Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.0. Introduction

In the last chapter, we have provided an overview of the present study by briefly discussing various aspects like the background to the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, key terms used in this doctoral thesis, the rationale of the study, the significance of the study, the research design and the context in which the research was carried out, the scope and limitations of the study. The chief aim of this chapter is to review the literature related to the area of the study and place the study in proper perspective with the ongoing research and theory in language learning. While talking about conducting literature review Mohanraj (2011), stated that there are two ways in which the review of literature can be carried out - discrete and integrated. According to him the discrete review is straightforward to make and most of the times it becomes monotonous and lengthy activity for the researcher. However, on the other hand, the integrated review is a discussion of the concepts related to the area of research reviewed by examining the variety of authors' views about the concept with critiquing it (2011, pp.226). This indicates that integrated review not only provides a consolidated view of the concepts but also enhances the researcher's knowledge about the concepts in the field. Thus, it can be stated that the integrated review of the literature is far better and useful than the discrete review of literature and therefore, considering the significance of the integrated review, the researcher

carried out the review of the relevant studies by following the approach of integrated review of literature.

This chapter begins with the role and significance of affect in the ESL context. Then, it discusses language anxiety as an identifiable factor in EFL/ESL context. Later in the third section, it focuses on the several definitions of the language anxiety. The main aim of this section is to understand how theorists and researchers have defined language anxiety and determine the appropriate definition for the present research study. Then, the fourth section sheds light on the theoretical underpinnings of the study. The primary focus of this section would be to understand various dimensions of language anxiety and examine several conceptual underpinnings of language anxiety. After that, the fifth section elucidates e anxiety and the theories of second language acquisition. The main aim of this section is to understand how theoreticians in the second language acquisition have conceptualized language anxiety. Then, the sixth section briefly explains the instruments used for measuring language anxiety. The main focus of this section is to examine instruments used for measuring language anxiety and determine the most suitable instruments for the present study. And finally, the last section provides a critical discussion on the various studies of language speaking anxiety and concludes the chapter with the summary.

2.1. The role and significance of affect in the ESL context

Many researchers have stressed the role and significance of affective factors in second language learning. For instance, according to Chastain (1975), "the affective domain is a subjective area of the learner, which includes individual's

personal experiences, desires, interests, feelings, fantasies, imaginings, and opinions" (p.212). Further, while talking about the importance of affective domain for language learning, Chastain (1975) states, "The cognitive domain is essential for learning to take place, but the lesson content for language practice is usually more interesting when it springs from the affective domain of the learners" (Chastain, 1975, p.212). The above two observations of Chastain (1975) indicate that both the cognitive and affective domains are essential for effective language learning as well as teaching. According to Arnold (2005), "attention to affective aspects can lead to more effective language learning". Secondly, Arnold (ibid.) asserts that, " focusing attention on affect in the language classroom reaches beyond language teaching and even beyond what has traditionally been considered the academic realm" (P. 2). Thus, from these two reasons it can be concluded that affective factors do play an important role in second/foreign language teaching and learning. Further, another scholar who investigated the role of affective experience in the language learning is Seo (2004). He asserted that the learners who experience positive feelings in the classroom tend to focus on searching and attaining positive outcomes, where as the learners who experience negative emotions process information with a lot of difficulty and show 'a defensive behavioural orientation'(p.430).

For the past twenty-five years, many of the major developments in the field of language teaching suggest that they are in some way related to the need to recognise the importance of affect in language learning. For example, the methods which came to the fore in the 1970s – suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1979), silent way

(Gattegno, 1972), community language learning (Curran, 1976), and total physical response (Asher, 1977) take into account the affect in language learning in a very central manner. Further, teaching approaches like communicative language teaching and the natural approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983) too consider the importance of affect in language learning. The natural approach, developed by Krashen and Terrell (1983), considers affect in a prominent way. One of the five hypotheses in Krashen's theory of second language acquisition is the affective filter hypothesis and the activities in the natural approach are designed to minimize classroom stress.

Even curriculum design in recent times has been influenced by humanistic-affective thought. For example, Nunan (1988) and Tudor's (1979) work in curriculum design have developed undeniably humanistic learner models , which demonstrates the necessity of focusing more on language learners and their experiences rather than simply on the narrower field of non-learner related linguistic corpora.

Apart from that both psychologists and neurobiologists also acknowledge the role of affect in language learning. For example, Stevick (1996) discusses research from psychology as one of the most vital aspects of language learning (memory) and links it very closely with emotion. In their comprehensive overview of the contributions to psychology to language teaching, Williams and Burden (1997) argue that educational psychology shares much with humanistic approaches to language teaching, especially in the need to go beyond mere language instruction to a concern with 'making learning experiences meaningful

and relevant to the individual. The field of neurobiology also has increasingly important implications for language learning and teaching. For instance, Schumann (1997) emphasizes the centrality of our emotional reactions in the learning process. According to him, our brain evaluates the stimuli it receives via the senses from the language learning situations, either in target language environment or in the classroom, and this appraisal leads to an emotional response which has a great influence on the rate and success of language learning. Thus, the above discussion indicates that affect plays a significant role in language learning. The next section will explicate on the language anxiety as an identifiable factor in EFL/ESL context.

