	.723**						-.307		.684
27	.823**								.805
28	.736**								.611
29	.523*			.570*					.650
30	.481*	.365			-.367			.390	.740
31	.667**							-.447*	.768
32	.554*	-.497*							.786
33	.641**								.573
Initial Eigenvalues	11.605	2.349	2.014	1.746	1.412	1.364	1.095	1.026	
% of variance	35.166	7.117	6.103	5.289	4.278	4.132	3.317	3.109	

% of the total variance accounted for by the solution   68.513

* = appreciable loading (.4 -.6),   ** = high loading (>.6)

Table 1. Factor loadings, communalities (h²), initial Eigenvalues and percents of variance for eight factor principal component analysis on HFLCAS items

Factor 2, accounting for 7.1 % of the variance, obtained appreciable loadings (.4 −.6) from three items, two of which, both referring to communication with native speakers, are negatively loaded on the factor (items 14, and 32). The only item with an appreciable positive loading is reflective of fear of unsuccessful test performance (No. 21). The other six items

with acceptable (>.3) loadings on this factor all seem to be related to feelings of failure to perform well in a classroom context, evidenced by anxiety during language tests (item 8), fear of not being able to cope with the task of language learning (item 30), worry over getting left behind (item 25) or even failing to meet the requirements (item 10), and feeling anxious even if well-prepared for class (item16). In view of this, the second factor was labelled *Fear of inadequate performance in English classes*, indicative of test anxiety and low self-perceived competence. The fact that apart from item 21 all the other items defining this factor loaded more strongly on the first factor suggests that although this component has a clearly identifiable and meaningful pattern, it is very closely related to the global FLA construct.

One item loaded strongly, and three appreciably (±.4 −.6) on Factor 3, which accounts for 6.1 % of the variance. What these items appear to have in common is that they measure anxiety only in an indirect way, asking about learners' inclinations to skip English classes (item 17)/have task-irrelevant cognitions during these classes (item 6), and exploring whether they would mind taking more of these classes (item 5)/felt pressure to prepare well for them (item 22). Therefore this factor was named *Attitudes to English classes*. As two of the four items (No. 6, and 22) did not load, and the other two (No. 5, 17) only marginally loaded (<.4) on the first, *Global FLA* component, it seems that these items are not very informative of learners' FLA. Indeed, besides anxiety there may well be other reasons for students' skipping classes, engaging in thoughts irrelevant to the course, not wanting to take more language classes, etc. Consequently this factor does not seem to define an important aspect of FLA.

Factor 4, accounting for 5.3 % of the variance, received high loading from one, and appreciable ones from two items. These items, as well as those with acceptable loadings (>.3) on this factor, all seem to be related to the teacher. They are reflective of anxiety over getting corrected (item 19) or not comprehending the teacher's correction (item 15) on the one hand, and the psychological effects of not understanding what the teacher is saying in the TL, on the other (items, 29, and 4). For this reason, it was labelled *Teacher-related anxieties*, including a form of test anxiety (feeling tested all the time, not only in actual testing situations), and receiver anxiety.

The remaining four factors did not receive high loadings (>.6) from any item of the scale, and each contained one item only whose loading was at least appreciable (>.4.). The percent of the variance accounted for by these factors was considerably smaller, with Factor 5 accounting for 4.3 %, Factor 6 for 4.1 % of the variance, and with Factors 7, and 8 just slightly above the critical 3 %: 3.3 % and 3.1 %, respectively. In view of this, no labels were attached to these factors, as they did not seem to define important dimensions of the scale.

To sum up, out of the eight components extracted by the PCA the first four appeared to identify meaningful patterns underlying the Hungarian FLCAS. These were the following: (1) *Global FLA*, with strong speech anxiety and fear of negative evaluation constituents, but also including test anxiety, (2) *Fear of inadequate performance in English classes*, reflective of test anxiety and low self-perceived TL competence, (3) *Attitudes to English classes*, and (4) *Teacher-related anxieties*, manifested in a form of test anxiety and receiver anxiety. Of the four factors, however, only the first two, closely related factors, appear to be truly important underlying components of the scale, as the third factor is defined by items that turned out to be not very successful measures of FLA, and the fourth one seems to be represented in the first factor as well, therefore does not add more information about the construct.

