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ABSTRACT

The Effect of Language Learning Experience on Motivation and Anxiety of Foreign Language Learning Students

Josie Eileen Thacker
Department of Linguistics, BYU
Master of Arts

The purpose of this study was to examine how motivation and anxiety within learners studying a foreign language are affected by a participant’s language requirement (whether a participant has a language requirement as part of their education), language class level, and language learning environment (those with traditional classroom verses significant in-country experience). The current study surveyed and analyzed the responses of 124 students currently enrolled in a language class at Brigham Young University. Self-reported survey results demonstrate the relationship between motivation and anxiety with relation to language class level, language learning experience, and language requirement fulfillment. Further analyses were done in order to explore the interaction of different types of motivation (instrumental, integrative, intrinsic and resultative) and different types of anxiety (classroom, text anxiety and fear of negative evaluation) on the three factors examined in this study.

Results indicated that there was a significant difference in motivation for participants whose major required taking foreign language courses and those whose major did not require a foreign language. Specifically, the results of the sub types of motivation (integrative, intrinsic, instrumental, and resultative) indicated that those that were required to take the language as a requirement had higher instrumental motivation than those that were not required to take a foreign language. The second significant finding of this study is that there was no effect on motivation and anxiety levels of participants with regard to language class level with one exception. Students at the 200 level had greater language class anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other levels did. The third significant finding was that significant in-country experience did not affect motivation or anxiety. These results demonstrate that several factors may influence students’ motivation and anxiety levels when learning a foreign language.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There has been a steady increase of research focusing on the impact of several psychological factors on second language (L2) acquisition over time. In particular several studies in the past thirty years have examined the effect of motivation (Clement et al. 1994; Dornyei, 2001; Gardner and MacIntyre, 1993; Mehrpour and Vojdani, 2012; Tuan, 2012) and anxiety (Horwitz et al. 1986; Liu, 2006; Liu and Jackson, 2008; MacIntyre and Gardner, 1989) on learning a foreign language.

Motivation has been used to explain learners’ language learning differences (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002) and is a significant factor in rate and success (proficiency gains) of language learning (Dornyei, 1998). Anxiety has generally been viewed as detrimental to attention span and deliberate focused learning tasks, such as vocabulary memorization and foreign language communication role-play (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) defined anxiety as a “subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry” (p.125). Anxiety is negatively linked to foreign language learning and may prevent learners from achieving a higher language proficiency (Aida, 1994). Although many have studied the effects of motivation and anxiety in language learning (e.g., Brown, Robson, and Rosenkjar, 2001; Gardner, Masgoret, Tennant, and Mihic, 2004; Hao, Liu, and Hao, 2004) few studies have been conducted to specifically define the relationship between the two although they both have been significantly correlated with second language acquisition achievement (Liu and Huang, 2011).

The current study replicates Tsai & Chang (2013) who found that English learning anxiety and English learning motivation were impacted by several factors such as gender, major, and other factors. In their study, there was a total of 857 participants (452 male and 404 female), who were enrolled in a university freshman English course. Participants were asked to complete
a survey, consisting of a 16-item Foreign Language Learning Motivation Scale (See Appendix A), a 24-item Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (See Appendix B), and demographic questions. All the items except the background questions were answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Most learners experienced greater instrumental motivation than integrative motivation while learning English but their classroom levels of anxiety in learning English were higher than levels of English use test anxiety. In addition, some of the factors influenced their levels of anxiety and motivation. For example, male students had greater English class anxiety than English use and test anxiety. By contrast, female students experienced greater English use and test anxiety than English class anxiety. (They had two different majors: English-majoring students and non-English Majoring students).

The Tsai & Chang (2013) study also focused specifically on students learning English in a school located in Taiwan. None of the students had significant in-country experience and all had progressed through the school’s language program from novice level to higher levels.

The current study differs from Tsai & Chang (2013) because it examines extrinsic factors such as significant in-country experience, various proficiency rates when beginning traditional classroom learning, and analyzes multiple foreign language being taught. Brigham Young University has become known as a language learning hub and teaches 62 different languages, and 30 with sufficient interest, in the traditional classroom setting and nearly 65% of students speaking a foreign language and 128 languages spoken on campus (Hollingshead, 2019). Many students having begun their foreign language learning endeavors through significant in-country experience. Proficiency levels were analyzed in relationship to anxiety and motivation in this study in order to see whether extrinsic factors such as in-country experience and language graduation requirements.
It will answer these three questions.

1. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety vary depending on whether taking a foreign language is a requirement for one’s major or not?

2. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ depending on language class level?

3. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ for those who have learned in a traditional classroom environment versus those with significant in-country experience?

These three questions were investigated by asking current foreign language students questions based on the Foreign Language Learning Questionnaire, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Questionnaire (FLACS) (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) and a 24-item foreign language anxiety level scale (Horowitz, 1986).
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study examines several important factors that can affect a learner’s motivation and anxiety while learning a foreign language. This chapter will first discuss previous research on motivation and anxiety. It will then address past research on the three factors pertinent to this study: language class level, language context, and language requirement.

2.1 Motivation

Motivation is the start of a student’s entire language learning experience because it is “what brought them there in the first place” or what propels the students through their language learning struggles and “[I]n fact, neither ability nor good teaching without motivation is sufficient to ensure success in foreign language learning” (Oliveira, 2011, pp. 20). A meta-analysis of 75 different samples from studies totaling 10,489 learners found that higher motivation leads to higher language class level achievement (Masgoret & Gardner, 2003). Motivation is primary in initial second language learning and “later the driving force to sustain the long and often tedious learning process; indeed, all the other factors involved in L2 acquisition presuppose motivation to some extent” (Dörnyei, 1998, p. 117). Without motivation language acquisition would not be acquired. Terrell (1989, p. 208) explains that language acquisition isn’t likely if the learner “is not open to the target language and culture” and that for the learner lacking motivation to learn the language and lacking “empathy or identification with speakers of the target language, acquisition will be difficult.” (Terrell, 1989).