2.2 Language anxiety as an identifiable affective factor in EFL/ESL Context

Second language theorists such as Gardner, 1993; Krashen, 1988; Ellis, 1985; Pappamihiel, 2001, have recognized the vital role of anxiety in the language learning process. According to them, every second language learner suffers some form of anxiety regardless of their age, experience with language, the type of language learning setting and location. In the same line of research, while studying anxiety in second language context, Ellis (1994), goes further and states that the construct of language anxiety refers to the subjective uneasiness, nervousness, apprehension, and worry experienced by second language learners who are required to use the second language in certain conditions like public speaking or classroom discussions. Thus, here it is crucial to note that the construct refers to the learner's subjective perception, evaluation, and experience of the language-learning situation. This means that language learning has a

subjective component to it and as it is subjective, the language learners differ in the level of language anxiety based on factors such as age, knowledge of the language, and the individual's culture, among others (Horwitz, 2001, P. 112).

Dornyei (2005) characterizes language anxiety as an individual difference variable along with creativity, learner beliefs, and general anxiety. He suggests that the individual difference variable of language anxiety is an essential learner characteristic in acquisition and use of a second language. Here, Dornyei's (2005), concern about language anxiety is in its integration in paradigms of research. He found that language anxiety, like other individual difference variables, is an affective independent variable and at other times a part of a larger structure of research. Even though there are areas where language anxiety is unresolved, Dornyei (2005) predicts it will be a variable to consider in the area of language performance. While talking about language anxiety Oxford (2005), states that if the teacher or the learner identifies the language anxiety and does something positive about it then it can have a positive impact on the learners; on the other hand, if they avoid it then it can have a negative impact on the learners and can lead to dropping out of the programme or losing a prospective career in the programme.

Krashen (1981) suggests that operations have a profound effect on the affective state of the learner. It includes egocentrism, which in turn leads to increased self-consciousness and greater reticence. Thus, young adult learners tend to obtain less input and make less effective use of the input. Now language anxiety has become the preferred term when discussing

communication apprehension in the L2 (Horwitz & Young,1991) and the negative effects of language anxiety can be explained by proposing that the arousal of anxiety causes an increase in self-focused attention and distracting, self-deprecating thoughts (Eysenck, 1979; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994b). This cognitive disruption and its consequences can occur within an individual without a single act of communication behavior; simply being aware of potential future communication with another person can create distraction and disrupt the language learning process (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994a, 1994b). According to Arnold (2005), "anxiety is quite possibly the affective factor that most pervasively obstructs the learning process. it is associated with negative feelings such as uneasiness, frustration, self-doubt, apprehension, and tension" (p.8).

While talking about anxiety, Eysenck (1979) explains that anxiety present in classrooms have a down-spiraling effect on the learners' language learning (p.364). It makes them nervous and afraid and thus contributes to poor performance. According to him, the feelings of fear and nervousness are intimately connected to the cognitive side of anxiety. Heron (1989) makes reference to what he terms existential anxiety, which arises out of a group situation and has three interconnected components that are relevant to the language classroom: Acceptance anxiety (will I be accepted, liked….?), Orientation anxiety (will I understand what is going on?), Performance anxiety (will I be able to do what I have come to learn?). The above discussion reveals that the language anxiety is an identifiable factor in

EFL/ESL context and lack of attention to such factor may create challenging situations for teachers as well as for ESL learners. The next section would examine how scholars have defined language anxiety and attempts would be made to determine the most suitable definition of language anxiety for the present research.

2.3 Defining language anxiety

Since anxiety has been found as a vital factor affecting language learning, researchers have conceptualized it in three different perspectives such as trait anxiety, state anxiety and situation specific anxiety (see section 2.4 of this chapter). Spielberger (1983) defines language anxiety as an individual becoming anxious in any situation. According to Gidron (2013), trait anxiety refers to the stable tendency to attend to, experience, and report negative feelings such as fears, worries, and anxiety across many situations. This implies that this perspective has conceptualized anxiety in terms of learners' personality dimension of neuroticism versus emotional stability.

Researchers following state anxiety perspective have defined anxiety as a blend of trait and situational approaches. From this perspective, state anxiety can be described as the experience of unpleasant feelings when confronted with specific situations, demands or a particular object or event. According to Spielberger (1983), state anxiety arises when the person makes a mental assessment of some type of threat. Thus, when the object or situation that is perceived as threatening goes away, the person no longer experiences anxiety.

Therefore, state anxiety refers to a temporary condition in response to some perceived threat.