        This two-factor solution appears to be supported by the results of the second run, for which the number of factors was specified as three so as to see whether the three components are reflective of Horwitz *et al.*'s theoretical model of FLA. Factor loadings, communalities, initial Eigenvalues and percentages of the variance for this solution are presented in Table 2.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	h²
1	.583*			.501
2	.336			.386
3	.687**			.644
4	.468*			.303
5		.417*	.428*	.364
6			.644**	.467
7	.414*	.501*		.627
8		.573*		.375
9	.828**			.677
10		.522*		.437
11		.459*		.259
12	.437*	.414*		.537
13	.675**			.550
14	.833**	-.417*		.617
15				.008
16		.404*	-.307	.400
17			.730**	.640
18	.725**			.582
19				.192
20	.744**			.660
21		.709**		.425
22			-.613**	.406
23	.421*	.477*		.616
24	.679**			.543
25		.653**		.539
26	.517*	.360		.558
27	.853**			.754
28	.492*	.375		.552
29	.407*			.279
30		.639**		.426
31	.531*			.447
32	.861**	-.360		.616
33	.731**			.501

Initial Eigenvalues

	11.605	2.349	2.014	
% of variance	35.166	7.117	6.103	

% of the total variance accounted for by the solution   48.386
* = appreciable loading (.4-.6),   ** = high loading (>.6)

Table 2. Factor loadings, communalities (h²), initial Eigenvalues and percents of variance for three-factor PCA with direct oblimin rotation on HFLCAS items

The rotated solution shows the emergence of a clear *Communication apprehension* (CA) component from the first, *Global FLA* factor of the initial run. This component receives high (>.6) or appreciable (>.4) loadings from items reflective of all three subcomponents of CA:

(a) oral communication/speaking anxiety, e.g., items 27, 14, 9, 18; (b) receiver anxiety, e.g., items 4, 29; and (c) "stage fright", e.g., item 24, with speaking anxiety as the strongest component, evidenced by the highest factor loadings (>.7/>.8). It is also evident from Table 2 that Factor 2 has become considerably stronger in comparison with the corresponding factor of the PCA (*Fear of inadequate performance in English classes*), which is reflected in an increase in the number of items loading on this component as well as the strength of the loadings (3 items with factor loadings >.6 vs. no such item in the first solution; 9 items with loadings >.4 vs. 3 such items in the first solution). This increase is attributable to the fact that items reflective of fear of negative evaluation and test anxiety, all included in the initial *Global FLA* factor, combined to form a more clearly identifiable *Fear of inadequate performance* component, either moving into Factor 2 altogether (e.g., items 8, 10, 21, 25, 30) or loading more strongly on it than on the first one (e.g., items 7, 23).

The idea that only the first two factors – *Communication apprehension* and *Fear of inadequate performance in English classes* – are really meaningful seems to be supported by the results shown in the component correlation matrix as well (Table 3). They indicate that the third factor (*Attitudes to the English class*) is not related to the first two, which in turn seem to be related to each other, as evidenced by a rather high correlation (r = .42). This two-factor solution bears a marked resemblance to the ones obtained in two previous factor analytic studies (Aida, 1994; Cheng *et al.*, 1999).

Component	1	2	3
1	1.000	.424	-.008
2	.424	1.000	-.007
3	-.008	-.007	1.000

Table 3. Component correlation matrix – Three factor PCA with direct oblimin rotation on HFLCAS items

The results of factor analysis performed on the data obtained from the 117 English majors are in line with Horwitz *et al.*'s three-part model of FLA, as all three components were represented in the factor solution of both runs. The fact that the three components did not actually appear as three clear-cut factors but (1) combined to form a *Global FLA* component in the first solution and (2) divided into *Speaking anxiety* and *Fear of inadequate classroom performance* factors – with the latter comprised of aspects of test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation – in the second run, does not make the model invalid. It only shows that the three anxiety constructs are not easily separable from each other. While MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b), and Aida (1994) found a strong link between communication apprehension and fear of negative evaluation, the present study has shown that the latter is also closely related to test anxiety in a broader sense. In the foreign language classroom, fear of negative evaluation in a social vs. academic sense are difficult to separate. Consider item 2 of the scale for example. The statement "I don't worry about making mistakes in language class"/"Nem izgatom magam amiatt, hogy hibázom az angolórán" may be reflective of not being afraid of being perceived negatively as a person because of making mistakes (i.e., fear of negative social evaluation based on L2 performance), as well as of not feeling being tested all the time in the classroom (i.e., test anxiety).