It has been found that motivation is not constant through the lengthy process of mastering certain subjects but is associated with a dynamically changing and evolving mental process, characterized by constant (re)appraisal and balancing of the various internal and external influences that the individual is exposed to (Dörnyei and Skehan, 2003). Unlike personality and
aptitude, motivation is not viewed as a static attribute but instead something that changes from
day to day and even lesson to lesson (Dörnyei, 2006). This creates a complex dynamic that
makes motivation difficult to capture.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) conducted a twelve-year study including motivation as a
key variable in an attempt to understand the varying success rates of language learners. Their
approach was created from the study of social psychology causing the focus to be centered on
social and cultural aspects of language learning. They concluded that along with aptitude,
motivation is an integral part in the language learning process and that attitude affects one’s
motivation. Gardner (1985) states that motivation is in reference to the “combination of effort
plus desire to achieve the goal plus favourable attitudes towards learning the language” (p. 10).

2.1.1 Socio-Educational Model
The original socio-educational model (1979) proposed that the dominate two factors in L2
learning were aptitude and motivation, with more emphasis on motivation. The model explored
motivation occurring in two separate learning environments: formal (class room) and informal
settings (cultural context). Gardner argued that formal (class room) and informal settings
(cultural context) played “distinct roles in boosting” a learner’s performance. “[T]he educational
context became a place where explicit instruction and correction occurs, whereas the cultural
context was an area allowing the learners to become immersed in the other culture without
placing any specific rules or instructions” (Gardner, 2011). In both learning environments
language learners become “increasingly knowledgeable and more confident” in various social
and cultural settings which in turn motivates them to gain further advancement and proficiency
in L2 (Sajid-us-Salam, 2008). This tends to have varying linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes.
Linguistic outcomes are that the learners are likely to develop L2 proficiency and fluency, where
non-linguistic outcomes can involve attitude changes toward the L2’s culture (Sajid-us-Salam,
Revisions to the socio-educational model in order to better explain motivation have included the addition of three sub-measures: intensity, desire to learn, and attitude (Dörnyei, 1998). Many researchers claim that a learner’s attitude towards L2 learning has a high influence on motivation because of its strong correlation with direct behavior such as learning (Dörnyei, 1998).

Linguistic self-confidence has arguably played “the most important role” in language learning motivation (Dörnyei, 2005). “Linguistic self-confidence refers to a person's perceptions of their own competence and ability to accomplish tasks successfully” (Clement, R 1980). It is established through the interactions between the learner and language community members and becomes increasingly strengthened through the quality and quantity of the interactions.

2.1.2 Motivation types

Motivation has commonly been broken down into two types (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Integrative motivation refers to learning through a holistic effect (a focus on all parts of foreign language learning instead of on one aspect at a time) with focus on language development and culture, as well as the development of positive attitudes toward the target culture and a personal desire and willingness to identify with the people and culture. Instrumental motivation refers to learning by immediate and practical goals. It is also a reflection of practical advancement such as career advancement (Bakker, 2007). In order for motivation to exist desire, effort, and positive attitudes toward learning a foreign language are necessary (Gardner, 1985).

It was discovered in Gardner and Lambert’s study (1972) that integrative motivation, mentioned above, was a stronger predicator in L2 achievements than instrumental motivation and its effects continue to be explored today (Dörnyei, 2003; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009; Noels, 2001).
Dörnyei (2005) divides motivation differently using self-determination theory discussing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation, similar to integrative motivation, refers to learning a language for pleasure while extrinsic motivation relates to instrumental motivation in reference to learning a foreign language because of punishment or reward from a social environment (Noels et al., 2001). Noels (2001) also explored the self-determination theory and developed the Language Learning Orientation Scale which “categorizes a person's motivational orientation as either intrinsic, extrinsic, or amotivated based on a continuum of self-determination.” Dörnyei (2005) found that in the language learning classroom teachers who were “autonomy supportive and non-controlling” promoted intrinsic motivation learning in students.

Two other types of motivation have also been explored and will be examined in this study. Intrinsic motivation occurs when students are motivated to learn a language for its access to a group or culture. For example, proficiency in French gives access to original works of French literature and can assist in gaining social status of being educated or the advantage of “the usefulness of Spanish” in the United States occurs because of the high concentration of Hispanic immigrants in the United States (Oliveira, 2011). Resultative motivation refers to the relationship between motivation and achievement (UKEssays, 2018). Ellis (1994) explained resultative motivation as “interactive” and that a learner’s motivation is “affected by their achievement”. Gardner, Smythe and Clement (1979); suggested that “while greater motivation and attitudes lead to better learning, the converse is not true” (Cited from Ellis, 1994).

In the current study, the relationship between motivation and language learning is analyzed through two lenses: (1) looking at motivation wholistically (2) examining the effect of instrumental, integrative, intrinsic and resultative motivation in particular. The current study
examines all of these types of motivation and how they may differ for students depending on their language requirement, in-country experience, and language class level