Researchers following situation specific perspective have defined anxiety as multidimensional phenomenon, which arises due to the fear or tension of a particular situation. For example, Horwitz et al. (1986) defined language anxiety 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. 125). Further, Young (1991), defined language anxiety as, "a complex, multidimensional phenomenon that deals with learners' psychology in terms of their feelings (frustration, fear, insecurity, or apprehension), self-esteem, and self-confidence" (p.428). While investigating the construct of language anxiety MacIntyre (1999), found that language anxiety is "the apprehension experience when a situation requires the use of a second language with which the individual is not fully proficient and the propensity for an individual to react in a nervous manner when speaking, listening, reading, or writing in the second language"(p.223).

Recently, in one of the seminal articles Llinas and Garau (2009) stated that anxiety could be defined by two approaches: "(1) language anxiety as a transfer of other forms of anxiety (Scovel, 1978; Young, 1991), and (2) language anxiety as a unique type of anxiety that causes worry and negative emotional reactions" (Bailey, Daley, & Onwuegbuzie,1999; Horwitz, 2001). Thus, the definitions of situation specific perspective indicate that investigation in the area of language anxiety should be focused on examining

the relationship between learners' negative feelings, emotions towards particular situation such as classroom performance or participation.

Therefore, by considering this view the present research study adopts Horwitz's (1986) definition of language anxiety 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" (p. 125). The primary reason for adopting this definition for our study is that it employs situation specific approach, which has yielded more meaningful and consistent results than other approaches in second language anxiety speaking studies.

2.4. Conceptualizing language anxiety: theoretical underpinnings

Research in the area of language learning and anxiety has been widely discussed for at least forty to fifty years (Horwitz & Young, 1991b; MacIntyre & Gardner 1991c; Horwitz, 2001). The scope of the research carried out in this area is not just determined by its prolonged engagement with the construct but it is also determined by the various languages in which it is carried out and the various countries in which it is carried out. For instance, the research is carried out in various languages such as Arabic (Elkhafaifi, 2005), Chinese (Le, 2004), English (Horwitz, 2001), French (MacIntyre & Gardner 1991b), Hebrew (Kraemer & Zisenwine, 1989), Japanese (Adia, 1994, Oh, 1996) and Spanish (Donley, 1997a, Horwitz, et al., 1986). Likewise this research has also been carried out in relation to language learners in various countries or territories such as Cyprus (Kunt, 1997), Hong Kong (Walker, 1997), Indonesia (Marwan, 2007), Japan, (Kondo &

Yang, 2004), Korea, (Kim, 1998, Yang, 2005), Mexico (Pappamihiel, 1999, 2001), China (Liu & Jackson, 2008) Puerto Rico (Melendez, 1997) South Africa (Kraemer & Zisenwine, 1989), Spain (Palacios, 1998), Taiwan (Chao, 2003, Tsai, 2003) and Turkey (Cetinkaya, 2005).

This indicates that the relationship between language learning and anxiety has been a crucial area of interest for a long time covering a wide range of languages and countries. The primary reason for having such a long interest for exploration is that the second language or foreign language courses are believed to be the most anxiety provoking situations for many learners (Walker, 1977). During these forty to fifty years many researchers (Horwitz, et al., 1986; Horwitz & Young, 1991b; MacIntyre & Gardner 1991c) have been trying to conceptualize the construct by either theorizing it or by carrying out the experimental investigations. Thus, the rest of the section reviews some of the established theories in this area including differentiations between state and trait anxiety, situation specific anxiety, facilitating and debilitating anxiety, and the theory of foreign language anxiety.

2.4.1 State anxiety vs. trait anxiety

State anxiety and trait anxiety are one of the two facets of anxiety. This distinction was first presented by Cattell and Scheier (1960), and further it was firmly established by Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene (1970) with the development of a measurement scale, the state-trait anxiety inventory. The perspective of state anxiety is a combination of the two approaches – trait and

situational anxiety. According to Spielberger (1983), state anxiety is apprehension experienced at a particular time, for instance speaking in the class. He defined state anxiety as "an immediate, transitory emotional state of subjective, conscious feelings of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the automatic nervous system reactions in response to a particular stimulus such as giving speech or taking an examination" (Deyuan, 2011, pp.13). In one of his studies, he found out that the high level of trait anxiety is highly correlated with the state anxiety. As like trait anxiety this perspective has been criticized by various researchers. For example, MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) criticized this approach in terms of the assessment of the state anxiety in the learner. They argued that in assessing state anxiety the subject is asked, "Are you nervous now?" instead of asking, "does this situation makes you nervous?" This implies that the subject is not asked to attribute the experience to any particular source. Therefore as an alternative to state anxiety, a concept of situation specific anxiety was adopted by several researchers.