To check the construct validity of the Hungarian FLCAS with another, non-English-specialist, population, factor analysis was also performed on the responses of the 66 non-English majors from the same university. Apart from small differences in factor loadings, the

same main factors were obtained, and when the analysis was performed on data pooled from the two populations the factor solution remained essentially the same (cf. Table 2 and Table 4). This result provides additional support for the construct validity of the new instrument.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	h²
1	.664**			.509
2	.418*		-.366	.590
3	.674**			.738
4	.441*			.484
5		.557*		.746
6			.642**	.641
7	.620**			.721
8		.433*		.625
9	.836**			.764
10		.450*	-.304	.512
11		.398		.629
12	.534*	.344		.572
13	.692**			.542
14	.729**	-.547*		.743
15		.346		.610
16	.358	.368		.573
17	.342		.651**	.719
18	.814**			.675
19		.351		.490
20	.722**			.751
21		.568*		.468
22			-.646**	.623
23	.617**			.760
24	.770**			.659
25		.604**		.657
26	.567*	.359		.677
27	.860**			.805
28	.548*	.345		.591
29	.392			.641
30		.450*		.543
31	.656**			.534
32	.774**	-.539*		.760
33	.675**			.542

Table 4. Three factor solution with pooled data from English and non-English majors

5 Conclusion

This article reported on the adaptation of the most widely used foreign language anxiety scale for use in a Hungarian university EFL context and the validation of the new instrument. The study fulfilled a practical as well as a theoretical purpose. As for the former, it has produced a standard Hungarian version of the original, well-established FLA scale, suitable for measuring Hungarian learners' feelings of FLA. The Hungarian FLCAS, checked through back-translation, tested for response and construct validity as well as reliability, was found to be reliable in terms of its internal consistency and displayed good psychometric properties.

As for the theoretical objective of the validation procedure, the results of factor analysis performed on English- and non-English major university students' responses to the HFLCAS lent support to Horwitz *et al*.'s (1986) three-part model of FLA in a hitherto unexamined ethnolinguistic and instructional context. All three elements of the theory, including the debated test anxiety component, were included in the factor solution, with *Communication apprehension* as a separate component, and fear of negative evaluation and test anxiety comprising a *Fear of inadequate performance in English classes* dimension. This result suggests that communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety are all important elements which constitute the construct of foreign language anxiety, as proposed by Horwitz *et al*.'s model. Therefore, the suggestion that "items reflective of test anxiety could be eliminated from the FLCAS" (Aida, 1994, p.162) should not be acted on until more findings accumulate on the construct validity of the FLCAS in various instructional settings. The factor solution has also shown that the three types of anxiety represented in the two main factors obtained are closely related to each other, which suggests that FLA is essentially a unidimensional construct, a unique combination of different performance anxieties arising in the process of L2 learning and communication.

Proofread for the use of English by: Ravi Sheorey, English Department, Oklahoma State University, USA.

References:

Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 155-168.

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (1998). Anxiety about foreign language students in French, Spanish, and German classes. *Psychological Reports, 1998, 82*, 1007-1010.

Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. In H. C. Triandis, & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, Vol. 2: Methodology. (pp. 389-444). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chastain, K. (1975). Affective and ability factors in second language learning. *Language Learning, 25*, 153-161.

Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*, 417-446.

Clarke, M. A. (1976). Second language acquisition as a clash consciousness. *Language Learning, 26*, 377-389.

Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: A study of Francophones learning English. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 9*, 123-133.

Clément, R., Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1980). Social and individual factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 12*, 293-302.

Cohen, Y., & Norst, M. J. (1989). Fear, dependence and loss of self-esteem: Affective barriers in second language learning among adults. *RELC Journal, 20*, 61-77.

Converse, J. M., & Presser, S. (1986). *Survey questions. Handcrafting the standardized questionnaire*. London: Sage.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ganschow, L., Sparks, R., Anderson, R., Javorsky, J., Skinner, S., & Patton, J. (1994). Differences in language performance among high-, average-, and low-anxious college foreign language learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 41-55.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C., Clément, R., Smythe, P. C., & Smythe, C. L. (1979). *Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB). Revised Manual*. Research Bulletin No. 15. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second-language learning. *Language Learning, 43*, 157-194.

Gardner, R. C., Moorcroft, R., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1987). *The role of anxiety in second language performance of dropouts*. Research Bulletin No. 657. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clément, R., & Gliksman, L. (1976). Second language learning: A social-psychological perspective. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 32*, 198-213.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., & Lalonde, R. N. (1984). *The nature and replicability of actors in second language acquisition*. Research Bulletin No. 605. London, Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 344-362.

