

INTERPLAY AMONG ANXIETY, MOTIVATION, AND AUTONOMY IN SECOND  
LANGUAGE LEARNERS OF FRENCH: A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE  
STUDY

By

MANJULA SHINGE

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2005

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Theresa Antes, Dr. Gillian Lord, Dr. Candace Harper and Dr. Virginia LoCastro for having served on my committee, and for providing me with invaluable guidance, feedback and encouragement.

My heartfelt thanks go to the instructors and students of the two French classes observed. It would have been difficult to conduct this study without their willingness and cooperation throughout the data collection process.

The encouragement and patience extended to me by my dear family and friends were much appreciated. I wish so much that my mother had lived just a year longer to witness the completion of this dissertation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Purpose of the Study .....	3
Research Questions.....	3
Quantitative .....	3
Qualitative .....	3
Significance of the Study.....	4
Organization of the Study .....	4
Definitions of Terms Used.....	5
Affective Factors .....	5
Anxiety .....	5
Motivation .....	5
Autonomy .....	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW .....	6
Individual Differences .....	6
Anxiety .....	8
Motivation.....	17
The Anxiety-Motivation Interface.....	25
Autonomy .....	26
The Motivation-Autonomy Interface.....	29
The Anxiety-Motivation-Autonomy Interface .....	32
3 METHODOLOGY .....	35
Participants .....	35
Procedures.....	39

Instruments .....	42
In-house French Test .....	42
The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) .....	42
The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) .....	44
The Questionnaire on Autonomy .....	44
Class Observations .....	45
Journals.....	46
Student Interviews .....	47
Teacher Interviews .....	47
Quantitative Data.....	48
Qualitative Data.....	50
Notes .....	51
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	52
Type of Anxiety.....	52
Research Question 1 .....	54
Research Question 2 .....	58
Correlation between Anxiety and Motivation .....	59
Correlation between Anxiety and Autonomy.....	60
Correlation between Motivation and Autonomy .....	63
Research Question 3 .....	65
Research Question 4 .....	70
Research Question 5 .....	74
Research Question 6 .....	76
Research Question 7 .....	85
Test Anxiety .....	88
Extensive Material.....	88
Fast Pace of Class.....	89
Language Requirement.....	89
Communication with Instructor.....	89
Dissatisfaction with Class.....	90
5 CONCLUSION.....	93
Summary.....	93
Pedagogical Implications.....	94
Anxiety and Motivation.....	94
Anxiety and Autonomy .....	95
Motivation and Autonomy .....	95
Anxiety, Motivation and Class Grades.....	96
Teacher Effect .....	97
Possible Reasons for Lack of Motivation.....	97
Limitations of the Study .....	97
Future research .....	98

## APPENDIX

A	PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE.....	100
B	IN-HOUSE FRENCH TEST .....	102
C	QUESTIONNAIRE ON ANXIETY .....	106
D	QUESTIONNAIRE ON MOTIVATION.....	109
E	QUESTIONNAIRE ON AUTONOMY .....	113
F	TOPICS FOR JOURNAL.....	117
G	QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT INTERVIEWS.....	119
H	QUESTIONS FOR TEACHER INTERVIEWS .....	120
I	OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS WHO EXPERIENCED HIGH LEVELS OF ANXIETY, MOTIVATION, AND AUTONOMY .....	121
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	129

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
3.1 Relevant demography of students (total N=32) .....	38
3.2 The range of points for the three categories on each measure. ....	42
4.1 Student classification based on scores received on questionnaires (n=32).....	55
4.3 The correlations among participants' levels of the three variables.....	59
4.4 Students who were highly anxious and/or highly autonomous .....	61
4.5 Paired samples t-test results showing change only in motivation levels.....	66
4.6 Group differences in motivation scores .....	67
4.7 Correlation of changes from test to retest .....	69
4.8 Changes in one factor showing corresponding changes in others.....	70
4.9 Summary of correlations between the French test scores/class grades and affective factors .....	71
4.10 Correlation between anxiety scores of moderately anxious participants and their French test scores .....	73
4.11 Correlation between anxiety scores of moderately anxious participants and their final class grades .....	74
4.12 Group-wise mean scores on the three questionnaires during Week 5.....	75
4.13 Group-wise mean scores on each questionnaire during Week 13.....	75
4.14 Students who are highly motivated and highly autonomous during Test 1 and/or Test 2.....	76

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

INTERPLAY AMONG ANXIETY, MOTIVATION, AND AUTONOMY IN SECOND  
LANGUAGE LEARNERS OF FRENCH: A QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE  
STUDY

By

Manjula Shinge

December 2005

Chair: Theresa A. Antes  
Major Department: Linguistics

Research in second language learning has shown a close connection between anxiety and motivation as well as between motivation and autonomy. This study goes one step further in examining the interactions among these three affective factors, namely, anxiety, motivation and autonomy, and their influence on class performance. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected over the course of the semester. The 32 participants, who were first-year French students at the University of Florida, completed four instruments during Weeks 5 and 13 of the semester. The instruments used were an in-house French test, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, and The Roles of Learners and Teachers, which is a questionnaire on autonomy. The students were observed in their French classes at least once a week. Eleven students wrote journal entries and six participated in an interview. The results showed that, in general, approximately 22-25% of the participants in this study were highly anxious, 53-59% were highly motivated, while 13-16% were highly

autonomous. Of the three affective factors, there was a correlation only between motivation and autonomy. Further, the participants' levels of anxiety and autonomy were stable from test to re-test, but there was a statistically significant decrease in their levels of motivation. This change in the participants' levels of motivation did not correlate with a corresponding significant change in the other two factors, but results show that there are possibilities of changes occurring in both anxiety and autonomy. Only anxiety had a negative correlation with students' class performance. Results also showed that students who are autonomous are also motivated, but students who are motivated are not always autonomous.

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Research in the field of second language acquisition acknowledges that both cognitive and affective factors within a language learner affect the level of success that will be achieved in learning a second language (L2). Earlier research concentrated on discovering the effect of cognitive factors on language learning, but since the 1960s, there have been more investigations on determining the effect of affective factors, such as anxiety and motivation (Gardner, 1985; Skehan, 1989). Affective factors are defined as “those that deal with the emotional reactions and motivations of the learner” (Scovel, 1978:131).

Most studies have found an inverse relationship between anxiety and language achievement of L2 learners, but in some cases it has been observed that anxiety encourages a student to work harder, resulting in better class performance (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; Phillips, 1992; Trylong, 1987). With regards to motivation, evidence shows that motivated students perform better in the classroom than those who are unmotivated. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) are of the opinion that both anxiety and motivation influence language learning and are good predictors of success. Their data suggest that the two variables have an inverse relationship, such that the higher the levels of anxiety experienced by the learners, the less motivated they tend to be. Consequently, these students put less effort into their learning process, which often results in lower class grades. The same studies show, however, that moderate levels of anxiety can act as an incentive and motivate the learners to work harder, potentially resulting in higher grades.

More recently, researchers have examined the relationship between motivation and autonomy. Dickinson (1995) posits that when learners are actively and independently involved in their own learning, their motivation levels increase and they learn more effectively. Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002) speculate on whether autonomy precedes motivation or motivation precedes autonomy in a language learner. In other words, they question whether students should first be motivated in order to develop and show signs of being actively and independently involved in their learning, or whether they should first be autonomous, which will then influence their motivation levels to increase. While most investigations reveal that motivation and autonomy are distinct factors, views differ on whether students need to first be motivated or autonomous in order to be successful language learners.

Recognizing that second language research has found a close relationship between motivation and anxiety, and also between motivation and autonomy, one wonders how these three affective factors interact together and what effect they would have together on students' class grades. Anxiety and motivation are considered to be good predictors of success, and learners' levels of motivation are said to rise when they are actively and independently involved in their own learning. Does this mean that teachers will have to concentrate on encouraging students to be autonomous in order to increase their motivation to learn more effectively, rather than trying to motivate them to follow the established curriculum? What relationship do anxiety and autonomy have? Can anxious students be autonomous? What happens to the correlation with other factors when there is a change in one of them? These are the questions the present study seeks to answer.

### **Purpose of the Study**

This study seeks to observe the levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy in beginning French students, and to determine if these affective factors are stable over an eight-week period. Correlation tests are run to examine how these three affective factors interact with each other and what effect they have on participants' class performance. An attempt is also made to ascertain the degree to which motivation and autonomy are distinct factors. Finally, a comparison is made between the quantitative results obtained from two intact classes taught by different instructors in order to investigate possible differences and, if any, reasons for these.

### **Research Questions**

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative data. Accordingly, the research questions are divided into two sections:

#### **Quantitative**

1. To what extent, if any, are the participants anxious, motivated, and autonomous?
2. To what extent, if any, is there a correlation among the participants' stated levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy?
3. To what extent, if any, are the participants' levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy stable over time?
4. What is the correlation between the three affective factors and students' performance, as measured by the French test and the final class grade?
5. In what ways, if any, do the results obtained from the participants in the two intact classes, taught by different instructors, differ?

#### **Qualitative**

6. Are motivation and autonomy distinct factors?
7. What are some possible reasons for a change, if any, in the levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy experienced by the participants from test to retest?

### **Significance of the Study**

Earlier studies have explored the relationship between the two affective factors of anxiety and motivation and their effect on class performance. Other studies have also investigated the role of autonomy in language learning, but no known study thus far has investigated the combined interactions and influence of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy on class performance or language achievement. Furthermore, unlike most previous studies, which relied on one type of data, this study used data collection procedures that were both quantitative and qualitative in nature in the hope that a more complete picture of the interaction among the three affective variables can be obtained. The participants completed questionnaires on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy towards the beginning as well as the end of the semester, and were observed in class at least once a week throughout the semester. They also submitted four journal entries on specific topics given to them at intervals, and at the end of the semester were interviewed about their experiences in the French course.

### **Organization of the Study**

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2, provides an overview of the research carried out in the area of individual differences of second language learners, and focuses on the three affective factors under consideration in this study. Chapter 3 describes the methodology used in this study. A detailed account of the instruments used and both the quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures are described. The Results and Discussion chapter, Chapter 4, gives the results of the tests run on the quantitative data collected and discusses these results, along with describing the qualitative data collected. Finally, Chapter 5 brings the

dissertation to a close by summarizing results, suggesting pedagogical implications, discussing the limitations of the study, and outlining avenues for possible future research.

### **Definitions of Terms Used**

#### **Affective Factors**

Affective factors are defined as “those that deal with the emotional reactions and motivations of the learner” (Scovel, 1978:131).

#### **Anxiety**

Anxiety is defined as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994:284).

#### **Motivation**

“Motivation refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect” (Keller, 1983:389).

#### **Autonomy**

Autonomy is “the ability to take charge of one’s learning . . . To take charge of one’s learning is to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning” (Holec, 1981:3).

## CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Individual Differences**

A substantial amount of research done in second or foreign language learning has revealed that the individual differences found in learners are caused by both cognitive and affective factors. As early as the 1920s, researchers (e.g., Henmon, 1929) first began to investigate cognitive factors such as language learning aptitude, learning strategies and intelligence; however, in the last four decades, second language acquisition researchers (e.g., Gardner et al., 1976; Horwitz et al., 1986) have become more aware of the fact that researching individual differences that are affective in nature, like motivation, anxiety and self-confidence, is just as important as researching the cognitive variables like language learning aptitude, learning strategies, and intelligence. They have realized that these two sets of factors work together to influence both the process and the outcome of language acquisition. Believing that each language learner is unique and works with a distinct combination of cognitive and affective variables that determine the process of second language acquisition, Gardner, Day and MacIntyre (1992) hypothesize that “there are probably as many factors that might account for individual differences in achievement in a second language as there are individuals” (p. 212). This is probably why much second language research has focused on individual differences in recent years.

Schumann (1994) strives to shed some light on the connection between these two sets of variables, the affective and cognitive, by citing Mishkin and Appenzeller (1987), who explain that the amygdale, a part of the temporal lobe in the brain, “assesses the

emotional significance and motivational relevance of stimuli; this appraisal then influences attention and memory” (p. 233). We thus learn that linguistic input, which is a form of stimulus, is first evaluated for its emotional significance and motivational relevance to the learner before it can be processed by the brain. This evaluation determines whether or not the linguistic input is attended to and stored in memory.

Considerable research in the area of second language learning reveals that emotions play an important role in language acquisition (e.g., Horwitz, 2001). Tomkins (1970) states that human beings are always experiencing some sort of emotion in varying degrees, and strong emotion can disrupt cognitive and physiological processes. This could account for the fact that some language learners perform better when they experience positive emotions such as motivation and enthusiasm, or perform poorly when they have negative emotions such as anxiety or low self esteem. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994b) concur when they claim, “Some of the strongest correlations between affective variables and achievement measures involve anxiety” (p. 284). Several studies have shown that anxiety causes cognitive interference, resulting in significant negative correlations between language anxiety and course grades (e.g., Gardner, Moorcroft, & MacIntyre, 1987; Phillips, 1992; Trylong, 1987).

As a result of the growing awareness that emotions play an important role in language learning, researchers, since the 1970s, have increasingly focused on the affective variables of a language learner, such as anxiety (e.g., Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey & Daley, 2000; Saito & Samimy, 1996) and motivation (e.g., Dornyei & Schmidt, 2001; Gardner, Tremblay & Masgoret, 1997). In the last two decades researchers have also turned their attention to the variable of autonomy (e.g.,

Benson, 2001; Little, 1991; Littlewood, 1996). They have found that both anxiety and motivation are good predictors of success in language learning, and that motivation and autonomy share a relationship. For these reasons, this study strives to investigate and shed some light on the interplay among the three affective factors of anxiety, motivation and autonomy in college students learning French as a foreign language.

### **Anxiety**

In 1978, Scovel examined the relationship between anxiety and second language achievement and concluded that anxiety is one of the most predominant variables identified in language learning tasks. He observed that different studies used a variety of instruments to measure anxiety and came up with different results. He believed that their results would be less conflicting if the researchers specified the type of anxiety (e.g., state anxiety, trait anxiety, and test anxiety) they were measuring which would have made it easier to compare the results. Much later, Young (1994) provided a comprehensive overview of the major research carried out on language anxiety since the 1970s, and tabulated the findings of various researchers, although the results were often contradictory and a consensus had yet to be reached. Some studies showed a negative correlation between language anxiety and language performance (Aida, 1994; Coulombe, 2000; Saito & Samimy, 1996), while other studies showed no effect or a positive correlation between the two (Chastain, 1975; Kleinmann, 1977). In one study, some of the least proficient students scored the highest on an anxiety scale, whereas others scored the lowest (Backman, 1976). One of the reasons Young (1994) offers for these inconsistent results is that “many of the studies had different goals, objectives, definitions, and conceptual schemata, rendering comparisons difficult” (p. 4). The

second reason she offers is the lack of a reliable and valid instrument for measuring foreign language anxiety.

Observing that researchers had “neither adequately defined foreign language anxiety nor described its specific effects on foreign language learning,” Horwitz et al. (1986:125) attempted to fill this gap by conceptualizing foreign language anxiety as a distinct variable, so that both language students and teachers would be able to recognize the symptoms and consequences. They developed the FLCAS as a standard measure to determine levels of foreign language anxiety. Young (1994) explains that with the introduction of a valid and reliable measuring instrument, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz et al., 1986), research on language anxiety began to consistently show a moderate negative correlation between anxiety and language achievement. This observation supported Scovel’s view that researchers were getting conflicting results in their studies because they were using a variety of instruments to measure different types of anxiety.

Early researchers did not try to define foreign language anxiety because of its complex, and multidimensional nature (Young, 1991). But later, MacIntyre and Gardner (1994b) defined language anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (p. 284).

Some researchers have found that language learners who experienced a higher level of anxiety were more likely to be motivated to perform better in class and receive higher grades than students with a lower level of anxiety. Alpert and Haber (1960) called this type of language anxiety “facilitating.” Other research (e.g., Trylong, 1987) found that

anxiety has the opposite effect on a language learner, where higher levels of anxiety result in lower grades and is termed “debilitating.” Scovel (1978) explores the likelihood that both faces of anxiety, are at work together whenever a person performs any activity. One part within an individual stimulates and stirs, while the other quiets and balances, resulting in an optimal mental state that motivates the learner to perform the task well. It seems that having the right amount of anxiety, rather than none at all, might be beneficial to language learning. The anxiety one feels at the possibility of failure may serve to motivate a language learner to strive harder and achieve success. This not-so-unusual phenomenon is elucidated by Eysenck (1979) who posits that “the extent to which anxiety either facilitates or impairs performance is determined by the extent to which high-anxiety subjects compensate for reduced processing effectiveness by enhanced effort” (p. 365). Thus, it is widely accepted that anxiety can influence both the amount of effort a language learner invests in a task and the quality of performance.

Other distinctions that researchers have made in their quest to discover the different types of anxiety are “trait anxiety” and “state anxiety.” Spielberger (1983) defines trait anxiety as an individual’s likelihood of becoming anxious in any situation, whereas state anxiety is apprehension which is experienced only in some specific situations, for example, in a language classroom. MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) define trait anxiety as a stable propensity to be anxious in a number of different situations, while referring to state anxiety as an unpleasant emotional condition or temporary state which one experiences at a particular moment in time. In other words, trait anxiety is considered to be a permanent personality feature, while state anxiety depends on the manner in which an individual reacts to the circumstances she or he is in.

Yet another type of anxiety that researchers have investigated is the situation-specific anxiety in which the “respondents are tested for their anxiety reactions in a well-defined situation such as public speaking, writing examinations” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991:90). In these studies, the “respondents are required to make attributions of anxiety to particular sources.... By testing more detailed hypotheses, the process by which a given situation generates anxiety can be examined” (p. 91) and the anxiety-creating sources are identified.

Researchers have not only identified different kinds of anxieties, but they have also documented the observable changes that occur in individuals who experience anxiety. Physiological signs of anxiety include perspiration, sweaty palms, dry mouth, muscle contractions and tension, and an increase in heart rate (Chastain 1975; Gardner et al.1985; Steinberg and Horwitz 1986). Behavioral signs of anxiety in an academic setting include avoiding class, not completing assignments, and a preoccupation with the performance of other students in class (Bailey 1983; Horwitz et al. 1986; Young 1992). It is possible that language teachers may consider such behavior as disruptive and thus miss an opportunity to identify and help their anxious students. Language anxiety even results in learners experiencing a “distortion of sounds, inability to produce the intonation and rhythm of the language, ‘freezing up’ when called on to perform, and forgetting words or phrases just learned or simply refusing to speak and remaining silent” (Young 1991:430).

Teachers in most classrooms have observed students who have exhibited one or more of the signs of anxiety while engaged in different language tasks, and at different levels of instruction. They have also probably wondered what exactly happens when a

student is anxious in the language classroom that makes it impossible for her/him to benefit from instruction. In order to find answers, researchers have examined the effect of language anxiety on different tasks. As expected, a negative relationship was found between foreign language anxiety and course grades of students in high school (Gardner et al., 1987) as well as in college (Trylong, 1987). Language anxiety has a negative impact on performance in oral examinations (Phillips, 1992), and on production of vocabulary (Gardner et al., 1987). It was also found that students with the highest levels of foreign language anxiety tended to report that (1) they spend too much time on some subjects and not enough time on others, (2) they frequently do not get enough sleep and feel sluggish in class or when studying, (3) they do not take breaks to avoid becoming too tired while studying, and (4) they have trouble settling down to work and do not begin to study as soon as they sit down (Bailey, Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 2000). Horwitz et al. (1986) observed that anxious students studied harder to compensate for their lack of confidence, had difficulty retrieving items from memory during exams, and had a fear of making mistakes, leading to silence instead of participation. Clearly, anxiety has a negative effect on language learners and it is not surprising that researchers claim that anxiety is one of the best predictors of second language achievement (Ehrman & Oxford, 1995; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994a, 1994b) because of the negative correlation between anxiety and performance. Teachers work very hard to ensure that language learners are successful in their classes. If teachers are able to identify their anxious students, they might be able to modify their teaching styles and strategies to help the anxious students feel more comfortable in class and thus have the opportunity to learn better.

One wonders what it is that happens to an anxious student's cognitive ability, to cause poor class performance. As early as 1979, Eysenck hypothesized that an anxious person's cognitive abilities are used not only to complete a task but also to deal with the emotional aspects of accomplishing the task, doing neither full justice, thus resulting in poor performance. He further postulated that an anxious student studies much harder than a less anxious student to compensate for the cognitive interference. When the task is simple, the anxiety experienced by a learner is facilitative. But when the task is difficult, the anxiety experienced interferes with the cognitive abilities and is debilitating.

MacIntyre (1995) elaborates on this hypothesis:

... a demand to answer a question in a second language class may cause a student to become anxious; anxiety leads to worry and rumination. Cognitive performance is diminished because of the divided attention and therefore performance suffers, leading to negative self-evaluations and more self-deprecating cognition which further impairs performance. (p. 92)

He further claims that this relation between anxiety and performance is relatively strong evidence in favor of considering anxiety as one of the major factors that creates individual differences among second language learners.

One of the first studies that sought to observe and analyze anxiety in students at different levels of proficiency was by Saito and Samimy (1996). Their study comprised 257 students in the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels of Japanese courses at the University of Texas at Austin. The goals of their study were (1) to find the relationship between language anxiety and language performance at the three different instructional levels, and (2) to find the variables that significantly correlated with Japanese class anxiety at each of these three levels. The variables included in their analyses were gender, year in college, length of time in Japan, time spent studying for the

class, language class anxiety, language class risk-taking, language class sociability, strength of motivation, attitude toward the Japanese class, concern for grade, and final course grade.

The researchers found that “year in college” was the best predictor of students’ final grades only at the beginning level. “In other words, for college students in the beginning Japanese classes, those who began (studying Japanese) at an upper level, such as seniors or graduate students, were predicted by the model to receive higher grades, while those who had just started college, such as freshmen, were predicted to receive lower grades” (Saito & Samimy, 1996:245). An explanation provided by the authors for this occurrence is that the students with high achievement scores are the most determined to protect their grade point average. It is possible that the senior students had already mastered some learning strategies in college and were better able to cope with tests and assignments, resulting in better grades than the freshmen and juniors. It is also possible that the seniors were more concerned about their grades than the freshmen, and so were more determined to protect their grade point average.