2.2 Anxiety

Anxiety in foreign language learning was studied early in a psychological context as a single broad construct (Guiora, Brannon, & Dull, 1972; Pimsleur, Mosberg, & Morrison, 1962; Smith, 1971). Its development was through studies in the field of psychology and was mainly measured using psychological instruments (e.g., Alpert & Haber, 1960; Spielberger, 1983; Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1968; Taylor, 1953). Distinctions were brought to aspects of anxiety including facilitating (beneficial) and debilitating (inhibiting) as well as trait and state anxiety. While anxiety is often viewed as negative there can be some positive aspects. Scovel (1991) explains that facilitating anxiety “motivates the learner to ‘fight’ the new learning task; it gears the learner emotionally for approach behavior” (p. 22). On the other hand, debilitating anxiety “motivates the learner to ‘flee’ the new learning task; it stimulates the individual emotionally to adopt avoidance behavior” (Scovel, 1991, p. 22). State anxiety refers to an emotional state of a person consciously perceiving feelings of tension and apprehension as well as heightened automatic nervous system activity to a present stressful situation (Coco, 1971) and trait anxiety refers to a person’s tendency to experience anxiety traits in response to perceived threatening situations which increase elevations of their personal perceptions of stress (Spielberger, 1969). These aspects broadened the depth of the construct of anxiety and spurred research into new measures of anxiety as well as encouraging theoretical and methodological sophistication (Scovel, 1978). Anxiety “is most typically seen as a debilitating factor (i.e., a factor negatively affecting L2 acquisition)” (Dewey, Belnap, Steffen, 2018).
Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) defined anxiety as a “subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry” (p.125) – a feeling negatively linked to foreign language learning that prevents learners from achieving a higher language proficiency (Aida, 1994). “Anxiety can affect any individual, and it impacts most if not all language learners to some extent, especially in a classroom setting” (Gaillard, 2017). Anxiety has also been described as worrying about an event in the past, present, or future without regard towards if it might actually occur or not (Anisman, 2015). Stress and anxiety have also been discussed as being nearly synonymous. Stress can be described as an “emotional strain or tension” and is usually accompanied by responses such as higher heart rate, blood pressure, sweating, indigestion (for descriptions, see Irving, Dobkin & Park, 2009). “One might think of stress as a response to stressors (demands exceeding current resources) and think of anxiety (worry over stressors) as an additional stressor” (Dewey, Belnap, Steffen, 2018).

Horowitz et al. (1986) is well known for reconceptualizing second language acquisition (SLA) research through the anxiety that occurs within foreign language classroom instruction context and is credited with the development of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). FLCAS has become the standard for measuring foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA). The current study will use FLCAS to measure anxiety in participants. Other researchers have studied other aspects of FLCA such as negative evaluation, fear of failing, and speech anxiety, typically using items from the FLACS. Horowitz (2017) argues that many items from the FLCAS scale have been related to test anxiety, speech anxiety, and communicative anxiety and so forth, but that these were subcomponents of FLCA based on the results of the FLCAS, and that FLCA is still its own distinct construct.
Horwitz, and Cope (1986) state that there are three main performance anxieties attributed to language learning in a formal classroom setting, meaning the “formal learning of a language” setting with peers. They are communication apprehension (example: I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my foreign language class), social evaluation (I am afraid the other students will laugh at me when I speak my foreign language), and test anxiety (I am usually at ease during tests in my foreign language class) because of the complexities of anxiety, it manifests differently in different learners and may appear as a combination of these types.

2.2.1 Second Language Research

In SLA research there has been a large focus on negative affective factors with anxiety being the most commonly researched. Anxiety has been negatively linked to learners’ self-assessment of their foreign language proficiency (Liu & Jackson, 2008), performance on sub-listening skills of comprehension (Elkhafaifi, 2005), reading and writing (Argaman & Abu-Rabia, 2002) as well as pronunciation (Szyszka, 2017)

Many applied linguist researchers have proposed methods in order to lessen the effects of anxiety on individuals and to make strides to increase acquisition, including “The Natural Approach” (see Krashen & Terrell 1983; Terrell 1977), “The Silent Way” (see Gattegno, 1972), “Suggestopedia” (see Ostrander & Schroeder, 1970), and “Counseling Learning” (see Curran, 1976), all of which demonstrate a greater awareness of the negative effects of anxiety on language learning.

SLA researchers have examined the cause of anxiety. Young (1991) identified six interrelated sources of language learning anxiety. They are (1) fear of a real or anticipated act of speaking, (2) learner beliefs toward language learning, (3) teacher beliefs about language instruction, (4) interaction between instructor and learners, (5) classroom procedures, and (6) language exams. Each of these six are related to one of two categories: personal and
interpersonal anxieties. Phillips (1991) collected data that suggests that students bring their own misconceptions and expectations to class and this likely heightens anxiety. His research concludes that those with anxiety will likely have a negative experience with language learning and consequently have a negative attitude. Anxiety has been said to have the greatest impact on a learner’s foreign language speaking abilities (Frantzen and Magnan, 2005; Horwitz et al., 1986). Anxiety is also related to foreign language performance constructs including: attitude and motivation (Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995), willingness to communicate (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément & Noels, 1998), confidence and self-esteem (Clément et al. 1994; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994), attitudes toward errors and mistakes (Mak & White, 1997), and personality (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995).

Anxiety is typically divided into two types (Jackson, 2002). The first, situational anxiety is anxiety that comes because of course contents, level, activities, and social interactions with peer groups in class (Jackson, 2002). The second type is learning variables such as cultures, selfbelief, and ability, for example, that may also affect anxiety (Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001; Campbell, 1999; Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). These factors generally combine in different ways to create different anxiety forms depending on each individual. For example, a common form of anxiety appearing in language learners is in a classroom setting which usually consists of nervousness during language activities, avoiding complex sentence structures, and a reticence towards willingness to communicate (MacIntyre, 1995; MacIntyre, et. Al., 1997). It has also been found that those with characteristic anxiety are more often people that are perfectionistic (Price, 1991) or suffer from low self-esteem when comparing themselves to others (Cheng, 2002).
“Anxiety can affect any individual, and it impacts most if not all language learners to some extent, especially in a classroom setting” (Gaillard, 2013, pp.22). The affective filter was proposed when Krashen recognized the presence of anxiety in all language learners. Krashen’s theory (1982) as explained in Omaggio Hadley (2001) states that the affective filter is low “when the affective conditions are optimal: (1) the acquirer is motivated; (2) he has self-confidence and a good self-image; and (3) his level of anxiety is low. When learners are ‘put on the defensive’ [...], the affective filter is high, and comprehensible input cannot ‘get in’” (p. 62). Krashen states that all learners have an affective filter therefore it is necessary for teachers to reduce the affective filter in order to enable students to progress in language acquisition (1982, as cited in Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Suggestopedia and the Natural Approach were created in order to reduce the learner’s anxiety and teachers were encouraged to give less error correction and allow the students to experience a natural “silent stage” (Omaggio-Hadley, 2001). Further research has shown that “anxiety can render the language learning experience so unpleasant that learners often stop language study even when they are doing well” (Bichon, 2000). This current study will also analyze the three different sub-types of anxiety. They are classroom, text anxiety and fear of negative evaluation.