In contrast, trait anxiety is another perspective which is generally known as personality trait, where learners are found to be anxious because of their personality trait. Spielberger (1983) defines it as an individual becoming anxious in any situation. This suggests that a person with high trait anxiety would likely to be anxious in a number of different situations leading to impair cognitive functioning, disrupt memory and avoidance behaviour (Eysenck, 1979). Research related to this perspective is considerable and have demonstrated that trait anxiety can have a pervasive effect on the learners cognitive, affective, and behavioral

functioning (Levitt, 1980; Spielberger, 1983). Although trait anxiety perspective has its strength in describing the effects of generalised anxiety, which is applicable across situations, it has faced with criticism as well. While commenting on this perspective, Endler (1980) argues that traits are meaningless unless they are considered in interaction with situations. This suggests that to study anxiety one needs to examine the interaction of the learner in the situation and that's how the trait anxiety can be investigated. To conclude the discussion on the state and trait anxiety, we can agree with MacIntyre (1995a) when he says, "it should be emphasized that state anxiety is the reaction, and trait anxiety is the representation of the tendency to react in an anxious manner" (MacIntyre, 1995a, p. 90).

2.4.2 Situation specific anxiety

Situation specific anxiety is known as an alternative perspective to the state anxiety. In this perspective, learners' anxiety is tested in a well-defined situation such as public speaking, writing examinations, or classroom performance. At this juncture a learner is asked about the various aspects of the situation, which in turn clearly delineates the situation of interest for the learner. Thus, making situation as the main focus of the study, this perspective allows the researcher to avoid making assumptions about the source of the anxiety reaction and offers a better understanding of the source of anxiety. Until now, many researchers have adopted this perspective in their investigations (Horwitz, 2001; Liu, 2006; Mak, 2011) and have found this perspective as a better approach for investigating the construct of language

anxiety. Although there are many advantages of this perspective, it has also faced some criticism. A criticism of this approach is that the situation under consideration can be defined variously such as very broadly (e.g., shyness), more narrowly (e.g., communication apprehension), or quite specific (e.g., stage fright). Thus, it is the researcher's responsibility to define a situation that is sufficiently specific to be meaningful for the purpose at hand, yet to have reasonable generality to permit generalizations (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). Since the broad-spectrum of study is to understand the targeted learners' language anxiety, the framework of this perspective aptly suits the aim of the study. Hence, the situation specific perspective forms the base for the present study's framework.

2.4.3 Facilitating vs. debilitating anxiety

 Another facet that the researchers have found out about the language anxiety is the effect of anxiety on the learners learning and performance. According to Oxford (2005), when it comes to the effect of language anxiety on the learners learning and performance the research in this area has shown mixed results. In this case, some language researchers assert that language anxiety has a positive effect on the learners learning and performance (Kleinmann, 1977; Chastain, 1975, Ehrman and Oxford, 1990). In contrast some researchers state that language anxiety has a negative effect on the learners learning and performance (Adia, 1994; Horwitz, 1986; Price, 1991; Scarcella and Oxford, 1992). In the literature, the negative effect of anxiety is called 'debilitative anxiety' and the positive effect of anxiety is called 'facilitative anxiety'. The

debilitative anxiety harms learners' performance both directly as well as indirectly. For instance, it harms learners' performance directly by reducing their participation in the class and creating overt avoidance of the language classroom and indirectly through the learners worry and self doubts. Thus, debilitative anxiety can be related to plummeting motivation, negative attitudes and beliefs, and language performance difficulties.

On the other hand the facilitative anxiety is known as 'positive or helpful anxiety' for learning English and it improves learners' performance. But the language researchers who support this view have different perspectives. For instance, Horwitz (1990), states that anxiety is helpful only in the simple learning tasks, but not in the complicated learning tasks. So in this way the researchers in this area have found the existence of both debilitative and facilitative anxiety. In the next section we will elaborate on the theory of foreign language anxiety.

2.4.4 Theory of foreign language anxiety

In 1986, Horwitz, et al. developed the *Theory of Foreign Language Anxiety*. This theory was basically evolved from the clinical experiences of authors' with the foreign language students in university classes. According to this theory when anxiety is confined to a language learning situation, it falls into the category of specific anxiety reaction. Horwitz et al., (1986) conceptualized foreign language anxiety 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" (P.125). Horwitz et al. (1986) identified foreign

language anxiety as one of performance anxiety within academic and social contexts and found similarities between it and three other related performance anxieties: communication apprehension, test anxiety, fear of negative evaluation. Horwitz et al. argued that communication apprehension played a large role in foreign language anxiety. People who had trouble speaking in front of groups were likely to experience greater difficulty speaking in a foreign language classroom where they had little control of the communicative situation.

In defining first performance anxiety, Horwitz et al. (1986) stated that due to its emphasis on interpersonal interactions, the construct of communication apprehension plays an important role in conceptualizing language anxiety. They consider communication apprehension as "a type of shyness characterized by fear or anxiety about communicating with people" (126). According to them difficulties in speaking in groups (oral communication anxiety) or in public (stage fright) or listening to or learning a spoken message (receiver anxiety) are all manifestations of communication apprehension.