On comparing the mean scores for language anxiety of the students at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels, the researchers discovered that the advanced students scored the highest, the intermediate students scored the lowest and the beginners scored in between the other two levels. These results contrasted with those obtained by Gardner et al. (1977), who discovered that language beginners had the highest mean scores for anxiety and the advanced students had the lowest mean scores, indicating that foreign language anxiety “decreases as proficiency and training increase” (p. 251). Similar results were obtained by MacIntyre and Gardner (1991), who claimed

that experience and proficiency are inversely proportionate to anxiety levels in a language learner. Differing from both these stances, Bailey et al. (1998) investigated the anxiety reported by 253 college students from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds enrolled in either Spanish, French, or German classes. Their analysis indicated no difference in anxiety about foreign languages among students in these three classes.

Saito and Samimy provide us with a rationale for the conflicting results they obtained in their study in comparison with the results of Gardner et al. (1977). They claim that foreign language anxiety is high in beginners of more commonly taught languages, such as Spanish and French, because the learners are still in the process of developing successful learning strategies. However, foreign language anxiety is high in the advanced students in less commonly taught languages, such as Japanese, because at this level more emphasis is placed on reading and writing rather than speaking and listening, which is a challenge to the students. As a result, they do not have as much time to practice their conversational skills and lack the confidence to speak the language, which in turn, raises their anxiety levels. These findings suggest that the levels of anxiety that language learners experience at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced stages of language learning, depend on the language being learnt.

Onwuegbuzie et al. (1999) conducted a study with 210 university students in the United States to investigate which factors out of 26 possible, correlated with language anxiety. They included:

direct measures of self-perception (e.g., perceived intellectual ability, perceived scholastic competence, perceived self-worth, and expected final course average for current language course) as well as measures of constructs that are manifestations of self-perceptions (i.e. social interdependence and study habits) (p. 221)

The participants represented 43 different degree programs offered at a mid-southern university, and were enrolled in French, Spanish, German and Japanese classes at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction. The majority of the students had never traveled outside the United States; however, they took this language course as a requirement toward their degree. Most of the participants had previously studied a foreign language, either in high school or college and the final grades they expected ranged from 68 to 100, with a mean of 87.1.

The researchers found seven variables that accounted for 40% of the total variance in foreign language anxiety. Those were: a student's expectation of her or his achievement in a foreign language course (18% of variance); the number of foreign countries visited (5%); perceived scholastic competence (5%); perceived self-worth (5%); age (4% of variance); number of high school foreign language courses taken (1-2%) and academic achievement (1-2%). The researchers did not find any significant differences in the levels of foreign language anxiety between students enrolled in beginning, intermediate or advanced classes, but they did find a significant difference in anxiety levels with "year of study" as an independent variable. Foreign language anxiety appeared to increase linearly, which means that in the same language classroom, freshmen reported the lowest levels of foreign language anxiety and seniors reported the highest levels.

The researchers do not give any information about the students' final grades in that language classroom, but they do suggest some reasons for the high anxiety level in the senior students. A higher proportion of seniors had already taken at least one college-level foreign language course, which was not the case with the freshmen or sophomores.

It may be possible that many of the seniors had formed negative attitudes about language classes through previous experience with learning languages in high school or college, which resulted in their higher levels of anxiety or probably led to their decision to delay taking a language course until it could not be put off any longer. The fact that the seniors in this study reported higher levels of foreign language anxiety is consistent with the results obtained by Crook (1979) and Hunt (1989) in their research. Finally, the advanced level students in this study had a higher grade point average than the beginning or intermediate level students, which might also account for higher anxiety levels in the language classroom. Karabenick and Knapp (1988) found that students with high academic achievement avoided asking for help because they perceived it as a sign of failure, which in turn, increased their anxiety levels. High achievers were also anxious about taking foreign language courses because they felt their grade point average would be adversely affected and were most determined to protect their grade point average. All these studies on language anxiety reveal that anxiety is a complex factor which is manifested in many different forms.

### **Motivation**

The term “motivation” is used and is easily understood in everyday conversations, yet, like anxiety, it has been difficult for researchers to agree on a definition or model for motivation as it relates to language learning. Motivation is considered to be one of the most important factors determining success in second or foreign language acquisition and language teachers are constantly striving to find ways to motivate their students. Its role in language learning has been examined in relation with other affective factors, such as language anxiety and language aptitude. In 1959, Gardner and Lambert demonstrated that motivation and language aptitude were both related to achievement in second

language learning. This study was then replicated in many different contexts and languages and it is now generally believed that individual differences in motivation are independent of individual differences in language aptitude.

Until recently, Gardner's (1985, 1988, 1997) socio-educational model of SLA, which has undergone many changes and reformulations, dominated research in motivation. Gardner (1996) refers to motivation as the driving force in any situation and distinguishes between two distinct perspectives. One is that motivation is an internal attribute of an individual and the other is that it is an external attribute, which means that a person can be motivated by an external trigger or force, for example, when a teacher attempts to motivate a student. Gardner (1996) says, "you can't motivate a rock" (p. 25), which suggests that a student must already have the potential to be motivated by an external force, for example, a teacher, and that motivation cannot be created out of thin air.

A great deal of emphasis has been placed on the learner's aim or motive in learning a second language. If the learner's goal in learning a target language is to become a part of the target group, then the learner is said to have integrative motivation, which involves positive attitudes toward the L2 community and a desire to integrate into the community. But, if the learner's aim is to learn a second or foreign language for financial or other benefits, for example, to get a job, then the learner is said to have instrumental motivation.

Gardner's model introduces the notion of "integrative motive," and shows that it is comprised of three variables: (1) integrativeness, which is the person's desire to interact with members of the target language; (2) attitudes toward the learning situation; and (3)

motivation, which comprises the person's attitude toward learning, desire to learn, and the effort invested. Of these three, Gardner posits that it is "motivation" that influences second language achievement, while the other two variables support motivation:

Motivation to learn the second language is viewed as comprising three elements. First, the motivated individual expends effort to learn the language....there is a persistent and consistent attempt to learn the material.... Second, the motivated individual wants to achieve the goal. Such an individual will express a strong desire to learn the language, ... Third, the motivated individual will enjoy the task of learning the language. Such an individual will say that it is fun, a challenge, and enjoyable, even though at times enthusiasm may be less than at other times (Gardner, 2001:6)

Gardner drives home the point that a truly motivated language learner will possess all three of these elements: an effort to learn, a desire to learn the language, and positive feelings while engaged in learning tasks. "Thus, Gardner's concept of motivation provides for behavioural, cognitive, and affective components" (MacIntyre, et al., 2001:463).

In addition to integrative and instrumental motivation, Ely (1986) adds a third type: the need to fulfill a language requirement. Identifying this type of motivation is practical as more and more students are learning a foreign language to fulfill a language requirement at their university these days. Their motivation levels could be measured by the amount of effort they put into their learning because, according to Keller (1983), "motivation refers to the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid, and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect" (p. 389). This definition is one that language teachers might easily relate to as they work to motivate their students in the classroom. Gardner and Smythe (1975, 1981) developed the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) to assess the motivation levels within language

learners. This proved to be a very reliable instrument and has been widely used for many decades by various researchers.

Gardner's socio-educational theory was widely accepted until the mid-1990s, when researchers began to feel that the framework provided by the model was too limited and needed to be studied from different perspectives. They believed that the distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation in Gardner's model was emphasized too much, without any reference to other variables that played an important role in language acquisition, for example, self-efficacy, expectancy, attributions, and locus of control (Dörnyei, 1990, 1994; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Crookes and Schmidt (1991) felt that researchers investigating motivation should focus less on the reasons for learning language and more on defining motivation as teachers and educators would, namely, noting that a motivated student is one who "becomes productively engaged in learning tasks, and sustains that engagement, without the need for continual encouragement or direction" (p. 480). They believed that not only the concept, but also the definition of motivation needed to be developed so that all teachers and educators could relate to and accept the ideas proposed by the researchers.

Since then, several models and constructs have been proposed by researchers to define and describe the role of motivation in second language acquisition, each of them trying to add dimensions that reflect the attitudes and behavior patterns of motivated students in a language classroom and to expand the socio-educational model.

MacIntyre et al. (2001) believed that it would be unproductive to develop new models or constructs that covered the same basic concepts as did the socio-educational model.

Therefore, they decided to examine the level of empirical similarity between the variables

addressed in four different models of motivation: (1) Gardner's socio-educational model, which was designed for language learning situations, (2) Pintrich's (1991) Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ), whose variables were taken from the social-learning literature on motivation as applied to academic learning contexts, (3) Kuhl's (1994b) Action Control Scale (ASC-90), which was used in psycho-physiological studies of motivation; and (4) McCroskey's (1992) Willingness to Communicate (WTC) scale from the literature on native language communication. We observe that Gardner's socio-educational model was designed for language learning situations, whereas the other three models were designed to be used in other contexts but could also be applied to language learning.

In the second model, Pintrich et al. (1991) examine general academic motivation from an expectancy-value perspective, in which "expectancy" refers to the behavioral outcomes one would expect, and "value" refers to the desirability of those outcomes. The authors believe that the higher the value placed on a particular task, the more motivated a person will be to complete the task. This reasoning is also extended to learning languages. Pintrich et al. claim that the two-part process of learning involves the assimilation of new information and the restructuring of internalized knowledge, called accommodation. They believe that the process of restructuring internalized knowledge requires much more effort than assimilating new knowledge, and whether a language learner would take on the task of accommodation or not would depend on how motivated the learner is. The authors developed the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) to measure motivation levels in language learners. These

motivation levels or scores will indicate the likelihood of a language learner exerting the effort to restructure their internalized knowledge, which is a part of the learning process.

Kuhl (1994a), on the other hand, does not believe that learners will automatically be more motivated in a high value task because there are many learners who continue to engage in tasks that are not very productive or rewarding even though they have a choice of tackling more rewarding tasks. Kuhl's model of motivation focuses on a theory of action-versus-state orientation. He claims that action-oriented people prefer to be active and are unwilling to be passive. State-oriented people, on the other hand, are more likely to let things happen without any effort or intervention on their part, and tend to contemplate on past and present feelings without taking any action to change their affective state. This model, called the Action Control Scale (ACS-90) evaluates a person's ability to initiate and maintain levels of behavior. It was initially developed to assess differences in personality which affected a person's ability to maintain the drive to start or complete a task (MacIntyre et al., 2001), and was then extended to include the affective variable of motivation in language learning (Kuhl, 1994b).

The fourth model MacIntyre et al. examined was the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) scale by McCroskey (1992), which consists of four communication contexts: public speaking, talking in meetings, talking in small groups, and talking in dyads. McCroskey explains that there are differences in the way individuals are motivated or willing to initiate communication when they are free to do so. He believes that the two most important factors that influence willingness to communicate are communication competence and communication apprehension. Communication competence is the ability to convey verbal or written information, whereas communication apprehension is defined

as the level of fear one experiences when thinking of how one's communication with others will turn out (MacIntyre et al., 2001). Communication apprehension can have a substantial, negative impact on communication competence (Rubin, 1990) and the WTC scale would reflect a learner's level of motivation. This situation seems to parallel the impact anxiety has on student performance.