Guiora, A. (1972). Construct validity and transpositional research: Toward an empirical study of psychoanalytic concepts. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 13*, 139-150.

Guiora, A., & Acton, W. (1979). Personality and language: A restatement. *Language Learning, 29*, 193-204.

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 559-562.

Horwitz, E. K. (1990). Attending to the affective domain in the foreign language classroom. In: S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Shifting the instructional focus to the learner* (pp. 15-33). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112-126.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*, 125-132.

Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (Eds.). (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kim, J-H. (2000). *Foreign language listening anxiety: A study of Korean students learning English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas, Austin.

Kleinmann, H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 27*, 93-107.

Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1984). Investigating a causal model of second language acquisition: Where does personality fit? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 16*, 224-237.

Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System, 34*, 301-316.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1988). *The effects of anxiety on foreign language learning and production*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. London, Ontario: The University of Western Ontario.

MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24-45). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2002). Motivation, anxiety and emotion in second language acquisition.In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 45-68). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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. (1991a). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning, 41*, 85-117.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991b). Language anxiety: Its relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second languages. *Language Learning, 41*, 513-534.

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.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37*, 269-277.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (2000). Cognitive, affective, personality, and demographic predictors of foreign-language achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 94*, 3-15.

Saito, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Garza, T. J. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*, 202-218.

Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learning anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 239-251.

Sarason, I. G. (1978). The test anxiety scale: Concept and research. In C. D. Spielberger, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Stress and anxiety: Vol. 5* (pp. 193-216). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Sarason, I. G., & Ganzer, V. J. (1962). Anxiety, reinforcement, and experimental instructions in a free verbalization situation. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65*, 300-307.

Schlenker, B. R., & Leary, M. R. (1985). Social anxiety and communication about the self. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4*, 171-192.

Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect: A review of the anxiety literature. *Language Learning, 28*, 129-142.

Sheorey, R. (2006). Anxiety about English language learning among Indian high school students. In R. Sheorey (Ed.), *Learning and teaching English in India* (pp. 163-178). New Delphi: Sage Publications.

Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the state-trait anxiety inventory* (Form Y). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). *The state-trait anxiety inventory: Test manual for Form X*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Stevick, E. W. (1976). *Memory, meaning and method*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. Swain, M., & Burnaby, B. (1976). Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. *Working Papers in Bilingualism, 2*, 115-128.

Taylor, J. A. (1953). A personality scale of manifest anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48*, 285-290.

Tóth, Zs. (2007). *Foreign Language Anxiety: A study of first year English majors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.

Tucker, R., Hamayan, E., & Genese, F. H. (1976). Affective, cognitive, and social factors in second language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 32*, 214-226.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *33*, 448-451.

Wheeless, L. R. (1975). An investigation of receiver apprehension and social context dimensions of communication apprehension. *Speech Teacher, 24*, 261-268.

Williams, M. (1994). Motivation in foreign and second language learning: An interactive perspective. *Educational and Child Psychology*, *11*, 77-84.

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

Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals, 25*, 157-172.

Young, D. J. (1994). New directions in language anxiety research. In: C. A. Klee (Ed.), *Faces in a crowd: The individual learner in multisection courses* (pp. 3-45). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

APPENDIX A

ÉN és az ANGOLÓRÁK (think- aloud questionnaire)

Ez a kérdőív az angol szakos hallgatók egyetemi nyelvórákhoz fűződő érzelmi viszonyulását, általános közérzetét vizsgálja. Az alábbiakban szubjektiv állításokat olvashat, melyekkel van olyan diák, aki egyetért, van aki nem. Mi azt szeretnénk tudni, **Ön** mit gondol róluk. Kérjük, jelezze az állítások mellett levő skálán, hogy mennyire ért velük egyet, illetve, hogy mennyire igazak önre nézve. A számok a következőket jelentik:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
abszolút nem értek egyet	nem értek egyet	egyet is értek meg nem is	egyetértek	abszolút egyetértek

Csak EGY számot karikázzon be. Itt nincs "jó" vagy "rossz" válasz - kérjük próbálja meg valódi érzéseit rögzíteni, mert kutatásunknak csak akkor lesz megbízható eredménye. Ugyanakkor szeretnénk biztosítani arról, hogy válaszait bizalmasan kezeljük. Részvételét nagyon köszönjük.