While explicating the second performance anxiety, authors think that performance evaluation is an ongoing feature of most foreign language classes. Thus, they find that test anxiety also plays a vital role in conceptualizing language anxiety. According to Horwitz et al. (1986), "test anxiety is a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure, since test anxious students often put unrealistic demands on themselves and feel that anything less than a perfect test performance is inadequate (p. 127).

Horwitz et al. (1986) defined third performance anxiety as "apprehension about others' evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate negatively" (p. 128). According to them the fear of negative evaluation is similar to test anxiety but its scope is broader than test anxiety. Thus, on the basis of the above conceptualizations Horwitz et al. (1986) acknowledged the uniqueness of foreign language anxiety and introduced the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) as an instrument to measure learners language anxiety levels (Trang, 2012). In a review of Horwitz et al.'s *Theory of Foreign Language Anxiety and Challenges to the Theory*, Trang (2012) stated that the theory has been widely accepted with the subsequent research acknowledging the uniqueness of foreign language anxiety and provided evidence that the FLCAS is a reliable tool for measuring language speaking anxiety.

Since then, "the concept of anxiety in second language acquisition has achieved the status of a precise technical notion" (Young, 1994, p.3) with more consistent research findings of the negative effects of language anxiety on achievement and performance (for example – Djigunovic, 2006; Horwitz, 1991; MacIntyre and Gardner , 1989 & Tallon, 2009).

To summarise, the present section has elaborated on the theory of foreign language anxiety. In the next section, we will discuss some of the theories that considered language anxiety as one of the important factors in their theory or model.

2.5 Anxiety and theories of second language acquisition

According to Pichette (2009), there are some theoreticians in second language acquisition who address anxiety as an important variable in their theories and models; these include Gardner's (1979) Socio-educational model, and Krashen's (1982) Affective filter and Monitor model.

2.5.1 Gardner's (1979) Socio-educational model

Gardner's socio- educational model is one of the important and widely researched models in the field of language acquisition and language learning. The author started working on the model in 1960s and proposed his model in 1979. The model was revised in 1985 and in 2001. In this model Gardner and his colleagues made an attempt to elucidate the four variables that are interrelated in acquiring the second language. Among these four variables Gardner (2006), considered anxiety as one of the sub variable of individual difference and stated that it has a significant impact on the learners' language learning and acquisition.

According to Gardner (2006), the four variables such as first social milieu (which consists of the individual's culture and environment), second individual differences (that comprise intelligence, aptitude, motivation and anxiety, that could be seen in most of the cases as an inhibited factor in the individual learning), third second language acquisition contexts (which includes the settings where the language is being learned), and the fourth outcomes (includes linguistic knowledge and language skills and non-linguistics skills) are very important while considering both language learning

and acquisition. While explaining the role of anxiety in his model he stated that in acquiring any second language, anxiety plays a vital role by either facilitating or debilitating the language learning process of the learner. Thus, he suggests that while teaching a second language one must create a learner friendly atmosphere in the language classrooms.

2.5.2 Krashen's (1982) Monitor model and affective filter

Another theoretician who has considered anxiety as an important factor while designing the theory is Stephen Krashen. In his theory of second language acquisition (1982), he proposed five hypotheses called - the acquisition-learning hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the natural order hypothesis, input hypothesis, and affective filter hypothesis. Among these, the monitor hypothesis, and affective filter hypothesis explicitly emphasize the significant role of anxiety in the second language acquisition. While discussing the monitor hypothesis, Krashen stated that in language learning the role of the monitor should be minor, and the learner should use it only to correct deviations from normal speech to give speech a more polished appearance.

Further illustrating the monitor hypothesis Krashen states that there are individual differences among language learners with regard to 'monitor' use and distinguishes them into three categories as over-users (those who use the 'monitor' every time), under-users (those who have not learned or who prefer not to use their conscious knowledge), and optimal users (those who use the 'monitor' aptly). According to him the overuse of monitor makes learners more conscious about their errors and leads them to the doubts and uncertainty

about their language use, which again creates the lack of self-confidence in their mind and thus impedes the language learning. Therefore he suggests that in language learning the over use of monitor should be avoided.

The concept of the affective filter hypothesis was first proposed by Dulay and Burt (1977) and later incorporated by Krashen in his theory called theory of second language acquisition. The affective filter hypothesis is one of the five hypotheses in the theory and basically captures the connection between affective variables (motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety) and the process of second language acquisition. While elaborating on the affective variables, Krashen argued that learners with high motivation, good self-confidence, good self-image, and a low level of anxiety would be successful in second language acquisition. Further he states that low motivation, low self-esteem, and debilitating anxiety can coalesce to 'raise' the affective filter and form a 'mental block' that prevents comprehensible input from being used for acquisition. This indicates that when the filter is 'up' it impedes language acquisition and when the filter is down it facilitates language acquisition. Krashen (1982) explained that to enhance language acquisition process an effective language teacher should provide comprehensible input in a low anxiety situation.