As stated above, MacIntyre et al. (2001) examined these four models to test for the degree of overlap among the constructs and found that there is considerable overlap among the various concepts addressed by these constructs. For example, Gardner's instrumental orientation and integrative motive significantly correlated with Pintrich's extrinsic goal orientation and expectancy-value, respectively. MacIntyre et al. (2001) observe "It might be surprising that there is such a high degree of overlap, but it should be noted that the Gardner model has always covered a great deal of conceptual ground" (p. 483).

Even though Dörnyei (1994) agreed that researchers would find it difficult to surpass the work done by Gardner and his associates, who "established scientific research procedures and introduced standardized assessment techniques and instruments, thus setting high research standards and bringing L2 motivation research to maturity" (p. 273), he believed that Gardner's social psychological approach was too influential and also limited. Dörnyei (1998) sought to expand on this approach by developing "a more pragmatic, education-centred approach to motivation research, which would be consistent with the perceptions of practicing teachers and, thus, be more directly relevant to classroom application" (p. 204). He identified three dimensions of motivation in order to outline a comprehensive and general framework of motivation that he feels would be

more relevant to the L2 classroom setting. The first level of his construct of motivation is the “Language Level,” where the focus is on orientations and motives related to the L2. This level includes different aspects of the second language such as the culture it conveys, the community it is spoken in, and the potential usefulness of being proficient in the language. This part of the framework is similar to Gardner’s integrative and instrumental motivational subsystem. The second level of Dörnyei’s framework is the “Learner Level,” which involves both the affective and cognitive abilities of a language learner. Individual differences, such as self-confidence and the need for achievement, are considered in this level. In talking about self-confidence, other factors, such as language anxiety and perceived L2 competence, are also included. The third level of the construct is the “Learning Situation Level,” which is made up of intrinsic and extrinsic motives and three different motivational conditions: course-specific, teacher-specific and group-specific motivational components. Dörnyei’s model of L2 motivation does seem to be more education-centered and thus more consistent with the perceptions of practicing teachers than Gardner’s socio-educational model. Teachers are aware of the three levels Dörnyei introduces, understand the demands they have to meet in each of these areas, and are prepared to put in efforts to motivate their students. This model seems to focus directly on the most important aspects of second language learning: the language, the learner, and the learning environment; but its effectiveness in explaining and measuring motivation in language learners needs to be researched and established.

Second language research has shown that motivation is multi-faceted. Some of the new themes and approaches Dörnyei (2001) presents are: social motivation, task motivation, a neurobiological explanation of motivation, and motivation from a process-

oriented perspective. Further, Oxford and Shearin (1994) explore whether motivations differ among learners of second versus foreign languages and believe that there are chances that these two motivations work differently because in a second language learning situation, the learners are exposed to the L2 inside as well as outside the classroom, which is not the case in a foreign language learning situation. Integrative motivation is an important part of the socio-educational model, but it may not have as much meaning in foreign language situations, where the students may not come in direct contact with the L2 community.

The social psychological approach to motivation in second language learning emphasizes integrative motivation because this approach is concerned with the individual in the context of a group. Undoubtedly, there is an urgent need to expand the theory of motivation beyond Gardner's widely accepted model and to try to formulate a more education-centered construct which teachers will be able to relate to and implement successfully in their classrooms, particularly in foreign language classrooms.

### **The Anxiety-Motivation Interface**

As has been stated, each language learner works with a unique combination of cognitive and affective variables, which influences the process of second language acquisition. Among the affective factors researched, anxiety and motivation, by themselves or together, have received the most attention. Schumann (1994) interprets Krashen's (1981) "affective filter" hypothesis as relating to these two factors as well: "when motivation is lacking, anxiety is high, and self-esteem is low, the filter is up and input will not become intake (i.e., input will not be processed so as to produce learning)" (p. 233). He makes a very clear connection between these two affective variables. Gardner et al. (1992) posit that "anxiety and motivation are two separate dimensions with

overlapping behavioral consequences . . . (that are) correlated yet distinguishable” (p. 212). The causal sequence cannot be established and probably differs from learner to learner. It may be that a highly motivated language learner experiences low or no anxiety levels and an unmotivated learner is very anxious.

Researchers who have investigated affective variables in language learners believe that both anxiety and motivation can predict language proficiency. MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) are of the opinion that “at the earliest stages of language learning, motivation and language aptitude are the dominant factors in determining success . . . (and) anxiety plays a negligible role in proficiency” (p. 110), but at the later stages of language learning, anxiety plays a more crucial role in determining success. They believe that if a language learner’s experiences are negative, then foreign language anxiety may become a regular occurrence and influence student performance.

### **Autonomy**

The third affective variable being investigated in this study is autonomy. The most frequently cited definition of autonomy in the context of foreign language learning is that autonomy is “the ability to take charge of one’s learning” (Holec, 1981:3). Holec further explains:

*To take charge of one’s learning* is to have, and to hold, the responsibility for all the decisions concerning all aspects of this learning,

- i.e.:
- determining the objectives;
  - defining the contents and progressions;
  - selecting methods and techniques to be used;
  - monitoring the procedure of acquisition properly speaking (rhythm, time, play, etc.);
  - evaluating what has been acquired (p. 3)

Holec focuses here on the learning process, and the factors a language learner would need to control, for effective learning to take place.

Little (1991), on the other hand, does not believe that autonomy is essentially a matter of having control of and organizing one's learning process. He feels that autonomy is a capacity – for detachment, critical reflection, decision-making, and independent action.... The capacity for autonomy will be displayed both in the way the learner learns and in the way he or she transfers what has been learned to wider contexts (p. 4).

Little believes that autonomous learning occurs not only in the confines of a classroom but spills over into every other area of life. This view of autonomy encompasses the capacity and the ability to be in control of one's cognitive faculties, and also to be able to use this capacity for language learning and beyond.

Little (1991) strives to dispel some of the misconceptions people have about autonomy in language learning. He states that some people think an autonomous person makes the decision to learn without a teacher or requires a teacher to give up all control over the student's learning. Little believes that this is not true because “we are social beings (and) our independence is always balanced by dependence ...our capacity for self-instruction probably develops out of our experience of learning in interaction with others” (p. 5).

Another misconception some people have is that “autonomy is something teachers do to their learners” (p. 3). Little believes that autonomy cannot be developed in learners through any set curriculum. This is probably why researchers are of the opinion that autonomy is a “capacity” that learners have. Little reminds us that autonomy is not a single behavior that can easily be described but that it takes different forms depending on individual factors such as age and perceptions of learning needs. Finally, he states that it is possible for learners to be highly autonomous in some areas and non-autonomous in others, so autonomy is not “a steady state achieved by certain learners” (p. 4).

According to Littlewood (1996), an autonomous person is “one who has an independent capacity to make and carry out the choices which govern his or her actions. This capacity depends on two main components: ability and willingness” (p. 428). Littlewood believes that an autonomous learner would need to have both characteristics, ability and willingness, in order to be autonomous, since it is possible for a person to be willing and not have the ability to make informed decisions, or vice versa. He further explains the terms “ability” and “willingness.” Littlewood claims that in order to have the ability to become autonomous, a person should have both the “knowledge” of all the options available to choose from and the necessary “skills” to make appropriate choices. He also believes that the willingness of a person to become autonomous depends on having both the “motivation” and the “confidence” to be responsible for the choices.

When discussing autonomy in second language learning, researchers focus on the ability or the capacity of an individual to make choices independently, and furthermore, to assume responsibility for those choices. It is believed that possessing this characteristic will help not only in making informed decisions leading to success in the language classroom, but that this trait will help the individual in all walks of life, even outside the classroom.

Not many studies conducted thus far have focused on collecting both qualitative and quantitative data on autonomy. Rivers (2001) analyzes self-directed language learning behaviors of adult third-language learners based on qualitative data gathered from 11 learners of Georgian and Kazakh at the University of Maryland and concludes:

The accurate use of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies to control the language learning process and the learning environment is the hallmark of self-directed language learning. In order for such learning to occur, learners must be able to determine accurately what their needs are, and they must have the freedom

to take action to meet those needs. In the absence of either accurate self-assessment or genuine autonomy, self-directed language learning will not occur. (p. 287)

With the limited amount of research that has been carried out on autonomy, it is difficult to understand whether the capacity to be autonomous language learners and control learning comes naturally or if it needs to be acquired through training. There is also a need to understand what conditions can help students develop autonomy in language learning and what factors will hinder its development. Teachers may be able to observe the behaviors of students in the classroom and gauge if a student is becoming more autonomous or not, but it would be beneficial to have a global system of measuring autonomy (Benson, 2001).

### **The Motivation-Autonomy Interface**

While researchers generally argue that motivation and autonomy are separate constructs, there is a definite interface between them. Keller (1983) believes that a motivated person can choose to attempt a particular task and decide on the degree of effort that will be exerted, but if the learner does not have the knowledge or the skills to accomplish the task, no amount of motivation is going to result in the successful accomplishment of the task. Additionally, there is research (e.g., Wang and Palincsar, 1989) that shows that when learners take responsibility for their own learning and make independent choices to facilitate their goals, their motivation increases and they are better able to achieve their goals.

Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory is based on a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and we can see here a relationship with autonomy as well. They state that people who are intrinsically motivated engage in activities because they are interested in the activity for its own sake, and find it enjoyable or satisfying to

engage in it. People who are extrinsically motivated expect rewards which are unrelated to the activity itself or engage in a task to avoid punishment. The authors believe that these types of motivations are not categorically different, but lie on a continuum of self-determination. They believe that learners who are intrinsically motivated will become more effective learners and that this learning will become even more productive when the learner is self-determined and has some control over the learning process. Their attribution theory of motivation is concerned with learners' perceptions of the reasons for success and failure in learning. Learners who believe they are responsible for their own success or failure will take greater responsibility for their learning. Hence, these self-determination and attribution theories provide a very strong association between motivation and autonomy.

Assuming that there is a distinct connection between motivation and autonomy, the question that language teachers may be confronted with is how their students can be motivated and become autonomous learners. Should teachers focus on motivating students so that they can ultimately become autonomous learners? Or should they train students to become autonomous learners so that they will be motivated to be successful language learners? In other words, does motivation precede autonomy, or does autonomy precede motivation?

Spratt, Humphreys, and Chan (2002) research the question of whether autonomy or motivation comes first and find that some research supports the view that motivation precedes autonomy while other research points to autonomy being a precondition for motivation to occur. In their own study, the authors found that "motivation is a key factor that influences the extent to which learners are ready to learn autonomously" (p.

245). Other researchers who hold similar views are Spolsky (1989), who claims that learners will be willing to invest the required time in learning a language only if they are motivated, and Skehan (1989), who feels that there is more evidence supporting the fact that motivation causes successful learning, rather than the other way round. These studies suggest that motivation generates autonomy.

Further, Spratt et al. (2002) posit that motivation may play an inhibiting or enabling role in relation to autonomy and could operate in different directions. Borrowing the terminology from the literature on anxiety, can we then state that autonomy is either facilitative or debilitating depending on the other factors within the language learning situation? The present study seeks to find the correlations between motivation and autonomy. It is possible that further research with different populations in a variety of learning situations may provide some answers to this question. One of the aims of this study is to determine if there is a correlation between motivation and autonomy and to examine if they are distinct factors.