1	Sohasem vagyok igazán biztos magamban, amikor angolórán angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Nem izgatom magam azon, hogy hibázom az angolórán.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Reszketek, ha tudom, hogy fel fognak szólítani angolórán.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Megijeszt, ha nem értem, amit a tanár angolul mond.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Egyáltalán nem aggódnék, ha több nyelvórát kellene felvennem angolból.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Angolórákon arra leszek figyelmes, hogy olyan gondolatok járnak a fejemben, melyeknek semmi köze az órai anyaghoz.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Folyton azt hiszem, hogy a többi diák jobban tud nálam angolul.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Általában nyugodt vagyok, amikor angolból tesztet írok.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Pánikba esem, ha angolórán felkészülés nélkül kell megszólalnom.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Aggódom mi lesz, ha nem sikerül teljesítenem az angolórákon támasztott követelményeket.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Nem értem, hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Olyan ideges tudok lenni az angolórán, hogy azt is elfelejtem, amit tudok.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Feszélyez, hogy önszántamból válaszoljak az angoltanár kérdéseire.	1	2	3	4	5

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**		
abszolút nem értek egyet	nem értek egyet	egyet is értek meg nem is	egyetértek	abszolút egyetértek		

14	Nem izgulnék, ha angol anyanyelvű emberekkel kellene angolul beszélnem.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Nyugtalanít, ha nem értem, hogy mit javított ki a tanár.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Akkor is izgulok, ha jól felkészültem egy angolórára.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Gyakran szeretnék inkább távol maradni az angolóráktól.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Magabiztosnak érzem magam, amikor angolórákon angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Félek, hogy az angoltanár kész minden egyes hibámat kijavítani.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Angolórákon majd kiugrik a szívem, amikor érzem, hogy mindjárt felszólítanak.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Minél többet tanulok egy angol tesztre, annál inkább összezavarodom.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Nem érzem annak a kényszerét, hogy nagyon kellene készülnöm az angolórákra.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Mindig az az érzésem, hogy a többiek jobban beszélnek angolul, mint én.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Zavarba ejtő számomra a többi diák előtt angolul beszélni.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Olyan gyorsan haladunk az angolórákon, hogy félek a lemaradástól.	1	2	3	4	5
26	Angolórán feszültebb és idegesebb vagyok, mint más órákon.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Izgulok és zavarodott leszek, amikor az angolórán meg kell szólalnom.	1	2	3	4	5
28	Magabiztosan és nyugodtan megyek angolórákra.	1	2	3	4	5
29	Ideges leszek, ha nem értek minden szót, amit az angoltanár mond.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Nyomasztóan hat rám az a rengeteg szabály, amit meg kell tanulni ahhoz, hogy megszólalhassak angolul.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Félek, hogy kinevetnek a többiek, amikor angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Valószínűleg nem érezném magam feszélyezve angol anyanyelvűek társaságában.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Ideges leszek, ha az angoltanár olyan kérdéseket tesz fel, melyekre előre nem készülhettem fel.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

Ambiguous items and wording issues

I. AMBIGUOUS ITEMS

9 <u>I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.</u>
   Pánikba esem, ha angolórán **felkészülés nélkül** kell megszólalnom.

   (M): *Pánikba esem, ha az angolórán **váratlanul** kell megszólalnom, **anélkül, hogy arra***
      előre felkészülhettem volna.

15 <u>I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.</u>
   *Nyugtalanít, ha nem értem, hogy **mit javított ki** a tanár.*

   (M): *Nyugtalanít, ha nem értem, hogy **miért javít ki** a tanár.*

22 <u>I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.</u>
    *Nem érzem annak a **kényszerét**, hogy nagyon kellene készülnöm az angolórákra.*

   (M): *Nem érzek **erős késztetést** arra, hogy nagyon **jól felkészüljek** az angolórákra.*

II. WORDING ISSUES

11 <u>I don't understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.</u>
   Nem értem, *hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.*

   (M): ***Számomra érthetetlen***, *hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.*

10 <u>I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.</u>
   *Aggódom **mi lesz, ha** nem sikerül teljesítenem az angolórákon támasztott követelményeket.*

   (M): ***Aggódom, hogy*** *nem sikerül teljesítenem az angolórákon támasztott követelményeket.*

30 <u>I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.</u>
   Nyomasztóan hat rám *az a rengeteg szabály, amit meg kell tanulni ahhoz, hogy meg-*
   szólalhassak angolul.