2.3 Language class level, language learning experience, and language requirement fulfillment

The following section outlines previous research on the relationship between motivation and anxiety and the three factors examined in this study (language class level, language learning experience, and language requirement).

2.3.1 Language Class Level

The correlation between anxiety and motivation has spurred many studies with various results. In relation to language class levels, Liu (2006) found that English proficiency was
positively correlated with the student’s motivation to learn. In Hessel’s study on German Learners it was found that anxiety, with other variables, predicated foreign language proficiency gains on German learners (Hessel, 2016). It was found in a study of Saudi students learning English in Ireland that proficiency in English was the best predictor on classroom anxiety experienced abroad (Alhammad, 2017). There have also been results showing that those with less anxiety exceeded their peers because they accelerate faster at language learning proficiency (Aida, 1994). Brown, Robson, and Rosenkjar, (2001), stated that learners’ motivation and anxiety were negatively correlated, and a lack of motivation could be the cause of anxious behaviors. In short, this current study will evaluate the relationship between anxiety and motivation in language class level to further explore the effect of proficiency level (defined in the study as a class level) and levels of motivation and anxiety.

2.3.2 Language Context

Language context has also been of wide interest. Gardner (1985) explains that “languages are unlike any other subject taught in a classroom in that they involve the acquisition of skills and behaviour patterns, which are characteristics of another community” (p.146). He attributes the nature of such complexity to the social adaptations and changes that learning a foreign language entails. Woodrow (2006) makes an important statement when saying that “[a] distinction is made...between learning English as a foreign language and learning English as a second language. It is argued that living in an environment where the target language is also the language of everyday communication may influence anxiety” (p. 309). Woodrow’s (2006) participants stated that their anxiety “became heightened” most often when speaking with native speakers. This statement implies that the environment in which a language is learned is a contributing factor to anxiety level. It seems reasonable to assume that a student learning English in the United States would experience more anxiety because of the necessity to use
English outside of the classroom (e.g. at the grocery store). That could mean that there are language learners who begin experience less anxiety in a formal classroom setting after having experienced a significant in-country language learning opportunity but more research would be required. Effiong (2016) also adds that “[w]ith different results emerging from different FLA studies, it is clear that anxiety is not stable across instructional contexts” (p. 137). These “instructional contexts” include English as a second language, English foreign language, and university students studying second or additional languages. Both Woodrow (2006) and Effiong (2016) agree that more research exploring ESL anxiety is needed.

A widely cited study regarding foreign language anxiety and study abroad used mixed methods to analyze anxiety of the 25 participants learning French as a foreign language who spent 6 weeks abroad in Paris. The Foreign Language Anxiety Scale was used to measure classroom anxiety, the French Use Anxiety Scale to measure anxiety during every day, out-of-class communicative interactions (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995), and their own State Anxiety Scale to measure participants opinions on their own anxiety when engaging in the language assessments administered for the research project. Open ended surveys and interviews followed the study abroad in order to understand sources and manifestations of anxiety during the study abroad. It was found that anxiety, over all three anxiety scales, decreased over the 6-week study abroad. Participants also expressed insecurities about linguistic incompetence and cultural familiarity early on and later were described as having a sense of “confidence, calm, and poise”. The change occurred because of linguistic “victories”, wants and needs, and common communications with native speakers (Allen & Herron, 2003, p. 378). It is believed that levels of communicative anxiety decreased as learners become more capable of daily communicative situations and being able to meet their own personal needs.
Further supporting the idea that time abroad can further reduce anxiety, Hessel (2016) found that anxiety decreased (as measured by items assessing anxiety interacting out of the class) over a three-month period of a year-long study abroad by 143 Germans studying in the United Kingdom. Thompson and Lee (2014) found that good predictors of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale results were the amount of time spent abroad and the self-reported foreign language class level based off of a study for Korean learners of English which spent various amounts of time abroad. After a year of living in an English-speaking country it was found that their anxiety levels were lower overall on the FLCAS than those with less experience. They also stated that “initial experience abroad can actually cause more anxiety”. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) found, “as time passes, this anxiety is lessened to the point of being less than before the experience abroad” (Thompson & Lee, 2014, p. 271). In their study, they had learners who had been only a few weeks abroad, a time period that others (e.g., Roitblat, Cleminson, Kavin, Schonberger, & Shterenshis, 2017) have believed is when anxiety peaks during study abroad.

Addressing the notion of anxiety changes in the first few weeks abroad, Wang (2016) using qualitative methods (interviews, observations, diaries) to analyze anxiety during a 3-week study abroad period, found no reduction in anxiety or increase in anxiety. She notes a complex relationship between anxiety, identity, social interaction, and language development. Wang says that there was “minimal impact on students’ English language learning in general and on reducing their anxiety in particular” (p. iii).

Another way researchers’ have sought to understand anxiety in the language learning context is to study the difference between foreign language anxiety and second language anxiety. These two contexts differ in that second language anxiety occurs in a situation where the
language being learned is spoken in the environment outside of the classroom, such as those language learners studying English in an English language setting such as the United States, Canada, or Australia. In foreign language anxiety, however, the language is not widely spoken outside of the classroom environment (Chakrabarti & Sengupta, 2012, p. 58) as in situations where English is being learned as a foreign language (such as in China, Japan, or Korea). This distinction in contexts is important to make because the nature of the environment might have an effect on the level and type of anxiety the learner experiences (Woodrow, 2006, p. 309).