The above discussion on the socio-educational model, monitor model, and affective filter reveals that anxiety plays a significant role in language acquisition. Therefore all the three conceptual frameworks suggest that creation of low anxiety environment with positive affect would enhance

learners' language acquisition process. The insights from the above discussion have assisted us in designing our intervention for reducing high anxious learners' language speaking anxiety.

2.6. Measuring anxiety

For the last forty years, the research in this area has been flourishing with researchers trying hard to explore the concept from different dimensions but since anxiety is a very complex phenomenon it was really difficult for the researchers to measure the construct of anxiety totally or entirely. Therefore, one of the biggest challenges that the researchers of this area confronted with was the measurement of the anxiety. In this section we will shed light on the various scales that have been developed to measure the language anxiety; along with it we will also try to select the appropriate scale for the present research study. In one of the seminal research paper MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a), reported that there are a host of scales available for measuring trait, state, and situation specific anxieties. The following is the brief description of the more prominent scales within each research tradition.

2.6.1 Trait and state anxiety scales

First commonly used Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS) was established by Taylor (1953) by using items from the MMPI personality test. According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1991c), MAS was the first anxiety questionnaire to be used in this area. Another, the most widely used scale for the measurement of trait and state anxiety is the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). This scale was developed by Spielberger (1983) and subsequently used in a variety

of contexts with meaningful results. The STAI claims to measure ones conscious awareness in two dimensions - state anxiety and trait anxiety. The comparison of the MAS and STAI revealed that the psychometric properties of the MAS were not as good as the STAI. Therefore, STAI may be considered as a slightly better scale for measuring anxiety, but still it does not provide the profound picture of anxiety to the researcher.

2.6.2 Situation specific scales

A number of studies have incorporated a scale intended specifically to assess foreign language anxiety. The studies conducted to date using these situation specific scales have shown promising results than do those studies using trait-state type of measures.

The first scale of situation specific paradigm was The French Class Anxiety Scale, originally included in a study by Gardner and Smythe (1975). It was followed by the development of scales tapping English use anxiety (Clement, et al. 1977) and English test anxiety (Clement, et al. 1980). This scale has been adapted for other languages, including French (Gardner, & smythe, 1980), and Spanish (Muchnick & Wolfe, 1982). Subsequently, Horwitz et al. (1986) developed a 33-item measure, The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). The scale measures learners' language anxiety on the 33 items ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. So far many researchers (Matsuds & Gobel, 2004; Liu, 2006; Trang, 2012) have used this scale and they are of the opinion that among these scales, FLCAS is a fully reliable and valid tool for measuring SL/FL anxiety (Matsuds & Gobel, 2004;

Liu, 2006; Trang, 2012). Therefore, based on the needs and requirements of the current study, we have adapted the FLCAS. Another reason for selecting the scale for the research study was that it was the only scale which was typically designed to measure learners' language speaking anxiety.

2.7. Language anxiety and second/foreign language research

So far researchers researching language anxiety have been able to explore various facets of the language anxiety. However the complex nature of the construct has not only made them little skeptical about their findings and question the aptness of their research but it also has created a scope for further research in the same area. Therefore most of the researchers working in this area undertook their studies more often. By now researchers have explored various facets of language anxiety for example – influential factors or causes of language speaking anxiety (Horwitz, 1986; Mak, 2011; Bailey, Daley, and Onwuegbuzie, 1999;), the effect or the impact of language anxiety on the learner's performance (Horwitz, 1986, 2001; Krashen 1982, 1985; Sparks and Ganschow, 1991, Chastain, 1975; Young, 1990; Scovel, 1978). Then, they have explored various coping strategies to reduce language speaking anxiety (Young, 1991; Christensen, 1975).

The above mentioned facets greatly correlate with the present study. Therefore in this section we will mainly review the studies conducted in the above mentioned area. To begin, the first and foremost facet of the language speaking anxiety is the influential factors or causes of language speaking anxiety. So far researchers have made an attempt to identify various influential factors or causes of language speaking anxiety, but every time they explored this facet they found new factors

or causes (Horwitz, 1986; Mak 2011). The primary reason they sighted for that was the complex nature of the construct. According to Horwitz (2001), the complex nature of the language anxiety not only has potential for the mixed results but it also suggests the need for further investigation for understanding the construct. Whenever we think of the construct of language speaking anxiety the name that appears in the list of prominent researchers is Prof. Horwitz. She was the one who actually initiated the research in this area. In 1986, Horwitz and her colleagues designed a tool for measuring foreign language learners' classroom speaking anxiety and tried to explore some of the influential factors responsible for it. They conducted their study with seventy eight learners at the University of Texas and found three most important influential factors of language speaking anxiety: communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. They conducted their study mainly by using quantitative approach.