Research also provides evidence to support the view that autonomy needs to be present to trigger motivation in language learners. Deci and Ryan's (1985) theories show that learners are intrinsically motivated if they are self-determined and have control over their language learning process. Dickinson (1995) asserts that for learners to be successful and to be motivated, they need to take responsibility for their own learning. Dörnyei and Csizer (1998) advise teachers to motivate their students by promoting learner autonomy. These studies imply that autonomy precedes motivation in a language learner.

Motivation is not a stable factor and can undergo changes moment by moment in terms of type and intensity, depending on the learner's experiences. It is possible for a learner to be motivated in some areas of study and not in others, or at some times and not at others. Motivation has been regarded and researched as an affective variable for decades. If there is such a strong connection between motivation and autonomy, is autonomy an affective factor too? Or is it a stable, cognitive factor? Different researchers present different viewpoints about autonomy. Nunan (1996) claims that there are degrees of autonomy and that it is not an absolute concept. Little (1990) believes that autonomy is not a steady state achieved by learners, but a process. Thanasoulas (2000) posits that one does not become autonomous, but rather one only works towards autonomy. The underlying belief seems to be that autonomy is a construct that is continually changing. It is possible for language learners to be taught how to be autonomous learners, but the degree to which they will succeed differs. Many factors, such as the personality traits of the learner, her/his goal for language learning, and the cultural context in which learning occurs, will determine the extent to which a learner will become autonomous. Both motivation and autonomy are dynamic, multifaceted variables and it is very likely that we see a different facet each time there is a change in the balance of factors, such as individual variables and learning situations. It will be worthwhile to investigate the interactions between different combinations of factors in a variety of learning situations with different populations, to examine if any patterns can be observed that will provide insights into these affective factors.

### **The Anxiety-Motivation-Autonomy Interface**

While trying to understand the interplay between anxiety, motivation, and autonomy, one wonders what role anxiety plays with regards to both motivation and

autonomy. The relationship between anxiety and motivation has been well documented. Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) suggest that anxiety and motivation have a reciprocal relationship and that each variable influences the other. They investigated whether anxiety caused poor performance or if poor performance caused anxiety and found that anxiety leads to poor performance (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994b). In describing the role played by affective factors in second language acquisition, Schumann (1994) states, “When motivation is lacking, anxiety is high ... the filter is up and input will not become intake ... When motivation and self-confidence are high and anxiety is low, the filter will be down and the relevant input will be acquired” (pp. 232, 233). An explanation for this negative correlation is offered by MacIntyre and Gardner (1989), who say that performance levels in the second language drop because anxiety uses up the cognitive resources and attention that could have been used to perform better in the second language.

Research on learning strategies provides some evidence that successful language learners do take measures to control their language anxiety (e.g., Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, & Todesco, 1978). We are reminded by Oxford (1990) that “good language learners are often those who know how to control their emotions and attitudes about learning” (p. 140), which suggests that successful language learners control such emotions as anxiety. In light of the fact that autonomous learners take charge of their learning and control their emotions by using anxiety lowering strategies, encouraging themselves and staying focused on the task at hand, there also seems to be a connection between anxiety and autonomy.

Researchers have also found a relation between motivation and autonomy. They are in mutual agreement that both motivation and autonomy are distinct factors but have a definite interface between them. Some researchers feel that students need to be motivated before they can be autonomous, while others feel that autonomy has to precede motivation in a student for more successful language learning.

There is a need for researchers to investigate all three of these individual differences using qualitative data (e.g., interviews and journals) to complement the quantitative data collected, in order to provide a more complete picture and deeper insights into the roles played by these factors, individually and collectively, in language learning. In this study, both quantitative and qualitative data have been collected and the three affective factors of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy have been examined.

## CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

The present study seeks to observe the extent to which the participants are anxious, motivated, and/or autonomy, the correlation, if any, among these factors, the extent to which these factors are stable over an eight-week period, and to ascertain whether there is any correlation between these factors and students' class performance. The results obtained through quantitative analysis are then corroborated with the qualitative data collected through journals, interviews and class observations. This study further investigates the correlation between motivation and autonomy to examine whether motivation and autonomy are distinct factors.

### **Participants**

The participants in this study were enrolled in two second semester French classes (FRE 1131) at the University of Florida. Out of a total of 32 participants, 23 (72%) were native speakers of English while 9 (28%) were bilinguals and had a native-like proficiency of English. Six of these nine bilinguals were fluent in Spanish, one student was fluent in Chinese, another student spoke an Indian language, and the last one spoke Haitian Creole. Participation was voluntary and data were collected throughout the semester from these 32 students from two intact classes: 15 students from one class and 17 students from the other. These classes were selected because they had a higher enrollment than some of the other classes.

Students at the University of Florida are placed in specific French classes depending on their prior experience with foreign languages, if any. If the students have

not taken foreign language classes in high school, they are placed in FRE 1130, which is the first semester French class. After their first semester, students are enrolled in FRE 1131, the second semester French class. If the students have taken any previous French classes, however, they take the SAT II standardized test to determine their placement in either FRE 1130 or FRE 1115. Both are first semester French classes and they follow the same syllabus, but FRE 1130 meets five times a week and FRE 1115 meets only three times a week.

The students in this study had already completed their first semester of French and were in the second semester of their language study. Each of these classes had an enrollment of about 20 to 25, so the students from two classes were recruited in order to obtain an adequate sample size. At the beginning of the semester a total of 44 students were enrolled in these two classes, but during the course of the semester, eight students dropped the class, and two students were dropped from the study because they did not complete all the required components of the study. Finally, another two students were eliminated from the study because it was determined that they were trait anxious rather than state anxious, which could potentially impact the anxiety results and skew the findings<sup>1</sup>.

All the participants were undergraduate students ranging in age from 18 to 22 years. From one intact class 13 females and two males participated, while 14 females and three males participated from the other class. The participants completed a background questionnaire (see Appendix A) in which they were asked for information such as their age, their native language, their year in school, and the length of time, if any, they had spent in French-speaking countries. Research done by Saito and Samimy

(1996) and Onwuegbuzie et al. (1999) clearly supports the view that there is a correlation between the “year of study” and language anxiety experienced by language learners. Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, and Christine (2000) found that students with high levels of foreign language anxiety tended to be older, “had never visited a foreign country, had not taken any high school foreign language courses, (and) had low expectations of their overall average for their current language course” (pp. 88, 89). Aida (1994), observed that first-year students who had been to a country where the target language was spoken showed significantly lower anxiety in the language class than students who had never visited or lived in countries where the target language was spoken. The adverse effect of anxiety on performance in language class has been well documented. In their study, Onwuegbuzie et al. (1999) discovered that students’ expectations of their overall achievement in foreign language courses was the biggest predictor of foreign language anxiety. This finding is in harmony with MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1991) claim that the negative expectations students have about their language courses result in “worry and emotionality.” (p. 110). Since research shows that these factors influence or predict success in language learning, the participants in this study were asked to share that information with the researcher<sup>2</sup>.

All of the 32 participants in this study had had some experience of learning French in high school. Some of them had also taken Spanish classes. However, only 20 had visited foreign countries, which included England, Germany, France, Spain, India, China, Portugal, Hong Kong, Chile and Venezuela. Of these 20 participants, only 10 had visited French-speaking countries for varying lengths of time ranging from a day to about three weeks on vacation. None of the students had spent any time studying in these countries.

A summary of the relevant demographic information of the participants in this study is provided in Table 1.

Table 3.1: Relevant demography of students (total N=32)

	<b>Number of students</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Female students	27	84%
Male students	5	16%
<b>Age</b>		
between 18-22	32	100 %
<b>Year in school</b>		
Freshman	7	22 %
Sophomore	10	31 %
Junior	7	22 %
Senior	8	25 %
<b>Foreign countries visited</b>		
Yes	19	59 %
No	13	41 %
French-speaking countries	10	31 %
<b>Previous foreign language experience</b>		
Yes	32	100 %
No	0	0 %
<b>Expected letter grade in class</b>		
A	10	31 %
B	19	59 %
C	3	10 %

Among the participants, seven students were freshmen, 10 were sophomores, seven were juniors and eight were seniors. As far as grade expectations were concerned, 10 participants expected to get an ‘A’ in their French class, 19 students expected a ‘B,’ and 3 students expected a ‘C.’ These students pursued a diversified range of majors: English, Public Relations, Political Science, Education, Finance, Psychology, Journalism, Telecommunications, Music, Microbiology, Agriculture, History, Anthropology, Mathematics, Quantitative Science, Business, Plant Pathology, Pre-Med, Advertising and Economics.

## Procedures

Permission was obtained from the University of Florida Institutional Review Board to conduct this study. Permission was also obtained from the instructors of the two second-semester French course to visit their classes to collect the data. The researcher explained the entire project and the time frame for data collection to the instructors, and asked for time in class to administer the French test and three questionnaires on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy. Then, the researcher met the classes two days before the administration of the first instrument to introduce the semester-long project to the students and enlist their help. They were not told that the affective factors of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy were being researched. The participants were assured that their identity would not be revealed and that their decision to participate (or not) would not affect their class grade, and were then asked to sign a consent form. This precaution was taken not only because the law requires it but also with the intention of making the students feel comfortable with the entire procedure, to give them a chance to ask any questions, and to reduce any anxiety that could be caused by having to deal with the unexpected.

During Week 5 of the semester, the four instruments: an in-house French test and questionnaires on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy, were administered to the students. Data were collected during Week 5, and not earlier in the semester, because it was hoped that by this time the students would have had a chance to overcome any initial discomfort and anxiety they might have experienced due to being in a new class with new classmates and instructor. It was hoped that any anxiety they felt during Week 5 would be directly related to their language learning experiences in general, as opposed to specific new-semester factors.

During Week 13 of the semester the same four instruments were administered to the students a second time. Final and oral examinations were to be held during Week 18 of the semester, so this administration was scheduled to occur before any final exam anxiety might appear. The in-house French test and the three questionnaires were completed at the beginning of the class period so that the students would not be tempted to rush through the questionnaires in order to leave class early. Additional data were also collected out of class. The students were given specific journal topics and were invited to submit journal entries. They were also invited to participate in one-on-one interviews on a volunteer basis. These additional data will be discussed in more detail below.

In order to decrease the tendency of over-relying on the results obtained from the quantitative data that were collected, and to increase the reliability and validity of the results, qualitative data that were obtained from the journal entries and the interviews with students and instructors was examined for corroboration with the questionnaire results. Inconsistencies in the different data sets were identified to gain a better understanding of the interplay between anxiety, motivation, and autonomy among the participants in this study.