Empirical data found that those with anxiety in foreign language learning were less willing to be involved in learning activities, which negatively impacted their performance results than those who were less anxious (Aida, 1994). It has also been found that learners’ motivation and anxiety were negatively correlated, and a lack of motivation could be the cause of anxious behaviors (Brown, Robson, and Rosenkjar, 2001).

2.3.3 Language Requirement

Another area of interest has been extrinsic factors in language learning, for example, requirements for graduation. To reiterate, extrinsically motivated participants are those motivation to learning a language by punishment or reward by a social environment (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2005). Extrinsic factors can refer to the effect of significant others (spouses, parents, teachers), the nature of interaction with others, the learning environment, cultural norms, wider family networks, and local education system (requirement to graduate) (M. Williams, R. Burden, 1997). For example, “both the student learning a language because it’s a requirement of a degree program and the student learning a language because she feels it will help her develop her talents in her chosen career are learning the language because it is instrumental to achieving an end other than enjoyment of the activity…” (Dörnyei, Schmidt, 2001, p. 361-398). They are learning because “of some possibility of attaining a reward” which could be achieving coursework in
order to graduate (Dörnyei, Schmidt, 2001, p. 361-398). Gardner and MacIntyre (1991) conducted a study based on whether participants would perform better on a vocabulary activity with a reward at the end. They found that the participants who were offered rewards at the end of the vocabulary task outperformed than the other comparable groups but as soon as the reward ended the positive increase ceased. The current study will also explore an effect extrinsic factors such as requirement to graduate to determine how they might affect the participants' anxiety and motivation during the language learning process.

While many conclusions have been drawn no definite answer on the correlation between anxiety and motivation has been concluded. However, based on existing literature, the complex relationships and correlations between motivation, anxiety, and language-learning outcomes is clear (Liu and Huang, 2012). A negative correlation between second and foreign language learning anxiety and achievement has been addressed in these studies mentioned earlier (Horwitz, 2001; Aida, 1994).

The purpose of this study was to examine how motivation and anxiety within learners studying a foreign language are affected by a participant’s language requirement (whether a participant has a language requirement as part of their education), language class level, and language learning environment (those with traditional classroom verses in-country experience). The current study is needed in order to better analyze the relationship between motivation and anxiety and the factors mentioned above.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

124 participants from a traditional classroom setting currently taking a foreign language class at Brigham Young University completed a survey sent in an email, with another 9 participants starting the survey but not finishing it. Participants had the option to take the survey, if they were 18 years of age or older. The participants most likely varied from novice to advanced high levels, based off of the ACTFL scale rating of each course although for this study language class level was used to determine proficiency. There were 37 participants in 100 level courses, 10 in 200 level courses, 54 in 300 level courses, and 10 who were in 400+ classes. Sixteen participants whose language class level was unknown were not included in the analysis. Students’ L2 class levels were determined by the classroom level they were currently enrolled in. Thirty-five participants were required to take the class for graduation requirements, 79 were taking the class for other reasons, and 10 were unknown and were not included in the analysis. Sixty participants had significant in-country experience and 65 did not. Within the group that had significant in-country experience, 44 participants received in-country experience through year and a half to two-year missionary service abroad, four participants completed an internship or a study abroad, one learned through military training, and two participants through visiting family, and ten participants lived in the target language country for an extended period for other reasons.

The survey was sent by email to the Center of Language Studies at Brigham Young University which was then sent to all Brigham Young University foreign language teachers currently teaching a foreign language class, who then forwarded the survey to their students of
every foreign language level. Participants were then notified that they could take the survey if they would like and that taking the survey would not their grades.

3.2 Instrument

The survey consisted of three parts. There was a background section (questions included asking the participants about their age, foreign language, reason for taking the language class, any outside foreign language learning, current college major, etc. (see Appendix A), a 16 item Foreign Language Scale, (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) (see Appendix B), and a 24-item Foreign Language Anxiety Level Scale (Horowitz, 1986), (see Appendix C). The 16-item Foreign language scale (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) and a 24-item foreign language anxiety level scale (Horowitz, 1986) had a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. The 24-item foreign language anxiety level scale had a high score of 120 and a low score of 24.

The 16-item Foreign Language Scale (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) was designed to measure four sub types of motivation. The four dimensions are integrative orientation (questions 1 to 4), instrumental orientation (questions 5 to 10), resultative orientation (questions 11 to 13), and intrinsic orientation (questions 14 to 16). For this section, there is possible a high score of 80 and a low score of 16.

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale originally had 33 questions items (Horwitz et, 1986). Nine of the original 33 question items were deemed ‘inappropriate’ by a review panel in Tsai & Chang (2013) therefore they were removed. The replication of this study also eliminated those 9 questions. The remaining 24 items were used in the survey. These 24 items are divided into three broad categories (1) communication anxiety, (2) test anxiety, and (3) fear of negative evaluation. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was also used to
measure two dimensions of foreign language classroom anxiety. They are foreign language use/test anxiety (questions 1 to 9), and Foreign Language Class Anxiety (questions 10 to 24). The 24-item foreign language anxiety level scale had a high score of 120 and a low score of 24.

All questions were listed in English in order to avoid confusion. The complete surveys are given in Appendix A, B, and C.

3.3 Data Collection

Data collection was collected using an online Qualtrics survey. The data was collected through an online survey. Participants were than notified that they could take the survey if they would like and that taking the survey would not their grades. Participants were not paid for their participation.

3.4 Data Analyses

The survey consisted of three parts. They are a background section (see Appendix A), a 16 item Foreign Language Scale, (Gardner and Lambert, 1972), and a 24-item Foreign Language Anxiety Level Scale (Horowitz, 1986). Each were answered using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”. A higher score indicates a higher level of foreign language anxiety or motivation, with an average score per section and two separate composites for anxiety and motivation.