   (M): ***Nyomaszt*** *az a rengeteg szabály, amit meg kell tanulni ahhoz, hogy megszólalhassak*
   angolul.

APPENDIX C

ÉN és az ANGOLÓRÁK

Ez a kérdőív az egyetemi hallgatók angol nyelvórákhoz fűződő érzelmi viszonyulását, általános közérzetét vizsgálja. Az alábbiakban szubjektiv állításokat olvashat, melyekkel van olyan diák, aki egyetért, van aki nem. Mi azt szeretnénk tudni, **Ön** mit gondol róluk. Kérjük, jelezze az állítások mellett levő skálán, hogy mennyire ért velük egyet, illetve, hogy mennyire igazak önre nézve. A számok a következőket jelentik:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
abszolút nem értek egyet	nem értek egyet	egyet is értek, meg nem is	egyetértek	abszolút egyetértek

Csak EGY számot karikázzon be. Itt nincs "jó" vagy "rossz" válasz - kérjük próbálja meg valódi érzéseit rögzíteni, mert kutatásunknak csak akkor lesz megbízható eredménye. Ugyanakkor szeretnénk biztosítani arról, hogy válaszait bizalmasan kezeljük. Részvételét nagyon köszönjük.

1	Sohasem vagyok egészen biztos magamban, amikor angolórán angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Nem izgatom magam amiatt, hogy hibázom az angolórán.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Szinte reszketek, ha tudom, hogy fel fognak szólítani angolórán.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Megijeszt, ha nem értem, amit a tanár angolul mond.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Egyáltalán nem aggódnék, ha több nyelvórát kellene felvennem angolból.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Angolórákon arra leszek figyelmes, hogy olyan gondolatok járnak a fejemben, melyeknek semmi köze az órai anyaghoz.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Folyton azt hiszem, hogy a többi diák jobban tud nálam angolul.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Általában nyugodt vagyok, amikor angolból tesztet írok.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Pánikba esem, ha az angolórán váratlanul kell megszólalnom, anélkül, hogy arra előre felkészülhettem volna.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Aggódom, hogy nem sikerül teljesítenem az angolórákon támasztott követelményeket.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Számomra érthetetlen, hogy egyesek miért izgulnak annyira egy angolórától.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Olyan ideges tudok lenni az angolórán, hogy azt is elfelejtem, amit tudok.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Engem feszélyez, hogy önszántamból válaszoljak az angoltanár kérdéseire.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Nem izgulnék, ha angol anyanyelvű emberekkel kellene angolul beszélnem.	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5		
abszolút nem értek egyet	nem értek egyet	egyet is értek, meg nem is	egyetértek	abszolút egyetértek		

15	Nyugtalanít, ha nem értem, hogy miért javít ki a tanár.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Akkor is van bennem izgalom, ha jól felkészültem egy angolórára.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Gyakran szeretnék inkább távol maradni az angolóráktól.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Magabiztosnak érzem magam, amikor angolórákon angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Tartok attól, hogy az angoltanár minden hibámat kijavítja.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Angolórákon majd kiugrik a szívem, amikor érzem, hogy mindjárt felszólítanak.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Minél többet tanulok egy angol tesztre, annál inkább összezavarodom.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Nem érzek erős késztetést arra, hogy nagyon jól felkészüljek az angolórákra.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Mindig az az érzésem, hogy a többiek jobban beszélnek angolul, mint én.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Zavarba ejtő számomra a többi diák előtt angolul beszélni.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Olyan gyorsan haladunk az angolórákon, hogy félek a lemaradástól.	1	2	3	4	5
26	Angolórán feszültebb és idegesebb vagyok, mint más órákon.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Izgulok és zavarodott leszek, amikor az angolórán meg kell szólalnom.	1	2	3	4	5
28	Magabiztosan és nyugodtan megyek angolórákra.	1	2	3	4	5
29	Ideges leszek, ha nem értek minden szót, amit az angoltanár mond.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Nyomaszt az a rengeteg szabály, amit meg kell tanulni ahhoz, hogy megszólalhassak angolul.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Attól tartok, hogy a többiek kinevetnek, amikor angolul beszélek.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Valószínűleg nem érezném magam feszélyezve angol anyanyelvűek társaságában.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Ideges leszek, ha az angoltanár olyan kérdéseket tesz fel, melyekre nem készülhettem fel előre.	1	2	3	4	5