The participants were first grouped into four categories on the basis of the scores they received on each of the three questionnaires. These four categories were labeled 'low,' 'fairly low,' 'fairly high' and 'high,' which meant that the participants experienced low, fairly low, fairly high or high levels of anxiety, motivation, or autonomy. This method of grouping students proved to be problematic because the number of participants who fell into the "high" category was too low to investigate or describe. One way to get a larger group would have been to combine the number of students who were included in

the “high” as well as the “fairly high” categories. But, if that were done, the range of emotions experienced by this group would have been very broad, ranging from the center to the highest point on the scale, in which case this group would not have represented students who had high levels of anxiety, motivation, or autonomy. The participants were then grouped into three equal categories of ‘high,’ ‘moderate,’ and low’ based on their scores on each of the three questionnaires. For example, the total possible score on the anxiety scale was 165. All the participants who obtained scores between 1 and 55 were considered to have little or no language anxiety and were placed in the “low” category. Students who scored between 56 and 110 were considered to experience moderate levels of anxiety and placed in the “moderate” category, while those who scored between 111 and 165 were considered to be highly anxious.

The participants were divided into three categories on the other scales as well. The total possible score on the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) was 375. The participants who obtained scores between 1 and 125 were believed to have little or no motivation; the students who scored between 126 and 250 were considered to be moderately motivated while those who scored between 251 and 375 were considered to be highly motivated.

The total possible score on the questionnaire measuring autonomy was 300. The participants who obtained a score between 1 and 100 were believed to have low levels of autonomy. The students who scored between 101 and 200 were considered to be moderately autonomous while those who scored between 201 and 300 were considered to be highly autonomous. Having these three groups for each measure made

it possible to identify students who were highly anxious, motivated and/or autonomous.

Table 3.2 gives the range of points for the three categories on each measure.

Table 3.2: The range of points for the three categories on each measure.

	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>
<b>Anxiety</b>	1 – 55	56 – 110	111 – 165
<b>Motivation</b>	1 – 125	126 – 250	251 – 375
<b>Autonomy</b>	1 – 100	101 – 200	201 – 300
<b>Trait Anxiety</b>	1 – 12	13 – 24	25 – 35

## **Instruments**

### **In-house French Test**

An in-house French grammar and vocabulary test (see Appendix B) was developed by the Assistant Director of the French program for this study to measure the performance of the students in their French class. The test includes some material that the students covered during the previous semester in French and other material that the students were expected to cover during the semester they were currently enrolled in. This meant that during the first administration of the test, the students were not expected to know all the answers. The test was constructed in this way to control for any potential ceiling effect among more advanced students.

### **The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)**

The questionnaire used to measure the levels of anxiety in foreign language learners is the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (see Appendix C), developed by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope in 1986. The FLCAS is a 33-item instrument that determines the degree to which students feel anxious during language classes by assessing their communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the foreign language classroom. Each item is a statement followed by a five-point

Likert response scale, with which the participants indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with each of the items. Items on this scale are both positively and negatively worded; for example, one item might be, “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in French class,” and another item may be, “I feel confident when I speak in French class”. When the negatively worded items are scored, the scale is reversed. The total possible score ranges from 33 to 165, with the higher scores indicating higher levels of foreign language anxiety. Validity and reliability studies have shown that the scale is both valid and reliable (Horwitz et al., 1986, Horwitz, 1991) with an alpha coefficient of .93 and an eight-week test-retest coefficient of .83. Also, Aida’s (1994) study of 96 students in a second-year Japanese course used the same instrument and reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .94. Alpha coefficient ranges in value from 0 to 1 and shows how well a set of items measure a single unidimensional construct. The higher the score, the more reliable the generated scale is. A reliability coefficient of .70 is considered as “acceptable” in the literature.

To determine if the anxiety experienced by the participants in this study was state anxiety rather than trait anxiety, seven extra Likert response questions were added to the 33-item FLCAS, making it a 40-item questionnaire. These items were adapted from the General Anxiety Scale Items by Spielberger (1972), and comprise numbers 34 to 40 on the questionnaire. The validity and reliability scores of the FLCAS were not altered because the scores obtained on the seven additional questions were computed separately. As was noted above, the data from these additional items resulted in the elimination of two students from the study.

### **The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)**

The questionnaire used to measure levels of motivation was the modified Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB), originally developed by Gardner (1985) and revised by Gardner, Tremblay and Masgoret in 1997 (see Appendix D). This instrument investigates such factors as attitude toward learning French, desire to learn French, and motivational intensity in learning French. Like the FLCAS, each item here is also followed by a five-point Likert response scale for participants to indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with the statements. Again, some of the items on this scale are also both positively and negatively worded. For example, one item might be, “When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in my French class, I always ask the instructor for help,” and another item may be, “I don’t bother checking my corrected assignments in my French courses.” Validity and reliability studies have shown that the scale is both valid and reliable, with coefficients of .91 and .89 respectively, and a six-week test-retest coefficient of .79.

### **The Questionnaire on Autonomy**

The students’ levels of autonomy in learning French were determined by using the questionnaire formulated by Spratt, Humphreys and Chan (2002) (Appendix E.) This questionnaire was strongly influenced by Holec’s (1981) definition of autonomy, and the researchers attempted to incorporate the notions of “ability” and “responsibility” in the five areas of their questionnaire, which aims to:

assess students’ readiness for learner autonomy in language learning by examining their views of their responsibilities and those of their teachers, their confidence in their ability to operate autonomously .... It also investigated their actual practice of autonomous learning in the form of both outside and inside class activities. (p. 245)

Some of the questions required the students to tabulate two answers: to what extent they thought it was the teacher's responsibility or their own responsibility "to make sure I make progress outside class" or "to decide the objectives of my French course." The terms "Not at all", "A little", "Some", "Mainly" or "Completely" were used on the five-point Likert response scale in this questionnaire. This questionnaire on autonomy was compiled, piloted, amended and then administered to 508 participants by Spratt, Humphreys and Chan at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University in 2002. No information on the reliability and validity of this questionnaire was included in the report.

### **Class Observations**

In an effort to get a complete picture of the participants' apprehensions, motivations, initiative, and the confidence they had throughout the semester, the researcher observed both the French classes each week. The researcher chose to observe the classes in person rather than to videotape the sessions in light of the findings by MacIntyre and Gardner (1994a), which indicate that the increased anxiety caused by a video camera in the classroom can impair students' performance.

All the participants were observed in their French classes at least once a week throughout the semester. The class observations provided insights into the participants' levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy through their behavior and attitudes in class. Anxiety is exhibited in different ways, for example, through physiological and behavioral signs discussed by researchers (Chastain, 1975; Horwitz et al., 1986). Students who are enthusiastic or confident in class, or those who take the initiative to enhance their learning in class, reflect their levels of motivation and autonomy. When necessary, at the end of class, the instructor was consulted about certain situations or occurrences in class.

At other times, and throughout the semester, the students were asked for their views and opinions about their French class. These conversations took place outside of class and normal class activities were never interrupted.

These class observations were excellent opportunities for the participants and the researcher to establish a rapport, which was of utmost importance during the end-of-term interviews with the students. The researcher was also able to observe the classroom behavior of the participants which helped, to some extent, in understanding the thoughts expressed by the students in the questionnaires, journals and interviews. Also, having interacted with the researcher during the administration of the questionnaires, engaging in small talk before class began, and observing that the instructor had no access to their responses, either written or verbal, the participants seemed to be comfortable, forthcoming, and honest while volunteering information during the journal writing exercise and interviews.

### **Journals**

The participants were asked to submit four journal entries of at least one typed page in length in which they answered specific questions, in English, regarding their experiences learning French. These journal entries were written outside of class. About ten students (29%) volunteered to write all four journal entries and were each given an honorarium of \$10 for their efforts. Specific dates were set to submit these journal entries directly to the researcher and were spaced at least ten days apart. All the students who volunteered to write journal entries completed all four entries. Each of the topics (see Appendix F) given to the students targeted information about one of the variables or constructs being investigated in this study. The first journal topic aimed at getting the

students to reflect on their foreign language learning experience in its entirety. The second journal topic focused on anxiety, the third on motivation, and the fourth topic targeted information on autonomy.

### **Student Interviews**

All the students who submitted journal entries were invited to participate in an interview with the researcher. From the ten students who submitted journal entries, seven students agreed to be interviewed, representing 22% of the total participant population. Each participant was given an additional honorarium of \$10 for participating in the interview.

The students were interviewed, in English, out of class. The primary purpose of the interview was to explore the participants' points of view, feelings, and perspectives about learning French in general and their classroom experiences in particular. Some open-ended questions were prepared to ask during the interview (see Appendix G), if needed, but mostly the students were allowed to talk freely about their experiences and their opinions about how anxious, motivated, or autonomous they were throughout the semester. Some of the questions that were asked in the interview were, "What thoughts go through your mind as you enter your French classroom?" and "If you needed to, how would you go about designing a syllabus for your French class?" These semi-structured interviews were conducted to complement the information obtained from the questionnaires and to gain a better understanding of what the participants' numerical responses mean.

### **Teacher Interviews**

The instructors of the two classes were also interviewed after the end of the semester and submission of grades. Some open-ended questions to ask during the

interview were planned out, but mostly the instructors were allowed to freely talk about their perspectives on their teaching and their students. Some of the questions (see Appendix H) that were asked in the interview were, “What are your expectations of the students, in terms of how they can learn best?” and “What are some ways in which you will recognize that a student is anxious in your class?” These semi-structured interviews helped to understand the teachers’ perspectives of the importance of particular class activities as opposed to the students’ perspective of what should be done in class to enhance language learning. The teachers’ opinions about the levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy in their students also served to substantiate the results obtained through other data collection procedures.

### **Data Analysis**

Some of the research questions are answered quantitatively by using statistical tests to evaluate the significance of the data collected, while others are assessed through observation of the data collected. In this first section, questions that are answered quantitatively are discussed.

#### **Quantitative Data**

Research Question 1 strives to identify the participants who are anxious, motivated, and autonomous. This was done by categorizing the students into three groups of “high,” “moderate,” and “low,” based on their scores on each measure. The participants whose scores fell into the “high” category were considered to be anxious, motivated, and/or autonomous.

Research Question 2 aimed at finding out the correlations between the participants’ levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy. A Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test was run on the scores the participants obtained on the three

questionnaires measuring anxiety, motivation, and autonomy to determine if there were any correlations among them both at the time of the first administration of the questionnaires and at the second administration. The questionnaires measuring the three affective variables were administered twice to the participants, during Weeks 5 and 13 of the semester.

Research Question 3 investigated whether the affective factors within the participants had undergone any changes from Time 1 to Time 2 or if they remained stable. This was done by running a Paired-Samples T-Test on the difference in scores obtained on each of those variables (e.g., anxiety score during second administration minus anxiety score during first administration). The mean scores obtained by the participants on different variables during each administration were also examined to observe if there were any significant changes.

In order to answer Research Question 4, which sought to find the correlation between the three affective factors and students' performance, a Linear Regression test was run with the scores on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy as the independent variables and class performance as measured by both the in-house French test and students' final class grades, as the dependent variable. The in-house French grammar and vocabulary test was administered two times during the semester, but the final class grades represented the grades the students obtained over the duration of the semester in a wide variety of areas: written homework, workbook activities, compositions, chapter exams, oral proficiency tests, attendance, preparation, and participation.

As mentioned earlier, the participants in this study were from two different French classes. Until this point the participants have been analyzed as a whole unit, but with

Research Question 5 the focus turns to the two classes as separate data sets. Here, an attempt is made to identify any differences in the results obtained from the participants in the classes taught by different instructors. An Independent Samples T Test was run to compare the overall performance of the 2 sets of participants.