For each of the study’s three questions two one-way ANOVAs were run, one examining motivation scores and another examining anxiety scores. These analyses were in order to understand the relationship between foreign language motivation and anxiety in correlation to language requirement, language class level, and significant in-country experience. Further analyses of language requirement, language class level, and significant in-country experience
(spent a substantial amount of time in country learning the foreign language) was examined using two one-way ANOVAs to analyze the sub types of motivation and anxiety.
4. RESULTS

4.1 Question 1: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety vary depending on whether it is a requirement for one’s major or not?

To answer this first question, two one-way ANOVAs were run, one examining the motivation scores and one examining the anxiety scores for the participants with motivation scores as the dependent variables and requirement (yes or no) as the independent variable. Those participants who were required to take a foreign language for their major scored 58.11 on average (N = 36, SD = 9.76) while those who were not required to take a foreign language scored 53.17 (N = 79, SD = 9.78) on the motivation scale.

It was found that there was a significant difference in motivation for those whose majors required taking foreign language courses $F(1,114) = 6.297, p = .014, \eta^2_p = .053$. As such participants whose majors required a foreign language course (58.11) scored significantly higher than those whose majors did not (53.17). See Figure 1 below.
Those participants who were required to take a foreign language for their major scored 58.44 on average (N = 36, SD = 9.76) while those who were not required to take a foreign language scored 53.17 (N = 79, SD = 9.78) on the anxiety scale. While See Figure 2 below. However, there was no significant difference between the two types on the anxiety test (F(1,114) = .728, p = .395, \( \eta^2_p = .395 \)).
4.2 Question 2: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ depending on language class level?

In order to answer question 2, again, two one-way ANOVAs were run, one with motivation and one with anxiety scores for the 4 class levels. Neither anxiety nor motivation scores differed depending on class level (motivation: \(F(3,112) = 1.73, p = .164, \eta^2_p = .046\); anxiety \(F(3,112) = 2.099, p = .105, \eta^2_p = .055\)). Therefore, it was found that there were no significant differences between the various class levels.
The participants scored 54.38 on average (N (100 level) = 38, N (200 level) = 11, N (300 level) = 54, N (400 level) = 10; SD (100 level) = 9.70, SD (200 level) = 9.01, SD (300 level) = 10.49, SD (400 level) = 4.03) on the motivation scale. See in Figure 3 above.

On the anxiety scale averagely, participants who were in the 100 level class scored 56.63, 200 level class participants scored 63.36, 300 level class participants scored 56.17, and 400 level students participants scored 50.7. On average all the participants scored 56.54 (N (100 level) = 38, N (200 level) = 11, N (300 level) = 54, N (400 level) = 10; SD (100 level) = 11.76, SD (200 level) = 17.02, SD (300 level) = 10.90, SD (400 level) = 7.61). See in Figure 4 below.
4.3 Question 3: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ for those who have learned in a traditional classroom environment versus those with significant in-country experience?

Finally, a similar analysis was run to answer question 3. In this analysis, participants with significant in-country experience were compared to participants with no in-country experience using two one-way ANOVAs, one for motivation and one for anxiety scores.

Participants with significant in-country experience were compared to participants with no in-country experience. Participants with no in-country experience scored 54.59 on average (N = 61, SD = 9.98) while those who did not have a foreign language requirement scored 54.71 (N = 56, SD = 9.76) on the motivation scale. As shown visually in Figure 5 below. There was no significant difference between the two groups on the motivation test $F(1,116) = 1.66; p = .283$, $\hat{\eta}_p^2 = .010$ It was found that significant in-country experience did not affect motivation.
The anxiety scale of participants with significant in-country experience were compared to participants with no in-country experience. Participants with no in-country experience scored 55.57 on average (N = 61, SD = 13.00) while those who were not required to take a foreign language scored 58.16 (N = 56, SD = 12.87) on the motivation scale. However, there was no significant difference between the two groups on the anxiety test $F(1, 116) = .005, p = .946, \eta_p^2 = .000$ It was found that significant in-country experience did not affect anxiety. See Figure 6 below.
4.5 Results of proficiency level, language requirement, and significant in-country experience on different sub types of motivation and anxiety

Analyses of the sub types of motivation and anxiety in relation to proficiency level, language requirement, and significant in-country experience wasn’t originally planned but later became of interest in better understanding the relationship between motivation and anxiety in language learning. Statistics were also run on the varying types of motivation and anxiety levels in order to better examine their relation to proficiency level, language requirement, and significant in-country experience. The varying types of motivation examined were integrative orientation, instrumental orientation, resultative orientation, and intrinsic orientation and anxiety types being communication anxiety and test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. The results are organized by relation to proficiency level, language requirement, and significant in-country experience.

4.5 Results of proficiency on different types of motivation and anxiety
A series of two, one for motivation and for anxiety, one-way ANOVAs were run on data for the 4 proficiency levels, similar to the analyses described above. Only one of these analyses reached significance. It was found that 200 level students had greater Language Class Anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups did. These findings are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of proficiency on different types of motivation and anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>η²p 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Class Anxiety</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.088 (group 2 scored lower than the other groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Orientation</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative orientation</td>
<td>3.047</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.077 (group 2 scored lower than the other groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use and Test Anxiety</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Results of Significant in-Country Experience on different types of motivation and anxiety

In order to answer question 2, again, two one-way ANOVAs were run, for the participants motivation and anxiety sub types scores. There was no significant difference between the motivational and anxiety types in those with no significant in-country experience and those with significant in-country experience with regards to the five additional analyses. These findings are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of Significant in-Country Experience on different types of motivation and anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>η²p 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>F statistic</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>$\eta^2_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Class Anxiety</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Orientation</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>8.301</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative Orientation</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use and Test</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, a similar analysis was run to assess the effect of integrative orientation, instrumental orientation, resultative orientation, and intrinsic orientation and anxiety types being communication anxiety and test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation on language requirement. The results indicate that there was a significant difference in those that were required to take the language as a requirement though it only affected their instrumental motivation (see Table 3).