Another study conducted in this area was by Bailey, Daley, and Onwuegbuzie, (1999). In this study they investigated various influential factors responsible for language speaking anxiety. Like Horwitz (1986) they also conducted their research in the foreign language context. They conducted their study with 210 students studying at the university. The study was conducted by using quantitative approach with a series of instruments like FLCAS designed by Horwitz (1986), the self perception profile for college students, the social interdependence scale, the academic locus of control scale, the study habits inventory, and background demographic form. With the help of these instruments they found seven factors (learner age, academic achievement, prior history of visiting foreign countries,

prior high school experience with foreign languages, expected overall average for current language course, perceived scholastic competence, and perceived self-worth) responsible for the language speaking anxiety.

Then, Tsiplakides, and Keramida, (2009) carried out a study in which they tried to investigate questions like what are the characteristics of anxious learners? And what makes the learners anxious? They carried out this study in the foreign language context with fifty students studying in the lower secondary school. For this research study they employed purely qualitative research design and collected their data by using classroom- based case studies. In this study they found that perception of low abilities in English and the fear of negative evaluation were mainly the two important factors that caused language anxiety in the learners.

The other study which explored the influential factors responsible for language speaking anxiety was conducted by Mak (2011). The study was conducted with 313 ESL learners studying at the university level. The primary aim of this study was to investigate various factors responsible for language speaking anxiety. To conduct this study the author used mixed method approach. To investigate the factors responsible for language speaking anxiety, he used FLCAS, learners' semi-structured interviews, discussions and participants observations. In this study the author found five influential factors (speech anxiety and fear of negative evaluation; uncomfortableness when speaking with native speakers; negative attitude towards English classrooms; negative self-evaluation; and fear of failing the class) responsible for participants language speaking anxiety. Apart from these five factors, Mak (2011) also found that factors like speaking in front of the

class, being corrected while speaking, inadequate wait time also contribute to the language speaking anxiety.

The critical overview of these studies indicates that the researchers have investigated the factors causing language speaking anxiety mostly in the foreign language context (Horwitz, 1986; Horwitz, 2001; Bailey, Daley, and Onwuegbuzie, 1999), and very few of them like Lee, 1991 and Mak, 2011 have attempted to investigate such phenomenon in the second language context. This indicates that there is a significant deficiency in the research work done in the second language context which might create noteworthy problems for generalizing the results. Therefore, it is very important to reduce this deficiency by conducting more research studies in the second language context. So by conducting the research in the second language context, the present study makes an attempt to bridge this gap between foreign language anxiety research and second language anxiety research.

Another critical impression that we have drawn from the above-discussed studies is that these studies have mostly used quantitative research design than the qualitative research design. Now it's crystal clear that language anxiety is a very complex construct and employing only qualitative or quantitative research design will not be appropriate to understand the construct holistically. So there is a strong need for obtaining a third research design 'mixed methods' for holistic understanding of the construct. Therefore to gain holistic understanding of the language speaking anxiety, we used mix methods research design in our study. Another impression that we have gained through the above- discussed studies is

that all studies have explored the factors that cause language speaking anxiety in the English learners. However their findings show very small level of similarity in identified factors.

For instance, Horwitz (1986), found three factors: communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. Then Bailey, Daley, and Onwuegbuzie (1999) found seven factors: learner age, academic achievement, prior history of visiting foreign countries, prior high school experience with foreign languages, expected overall average for current language course, perceived scholastic competence, and perceived self-worth. Later Tsiplakides, and Keramida, (2009), found two factors similar to Horwitz (1986). They are perception of low ability in English and the fear of negative evaluation. Then Mak (2011) found five factors: speech anxiety and fear of negative evaluation, uncomfortableness when speaking with native speakers, negative attitude towards English classrooms; negative self-evaluation, and fear of failing the class. This indicates that still there is wide possibility of discovering new factors that might cause language speaking anxiety in the language learners.

While exploring various factors that cause language speaking anxiety in the language learners some of the researchers (Horwitz, 1986; Krashen 1982, 1985; Sparks and Ganschow, 1991, Phillips, 1992; Chastain, 1975; Young, 1990, Scovel, 1978, Liu, 2006) tried to investigate the effect or the impact of language anxiety on the learner's performance.

In 1986, Horwitz and her colleagues investigated the impact of language anxiety on the learners' performance and the factors responsible for it. They conducted their study with seventy-eight learners at the University of Texas, in foreign language context and found that the language anxiety has a negative impact on the learners' language performance. In that study, they found that anxious students are widespread in foreign language classrooms and they face numerous problems while dealing with the speaking tasks of language learning.

Another study which investigated the impact of language anxiety on the learners' speaking performance was conducted by Phillips (1992). The aim of this study was to evaluate the influence of foreign language anxiety on the learners speaking performance. This study was carried out in the foreign language context with 44 university learners studying French. In this study, Phillips (ibid.) found that there is a negative correlation between language anxiety and high anxious learners speaking performance. In this study they found that high anxious learners' performance was strongly influenced by the language anxiety. So they finally stated that language anxiety has a debilitative impact on the high anxious learners speaking performance. To generalize the finding of the Phillips (1992) study was replicated by Hewitt and Stephenson (2012), with 40 learners' studying English at the university level. For this study they used FLCAS, an oral examination tasks and learner interviews. Their findings revealed that there is a debilitative impact of language anxiety on the learners speaking performance. Further, they also stated that their replication of study have got almost similar results with their sample.