In order to answer Research Question 5, both the quantitative data from the scores on the questionnaires and qualitative data collected through journals and interviews were examined to determine if motivation and autonomy were distinct factors. If the results of Research Question 3 showed that the participants' emotions had changed from Time 1 to Time 2, Research Question 7 sought to examine some possible reasons for the change.

### **Qualitative Data**

The qualitative data in this study were collected through different modes: class observations, journal entries, and interviews with students and instructors.

Research Question 6 aimed at determining whether motivation and autonomy are distinct factors. Students who were highly motivated and highly autonomous were identified and an attempt was made to see if any patterns emerged.

Research Question 7 discusses some possible reasons for a change in the affective factors experienced by the participants from test to retest. This information was obtained from the journal entries submitted by the students and the interviews. The qualitative measures reveal much information about the three affective variables under investigation, for example, the areas of language learning which cause anxiety, activities that motivate students to work harder in and out of class, and students' thoughts about the instructors' responsibility to teach them effectively as opposed to their own responsibility.

The next chapter presents the results of the statistical tests that were run and discusses both the quantitative and qualitative findings.

**Notes**

1. According to Hatch and Lazaraton (1991), the minimum number of students required to get a normal distribution is 30, so even with these eliminations, this study meets that basic requirement, with a final number of 32.
2. The reason for obtaining these details from the students was to have more complete information about the language learner even though it goes far beyond the scope of this study.

## CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative data were collected during weeks 5 and 13 of the semester and the participant scores from the three questionnaires on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy, along with the scores from the in-house French pre- and post- tests were recorded. Research questions 1 through 5, which are quantitative in nature, are answered in this chapter by running a number of statistical tests to ascertain if the results were statistically significant and if they were indicative of a trend within the sample.

Qualitative data were collected throughout the semester in the form of journal entries, individual interviews with both students and instructors, and classroom observations. Research questions 6 and 7, which are qualitative in nature, are also discussed in this chapter by providing information obtained from the participants through their journals and interviews.

In all, 34 participants completed all the tests and questionnaires, which were part of the data collection procedures in this study. The scores obtained by the participants on each questionnaire indicated the degree to which the participants were anxious, motivated and/or autonomous. Recall that the procedure used to identify students who experienced higher than average levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy, has been described in chapter 3.

### **Type of Anxiety**

In order to increase the chances that research on anxiety and language achievement obtained comparable results, Scovel (1978) suggested that language researchers should

be specific about the type of anxiety they were measuring. Accordingly, it is noted that the present study focused on students who experienced foreign language anxiety or anxiety that is felt only in specific situations, also called ‘state anxiety,’ and not trait anxiety, which is a non-situation-specific personality trait. So, to determine the degree of foreign language anxiety, it was important to ascertain that the students did indeed experience state anxiety rather than trait anxiety. This was done by adding seven extra questions measuring trait anxiety to the FLCAS. These seven questions were adapted from Spielberger’s (1983) State-Trait Anxiety Inventory which, according to Horwitz (1986), has a low but significant correlation with the FLCAS at a correlation coefficient of .29 ( $p=.002$ ). Each item is a statement followed by a five-point Likert response scale.

The added questions are:

1. I get just as nervous in my other classes as I do in my French class.
2. I am usually calm and not easily upset.
3. I am a high-strung person.
4. I avoid meeting new people even though they are English speakers.
5. I am satisfied with the progress I am making in all my classes, except French.
6. I go through periods in which I lose sleep over worry.
7. It doesn’t bother me when I am not in control of a situation.

The total possible score on these seven questions is 35. Students who obtained a score between 1 and 12 were considered to have low levels of trait anxiety, while students who scored between 13 and 24 were considered to be moderately trait anxious. To qualify as being highly trait anxious, a participant had to score between 25 and 35 points on the trait anxiety scale. These three categories of ‘low,’ ‘moderate,’ and ‘high,’ were devised the same way as for the other measures used in this study.

The scores obtained by the participants on the trait anxiety part of the questionnaire were closely examined to identify students who were highly trait anxious. Out of a total

of 34 participants, two were identified as being highly trait anxious. The first highly trait anxious participant, A15, scored 30 points during both administrations of the trait anxiety scale, whereas the second highly trait anxious participant, B04, had a score of 27 during the first administration of the test and a score of 25 during the second administration.

An interesting observation to be made is that the scores A15 received on the state anxiety part of the questionnaire identified her as also being highly state anxious. Her scores for the two administrations were 131 and 137, respectively. However, such was not the case with B04, who scored 89 points during both administrations of the state anxiety scale. These scores indicate that A15 experienced both trait and state anxiety, while B04 experienced only trait anxiety. Understanding that trait and state anxieties could have a different influence on a language learner and that the interplay between trait anxiety, motivation, and autonomy could possibly be different from the interplay between state anxiety, motivation, and autonomy, a decision was made to eliminate both these participants from the study. As a result, a total of 32 participants were left in this study. The above-mentioned scores indicate that it is possible for a language learner to be trait anxious yet not state anxious, so it is advisable for researchers to take note of Scovel's suggestion and ensure that they measure the appropriate variables in their studies.

The results obtained for each of the research questions are discussed in turn below, and the type of anxiety measured is state anxiety.

### **Research Question 1**

**To what extent, if any, are the participants anxious, motivated, and autonomous?**

In order to determine to what degree the participants were anxious, motivated and autonomous, the following sub-questions of Research Question 1 were considered:

- a. To what extent, if any, are the participants anxious?
- b. To what extent, if any, are the participants motivated?
- c. To what extent, if any, are the participants autonomous?

The scores received by the participants at Time 1 and Time 2 on each of the three questionnaires were examined. Table 4.1 provides information on the number of students who were categorized as having high, moderate, or low levels of anxiety, motivation, and/or autonomy, and Appendix I gives an overview of all the participants who experienced high levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy.

Table 4.1: Student classification based on scores received on questionnaires (n=32)

		<b>High</b> Number of students	<b>Moderate</b> Number of students	<b>Low</b> Number of students
<b>Anxiety</b>	First administration	8 (25%)	23 (72%)	1 (3%)
	Second administration	7 (22%)	23 (72%)	2 (6%)
<b>Motivation</b>	First administration	19 (59%)	13 (41%)	0
	Second administration	17 (53%)	15 (47%)	0
<b>Autonomy</b>	First administration	5 (16%)	27 (84%)	0
	Second administration	4 (13%)	28 (87%)	0

The results are discussed below.

### **Anxiety**

Students were identified as being anxious if their scores fell into the ‘high’ category, which meant their scores ranged from 111 to 165 on the anxiety scale.

Emphasis was placed on this category because research has consistently shown that high levels of anxiety have a negative effect on the performance of language learners, whereas moderate levels of anxiety can either be facilitative or debilitating, either motivating students to work harder to reach their goals, or impeding their progress in their language study program. MacIntyre (1995) calls this an inverted “U” relationship between anxiety and performance. The topmost segment of the inverted “U” divides the range between

low and moderate anxiety, which may be facilitating, from the range between moderate and high anxiety, which may be debilitating to a language learner.

As shown in Table 4.1, during Week 5 of the semester, eight students (25%), out of a total of 32 participants, experienced high levels of anxiety with scores ranging from 111 to 134, and during Week 13 of the semester, seven participants (22%) experienced high levels of anxiety, with scores ranging from 112 to 126. Table 4.2 gives the details of the students who were anxious at some point in the semester.

Table 4.2: Students who were anxious during Time 1 and Time 2

<b>Student</b>	<b>Time 1 Points</b>	<b>Time 2 Points</b>	<b>Increase in Points</b>	<b>Decrease in Points</b>	
A11	116	120	4 (2.4%)		Anxious Time 1 and 2
A20	116	117	1 (0.6%)		Anxious Time 1 and 2
B18	134	126		8 (4.8%)	Anxious Time 1 and 2
B22	127	124		3 (1.8%)	Anxious Time 1 and 2
A08	119	99		20 (12%)	Anxious Time 1
B12	122	102		20 (12%)	Anxious Time 1
B14	112	107		5 (3%)	Anxious Time 1
B17	111	110		1 (0.6%)	Anxious Time 1
A03	110	123	13 (7.9%)		Anxious Time 2
A18	97	113	16 (9.7%)		Anxious Time 2
B15	107	112	5 (3%)		Anxious Time 2

Only four participants (A11, A20, B18 and B22) out of eight, were highly anxious during both administrations of the questionnaire on anxiety with a maximum of 4.8% change in their scores. Other four students (A08, B12, B14, and B17), who were anxious at the beginning of the semester were not anxious at the end of the semester. Their decrease in scores ranged from 0.6-12%. Yet another three students (A03, A18, and B15) who were not anxious at the beginning of the semester were anxious at the end of the semester, and their anxiety scores increased by a maximum of 9.7%. These results show that a total of 11 students in this study were highly anxious at some point in their French

class during the course of the semester, which is about 34% of the participants.

### **Motivation**

In order to find out if the participants in this study were motivated, their scores on the AMTB were examined. Students who scored between 251 and 375 were considered highly motivated. The results showed that 19 students (59%) were highly motivated during the first administration of the questionnaire, with scores ranging from 257 to 305, and 17 (53%) of those participants remained highly motivated during the second administration, with scores ranging from 259 to 299. It is encouraging to observe that more than half the participants started off their studies motivated and continued this trend until the end of the semester. Thirteen (41%) participants were moderately motivated during the first administration, but during the second administration, 15 (47%) participants were moderately motivated. In other words, approximately the same subset of students were moderately motivated during both the first and second administrations of the motivation questionnaire. However, two students, A17 and A20, who were highly motivated during Week 5 were only moderately motivated during Week 13 of the semester. None of the participants had “low” levels of motivation at any time during the semester.

### **Autonomy**

Students who scored between 201 and 300 on the autonomy scale were considered to be highly autonomous. With regards to the number of participants who were autonomous, the data show that only five (16%) of the participants, A03, A11, B10, B13, and B17, were highly autonomous during the first administration of the questionnaire, with scores ranging from 201 to 249, and only four (13%) participants, A03, A08, B10,

and B17, were highly autonomous during the second administration, with scores ranging from 203 to 222. Three of the participants were highly autonomous during both administrations. Two of the students who were highly autonomous during Week 5 were only moderately autonomous during Week 13 of the semester, whereas one student who was moderately autonomous during Week 5 was highly autonomous during Week 13. In comparison with the number of students who were highly motivated, fewer in this group were highly autonomous. Most of the students were moderately autonomous, with twenty-seven (84%) students falling into this category during the first administration, and twenty-eight (87%) during the second administration. None of the students fell into the category of “low” autonomy.

Overall, the results show that about 34% of the participants in this study were highly anxious at some point during the semester, 59% of them were highly motivated, but only 19% of them were highly autonomous.

### **Research Question 2**

**To what extent, if any, is there a correlation among the participants’ stated levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy?**

In order to determine if there was a correlation among the three affective factors under consideration in this study, a Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient test was run. Correlation coefficients tell us how well two or more variables are related to each other. They can also be used to determine how much variability in one factor is explainable by variation in the other factors.