Table 3: Results of Language Requirement on different types of motivation and anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>$\eta^2_p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Orientation</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Class Anxiety</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Orientation</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>8.301</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resultative Orientation</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(motivation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use and Test</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant findings involving language requirement were that there was a significant difference in motivation for those whose majors required taking foreign language courses and through further analyses of the motivation sub types it was found it only affected their
instrumental motivation. It was also found that 200 level students had greater Language Class Anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups did.
5. DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine how motivation and anxiety within learners studying a foreign language are affected by a participant’s language requirement (whether a participant has a language requirement as part of their education), language level (operationalized as their class level), and language learning environment (those with traditional classroom or in-country experience). This section will discuss the results of these three research questions:

1. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety vary depending on whether taking a foreign language is a requirement for one’s major or not?
2. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ depending on language proficiency?
3. How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ for those who have learned in a traditional classroom environment verses those with significant in-country experience?

Along with discussing the findings for each of these questions this section will also discuss this study’s limitations, future research ideas, and implications.

5.1 Question 1: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety vary depending on whether it is a requirement for one’s major or not?

It was found that there was a significant difference in motivation for those whose majors required taking foreign language courses. More statistical analyses were also run on the sub types of anxiety and motivation. The results indicate that there was a significant difference between those that were required to take the language as a requirement and those who did not. It was found that language requirement only affected instrumental motivation (referencing to
learning by immediate and practical goals. However, there was no significant difference between
the two groups on the anxiety test.

These results were to be expected because of previous research done with previous
findings that have extrinsic factors (language requirement) significantly altered motivation
(Dörnyei and Schmidt, 2001, p. 361-398) and increase performance levels (MacIntyre, 1991).
The results of motivation in participants learning a foreign language were similar to the results in
the Tsai & Chang (2013) study. They found that “[i]n general, instrumental motivation plays an
important role in English learning motivation to English-majoring students, whereas, integrative
motivation plays a significant part in English learning motivation to non-English-majoring
students.”

The results of anxiety testing were surprising because Tsai & Change (2013) found that
there was a significant increase on participant’s anxiety who had a language requirement but in
the current study anxiety was not altered because of a participant’s language requirement. This is
interesting because it was originally thought that anxiety would be higher in those who had
extrinsic factors. Tsai & Change (2013) had 857 participants and divided them into two groups:
English-majoring students and non-English-majoring students. This current study divided the
participants into two different groups: Majors with a foreign language requirement and majors
without a foreign language requirement. This division was made because there was a lower
number of participants with a foreign language as their major.

These results advance our knowledge of the relationship between motivation and
extrinsic factors in language learning in that those who are instrumentally motivated have higher
motivation levels than those who aren’t instrumentally motivated, and that anxiety wasn’t
affected based on language requirement in this study.
5.2 Question 2: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ depending on language proficiency?

It was found that neither general anxiety nor general motivation scores differed depending on proficiency level. The different types of motivation and anxiety sub types were also analyzed using statistical analyses. It was discovered that 200 level students had greater language class anxiety and lower resultative motivation (relationship to achievement) than the other groups did.

The proficiency levels results were as expected because in Tsai & Chang (2013) found that varied English language proficiency groups had only a “slight effect on English learning motivation of the intermediate group.” They also found that higher-intermediate, intermediate or lower-intermediate levels “identified that their English class anxieties were more extreme than those regarding English use and test anxiety.” This was also found in the current study. In the current study it was discovered that the 200 level students had greater language class anxiety but also found a varied result from Tsai & Change (2013) that 200 level participants had lower resultative motivation.

Proficiency levels were analyzed in this study to see the relevance on whether extrinsic factors such as in- country experience and language graduation requirements had an effect on the anxiety and motivation of participants learning a language in a traditional classroom setting. Previous research indicates that those with high proficiency rates may still experience high levels of anxiety when using their foreign language furthermore anxiety has been negatively linked to obtaining higher proficiency rates (Aida, 1994). Liu (2006) found that English proficiency was positively correlated with the student’s motivation to learn.
Since there was no change in motivation and anxiety from participants in lower proficiency rates to those in higher proficiency rates it is reasonable to conclude that proficiency rate had a consistent effect on their motivation or anxiety on learning a language through the many proficiency levels. However, in further analyses of motivation and anxieties sub types the results in that 200 level students had greater language class anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups which adds to what is unique to this study. This could because of the anticipation of having the following class be with students who may have experienced 1-2 years learning a foreign language out of the class.

5.3 Question 3: How do foreign language learning motivation and anxiety differ for those who have learned in a traditional classroom environment verses those with significant in-country experience?

It was found that significant in-country experience did not affect overall motivation or anxiety. Further analyses into the sub types of motivation and anxiety also indicated that there was no significant difference between the motivational and anxiety types of those with no significant in-country experience and those with significant in-country experience.

In-country experiences and traditional classroom settings have been known to alter the motivation and anxiety levels in participants. In both learning environments language learners become “increasingly knowledgeable and more confident” in various social and cultural settings which in turn motivates them to gain further advancement and proficiency in L2 (Sajid-us-Salam, M. 2008).

In one study involving anxiety and residence abroad, Woodrow (2006) found that “…living in an environment where the target language is also the language of everyday communication may influence anxiety” (p. 309). Allen & Herron (2003) conducted a study with
participants studying French in France for a 6-week study abroad. They found that over all three anxiety scales that participant’s anxiety levels became less over the 6-week study abroad and later the participants described themselves as becoming “confident, calm, and poised.” Contrary to this sort of previous research the current study indicates that there was no significant anxiety difference between those with in-country experience and those without.