While keeping the interest in exploring the effect of language anxiety on the learners' performance, Young (1990) conducted her study with 244 learners' studying at university level. This study was purely quantitative in nature. In this study, the author found language anxiety has a negative effect on the learners' performance. Further, he stated that language learners get anxiety in response to three general areas: activity-task, speaking errors, and lack of preparedness.

Later, Liu (2006) investigated the impact and factors of language speaking anxiety in the EFL context. He took 98 Chinese mixed proficiency learners as a sample for his study. He used mixed methods research design and found that there was a negative correlation between learner language anxiety and language performance. Further, he also found that due to the negative impact of language anxiety learners opted to drop out of the course.

Although researchers like Horwitz, 1986; Phillips, 1992: Hewitt and Stephenson, 2012; Young, 1990 have found a negative correlation between language anxiety and speaking performance, yet quite a few other researchers like Ganschow and Sparks (1991) have found positive (Facilitative) or no impact of language anxiety on the learners speaking performance. For instance the findings of a series of studies conducted by Ganschow, Sparks and their colleagues (1991) suggest that the language anxiety has positive impact on the learners' written and oral performance. In these studies they found that anxious language learners performed better on oral as well as written foreign language measures as well as on the modern language aptitude test. Therefore, on the basis of their findings they proposed Linguistic Coding Differences Hypotheses. According to them

(1991), "Foreign language learning is based primarily on one's native language learning ability and students' anxiety about foreign language learning is likely to be a consequence of their foreign language learning difficulties".

The above discussion on the impact of language anxiety and language performance indicates that language anxiety might have either positive or negative impact on the learners speaking performance. Although the findings of studies done in this area have mostly revealed negative impact of language anxiety on the learners speaking performance, the positive findings cannot be neglected. Therefore, it's crucial for the researchers to know the impact of language anxiety in their context and then plan their further study.

The literature on the anxiety reduction strategies reveals that the strategies suggested in the literature are based on the researchers' intuition and not empirically proven. Therefore considering this as one of the gaps in the research, the present research study tries to bridge this gap. An important study on anxiety reduction strategies is that of Young (1992). In 1992 Young conducted interviews with the specialists (Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin) in this area. The author's main focus was to understand the language anxiety from their perspectives and explore various strategies to reduce language anxiety. Through the interviews she found the following anxiety reduction strategies –

- The use of comprehensible and interesting input

- Conduct group and pair work

- Avoid explicit error correction

- Make learners relaxed by using music

- Create awareness in the learners about their anxiety

Another theoretical paper which provides significantly good perspective on the means of overcoming language anxiety is by McCoy (1979). According to him language learners' anxiety can be reduced with three strategies – systematic desensitization, cognitive restructuring, and modeling and guided practice. In brief these are some of the strategies given in the literature and as language researchers we need to conduct more empirical studies to explore other means to overcome learners' language speaking anxiety.

Apart from these theoretical papers, some researchers (Kondo, 1997, Kondo and Ying-Ling, 2004) have investigated coping strategies from students' perspective. For instance, Kondo and Ying-Ling (2004), studied what coping strategies learners use when they get into the anxiety-provoking classroom situations. They conducted this study with 209 Japanese university learners by following purely qualitative research design. The finding of the research suggest that the university learners used mainly five categories of strategies – preparation (studying hard, trying to obtain good summaries of lecture notes), relaxation (taking a deep breath, trying to calm down), positive thinking (imagining oneself giving a good performance, trying to enjoy tension), peer seeking (looking for help from other) and resignation (giving up, sleeping in the class).

In brief, it is clear that very few empirical studies have been carried out on the strategies that help learners in reducing their language anxiety. Thus considering

this gap the present study makes an attempt to identify which strategies work best in reducing especially high anxious learners' language anxiety.

2.8 Conclusion

To conclude, in this chapter, we have shed light on various facets of language anxiety. To do so, we began with the role and significance of affect in ESL context and discussed language anxiety as an identifiable affective factor in EFL/ESL context. Then, we looked at several definitions of language anxiety and decided on one which would be apt for the present research. Later, we explored the theoretical underpinnings of language anxiety by discussing the conceptual framework like - state anxiety vs. trait anxiety, situation- specific anxiety, facilitating vs. debilitating anxiety, and the theory of foreign language anxiety. After illuminating this, we discussed anxiety and some part of theories of second language acquisition anxiety. Then, we looked at measuring scales such as trait and state anxiety scales and situation specific scales. And lastly, we explored various research studies done in this area. In the next chapter we will discuss and elaborate on the methods and the research design of the research study.