The results tell us that anxiety and motivation, including anxiety and motivation sub types, were not altered when a participant had a significant in-country experience verses those who have only learned in a traditional classroom setting at the particular time the questionnaire was completed. The results of this current study are interesting because even with a strong relationship with culture, native speakers, and living in the country these experiences have not affected participant’s motivation on learning the language or their anxiety on using the foreign language more than those without in country experience.
6. CONCLUSION

Although this research was planned out with thoughtful care there are limitations to consider. This study is limited in that it only measured anxiety and motivation at one specific moment in time (the moment when the questionnaire was answered) verses either various moments throughout the semester or when they were experiencing a significant in-country experience verses the present moment of learning in a classroom setting. With regard to significant in-country experience not all participants listed the length of time they spent abroad. Specifically, examining exact length of time spent in significant in-country experience may have altered the results.

Secondly, another limitation is that participants pursuing more than just a major in their current program of study, such as university minors or a language certificate, were not recognized when analyzing whether a language was required to graduate. Considering a program minor is not required but are decided upon by the participant participating in school although there are certain minors that require a language requirement in order to obtain them. This current study did not ask if the participants were enrolled in a university minor or language certificate alongside their major, they were only their college major was.

Another limitation of the study was in how the statistics were conducted. Each factor (language requirement, language proficiency and language experience) were analyzed separately. It is likely that a mixed effects analysis that included all factors in the analysis would have produced more accurate results of the influence of these three factors on anxiety and motivation. Further research is needed to verify the statistical analyses in this thesis.

The final limitation was that proficiency rate was measured by which class level the participant was enrolled in at the time of the study and not by the objective test. There often are
participants who enroll in classes not appropriate for their levels (typically lower than they can handle) for reasons such as the time the course is offered being convenient or the need for an easier class to complement harder ones in a given term. Therefore, there may be participants classified as lower level even though they qualify at higher proficiency levels.

Despite its limitations, this study does include important implications to better the understanding of how foreign languages are learned. First it was found that language requirement had a significant effect on motivation specifically participants instrumental motivation. Secondly, it was also found that 200 level participants experienced greater language class anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups. This adds to research that there is a difference between proficiency levels on certain anxiety and motivation types and that language requirement do have an effect on participants’ motivation.

6.1 Implications and Further Research

The implications of this study open some avenues for future research. Some of the limitations listed in the previous section could be addressed in further research and improve the findings. More research can be done using the current data collected, such as analyzing the relationship between the participant’s specific languages in relation to anxiety and motivation as well as research based on why each participant has chosen their specific language to learn. The sub types of motivation and anxiety type could also be analyzed in future research in relation to why the participant chose a specific language.

Future research could be done on a participant’s current language context in relation to long-term effects (after the significant in-country experience) on anxiety and motivation. For example, researchers could compare motivation and anxiety before, during and after in-country
experiences and also see how those responses compare with anxiety levels at-home in a classroom before or after residence abroad.

There also can be further analysis of why only 200 level students experienced greater language class anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups. A further analysis into the differences between the proficiency levels could yield interesting results. Such as examining the differences of proficiency level by further analyses of the sub types of anxiety and motivation.

In conclusion, though this study has its limitations it does adds to the body of knowledge already existing in the field. First that it was found that there was a significant difference in motivation for those whose majors required taking foreign language courses. Specifically, the results of the sub types of motivation indicate that there was a significant difference in those that were required to take the language as a requirement though it only affected their instrumental motivation. The second significant finding of this study is that there was no effect on motivation and anxiety levels of participants with regard to proficiency level aside from the fact that 200-level students had greater Language Class Anxiety and lower resultative motivation than the other groups did. The third significant finding was that significant in-country experience did not affect motivation or anxiety.
7. APPENDIX

7.1 Appendix A: Background Questionnaire

1. What is your current major?
2. What foreign language class are you currently enrolled in? (please include course code)
3. Have you studied this foreign language before taking a class? If so, where?
4. Why are you taking a foreign language class?
5. Why have you chosen to learn this specific foreign language?
6. Are you over the age of 18?

7.2 Appendix B: Foreign Language Learning Motivation Questionnaire

1. My foreign language will help me acquire new ideas and broaden my outlook.
2. My foreign language will enable me to better understand and appreciate my foreign language’s culture.
3. I am interested in my foreign language’s music.
4. I can learn more about the world through learning my foreign language.
5. My foreign language is necessary to get a good job.
6. My foreign language is essential to be active in society.
7. My foreign language will help me if I should ever travel abroad.
8. My foreign language is essential for personal development.
9. My foreign language will be helpful for my future career.
10. My foreign language will help me to pass my exams and graduate from college.
11. I like to discuss something in my foreign language but not in first language.
12. I enjoy discussions in my foreign language class.
13. It is important to use a course book in class.
15. I try to use my foreign language as much as possible in class time.
16. I always enjoy learning my foreign language.

7.3 Appendix C: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Questionnaire

1. I am usually at ease during tests in my foreign language class.
2. I worry about the consequences of failing in my foreign language.
3. I get nervous when my foreign language teacher asks questions when I have not prepared in advance.
4. The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.
5. When called up on to use my foreign language, I feel very much at ease.
6. I feel anxious if someone asks me something in my foreign language.
7. I would feel uncomfortable speaking my foreign language under any circumstances.
8. I would feel quite relaxed if I had to ask street directions in my foreign language.
9. It would bother me if I had to speak my foreign language on the phone.
10. I don’t usually get a clear idea when I have to respond to a question in my foreign language class.
11. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my foreign language class.
12. I always feel that the other students speak my foreign language better than I do.
13. I feel confident when asked to participate in my foreign language class.
14. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my foreign language class.
15. I am afraid the other students will laugh at me when I speak my foreign language.
16. I don’t worry about making mistakes in my foreign language class.
17. During my foreign language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
18. I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying.
19. Even if I am well prepared for my foreign language class, I feel anxious about it.
20. I often feel like not going to my foreign language class.
21. I am afraid that my foreign language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
22. My foreign language class moves so quickly, I worry about getting left behind.
23. I feel more tense and nervous in my foreign language class than in other classes.
24. When I am on my way to my foreign language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
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