The correlations were examined for both administrations of the three questionnaires. The results showed that there were no correlations between anxiety and motivation, or between anxiety and autonomy, but there was a statistically significant

moderate correlation between motivation and autonomy with a coefficient of .623 ( $p < .001$ ) at Time 1 and .624 ( $p < .001$ ) at Time 2. Table 4.3 summarizes these results.

Table 4.3: The correlations among participants' levels of the three variables

	<b>First administration</b>	<b>Second administration</b>
<b>Correlation between anxiety and motivation</b> (correlation coefficient)	.052	-.148
<b>Sig</b>	.776	.417
<b>Correlation between anxiety and autonomy</b> (correlation coefficient)	.111	.030
<b>Sig</b>	.545	.871
<b>Correlation between motivation and autonomy</b> (correlation coefficient)	.623	.624
<b>Sig</b>	.000*	.000*

### **Correlation between Anxiety and Motivation**

In considering the participant scores in this study, the results show that there is no correlation between anxiety and motivation. These results are contrary to those of Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992), who examined the effects of both motivation and anxiety on computerized vocabulary acquisition and proposed that anxiety and motivation “are two separate dimensions with overlapping behavioral consequences . . . correlated yet distinguishable” (p. 212).

Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery included some questions on French class anxiety and French use anxiety. These questions were identified and the scores of each participant on the extracted anxiety questions were correlated with the scores on the FLCAS to ensure that the anxiety questions, from both scales, were consistent and measured the same affective factor. The results show that the correlation between the anxiety scale and the anxiety questions from the motivation scale was high,

at .801 and .849 during Test 1 and Test 2, respectively and  $p < .001$  at both times, suggesting that the type of anxiety measured was the same.

In an effort to observe the true motivation scores of the participants, the AMTB questions on anxiety and autonomy were disregarded. It was interesting to note that when a correlation test was run between the anxiety and new motivation scores, a statistically significant moderate inverse correlation was found with a correlation coefficient of  $-.482$  ( $p = .005$ ) during the second administration of the instruments. These results are now similar to those obtained by Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992) who believe that there is a correlation between anxiety and motivation. This change in results suggests that the AMTB questions on anxiety and autonomy have an impact on the motivation scores.

As mentioned before, eight students were highly anxious during Test 1; of these eight, two were freshmen, two were sophomores, two were juniors, and two were seniors. During Test 2, out of the seven students who were highly anxious, two were sophomores, three were juniors, and two were seniors. Interestingly, none of the freshmen were anxious at the end of the semester, which is in keeping with the results reported by Onwuegbuzie et al. (1999), who posited that foreign language anxiety increased linearly, meaning that the freshmen reported the lowest levels of anxiety while the seniors reported the highest levels. As noted earlier, more than half of the students were motivated during both Test 1 and Test 2.

### **Correlation between Anxiety and Autonomy**

With regards to the relationship between anxiety and autonomy, again the data show that there is little or no correlation between the two, with a correlation coefficient of .111

( $p=.545$ ) during Test 1, and a correlation coefficient of  $.030$  ( $p=.871$ ) during Test 2.

Table 4.4 gives a summary of all the students who were highly anxious and/or highly autonomous during both administrations of the questionnaires.

Table 4.4: Students who were highly anxious and/or highly autonomous (represented by 'X') during Test 1 and Test 2

Participant	Highly Anxious Students		Highly Autonomous Students	
	Week 5	Week 13	Week 5	Week 13
<b>A03</b>		X	X	X
<b>A08</b>	X			X
<b>A11</b>	X	X	X	
<b>A18</b>		X		
<b>A20</b>	X	X		
<b>B10</b>			X	X
<b>B12</b>	X			
<b>B13</b>			X	
<b>B14</b>	X			
<b>B15</b>		X		
<b>B17</b>	X		X	X
<b>B18</b>	X	X		
<b>B22</b>	X	X		

There is no apparent pattern in the levels of anxiety and autonomy experienced by the participants. Two students, B10 and B13, who were highly autonomous, did not experience high anxiety levels in their French class, whereas two other students, A03 and B17, were highly autonomous during both Test 1 and Test 2, and were also highly anxious during one of the administrations of the anxiety scale. B18 and B22, were not highly autonomous but were highly anxious. Thus, in this sample, students were highly autonomous but not anxious; highly anxious but not autonomous, and also both highly autonomous and highly anxious at the same time. These results suggest that experiencing high levels of anxiety in a language classroom does not indicate whether a student will or will not take charge of his or her learning. Neither can it be said that a highly autonomous student will not experience any language anxiety in the classroom.

A closer look at Table 4.4 shows that four students who were highly anxious during Test 1 were not as anxious during Test 2, and three other students who were not highly anxious at Test 1 were anxious at Test 2. Also, two students who were highly autonomous at Test 1 changed categories and were not as autonomous at Test 2. Finally, A08, who was not highly autonomous at Test 1 was so at Test 2. These results show that the participants' levels of anxiety and autonomy changed within the eight-week period.

Participants A03, A18, and B15 were not highly anxious during week 5 but they were anxious during Week 13. Class observations reveal that both A03 and A18 would come early to class, sit at the back and not engage in any conversations with their classmates. They would attempt to answer any questions the teacher asked them. Their class grades for the first half of the semester were lower than they were toward the end of the semester. It is possible that these students became anxious about their grades and put in greater efforts, resulting in improved grades at the end of the semester. This information is corroborated from the qualitative data collected from A18. She said that she was not highly anxious at the beginning of the semester because she was familiar with the course material and had heard that the instructor was good. During the course of the semester, she said that she was frustrated with the tediousness of the workbook and did not do her daily assignments. She was anxious in class whenever she had not done the reading for that day and felt tense at the thought of the instructor calling on her to answer a question. Though she had no intentions of continuing her language study, she wanted to get a good grade in class, so she put in extra efforts to reach her goal.

B15's behavior in class was very different from the previous two participants. She would usually come late to class, sit next to one of her friends, and chat and play

throughout the French class. Her grade halfway through the semester bottomed out to an overall average of 42%. She was not anxious at Time 1 but was anxious at Time 2, suggesting that it was possible that she began to be anxious about her grade and put in efforts to improve her grade; this is corroborated by her final class grade, which came up to 64%.

These results show that there is no correlation between anxiety and autonomy, and that the degree to which the participants are anxious or autonomous can change over the course of a semester.

### **Correlation between Motivation and Autonomy**

In examining if there is a relationship between motivation and autonomy, the data show that there is a reasonably high correlation between these two affective factors, with a coefficient of .623 during the first administration and .629 during the second administration. Both these correlations are statistically significant at  $p < .001$ .

Language learning research has established that there is a strong connection between motivation and autonomy. Describing motivated behavior is a challenging task because it inevitably includes some characteristics of autonomous behavior. Neither is it easy to describe autonomous behavior and claim that it cannot also be labeled as motivated behavior. Hence, it is not surprising to find that some questions in the AMTB seemed to overlap with autonomy. The following questions focused on the efforts the students put into their language learning, suggesting that they were taking charge of their learning and showing some autonomous behavior.

1. I keep up to date with French by working on it almost every day.
2. If it were up to me, I would spend all my time learning French.

3. When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in my French class, I always ask the instructor to help.
4. I really work hard to learn French.
5. When I am studying French, I ignore distractions and stick to the job at hand.

Again, these questions were identified and the scores of each participant on the extracted questions were correlated with the instrument on autonomy. This time, it was found that the correlation between the autonomy scale and the autonomy questions from the motivation scale had a moderately high correlation at .633 and .689 during the first and second administrations, respectively and  $p < .001$ . This process ensured that the autonomy questions, from both scales, were consistent and measured the same affective factor.

These moderately high correlations between the autonomy questions on both the scales, and also the anxiety questions on the AMTB and FLCAS, reinforce what researchers have said about motivation and anxiety, and motivation and autonomy being factors that are closely connected, yet are distinct and distinguishable as different affective factors in a language learner. The relationship between motivation and autonomy will be further examined while discussing Research Question 6.

To further examine the correlation between motivation and autonomy, a correlation test between the scores on motivation and autonomy was run a second time; this time with the new motivation scores. The results were similar to those obtained the first time showing statistically significant moderate correlations between motivation and autonomy with correlation coefficients of .603 ( $p < .000$ ) and .534 ( $p = .002$ ) during the first and second administrations, respectively.

An investigation into the correlations among the levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy observed in the participants of this study show that there is a moderately high correlation between motivation and autonomy. When a correlation test was run between anxiety and motivation using the AMTB in its entirety, there was no correlation between the two factors, but when the questions on anxiety and autonomy in the AMTB were disregarded, a negative correlation was found between anxiety and motivation. These results support those of Gardner, Day & MacIntyre (1992) who found a correlation between anxiety and motivation.

### **Research Question 3**

**To what extent, if any, are the participants' levels of anxiety, motivation and autonomy stable over time?**

The sub-questions that were considered to discover if there were any changes in the participants' stated levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy were:

- a. To what extent, if any, does the participants' anxiety change from test to retest?
- b. To what extent, if any, does the participants' motivation change from test to retest?
- c. To what extent, if any, does the participants' autonomy change from test to retest?
- d. If a change has occurred in one of the affective factors, is there a corresponding change in the other two factors?

The questionnaires measuring anxiety, motivation and autonomy were administered twice to the participants, during Weeks 5 and 13 of the semester. A series of paired samples t-tests were run to investigate the stability of the levels of emotions experienced by the participants. The results in Table 4.5 show that there was no change in the participants' levels of anxiety and autonomy from test to retest, but that there was a significant decrease ( $p=.038$ ) in their motivation levels.

Table 4.5: Paired samples t-test results showing change only in motivation levels

	Mean	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Correlation coefficient	Sig.
Pair 1					
First Anxiety Questionnaire	93.44	.770	.447	.789	.000*
Second Anxiety Questionnaire	91.63				
Pair 2					
First Motivation Questionnaire	253.75	2.165	.038*	.905	.000*
Second Motivation Questionnaire	248.88				
Pair 3					
First Autonomy Questionnaire	177.84	-.429	.671	.718	.000*
Second Autonomy Questionnaire	179.19				

There was a high correlation between the first and second administrations of the instruments measuring the three variables, suggesting that the instruments were reliable.

With regards to the possible changes in the levels of anxiety felt by the participants, the mean anxiety score was 93.44 during Week 5 and 91.63 during Week 13, a negligible decrease of 1.81 points, which was statistically non-significant at  $p=.447$ . In other words, there was no significant overall change in the participants' stated levels of anxiety from test to retest.

When the participant scores on the motivation scale were examined, it was found that during the first administration, the mean score for the participants' level of motivation was 253.75 while during the second administration, the mean score for motivation was 248.88, a decrease of 4.87 points. This change was statistically significant with  $p=.038$ , so an overall decrease in participants' motivation levels is observed from Week 5 to Week 13 of the semester.

These results were puzzling because the decrease in motivation levels seemed to contradict earlier results which showed a high correlation between the first and second administrations of the motivation scale, with a correlation coefficient of .905 ( $p < .001$ ). Therefore, each class was then examined separately to better understand the changes in the levels of motivation. An independent samples t-test was run to compare the scores obtained by the participants in each of the two groups. On the first administration, the mean motivation score of the first group was 242.27 points, while the second group scored 263.88 points, a difference of 21.61 points, which was statistically significant at  $p = .032$ . This meant that the second group was significantly more motivated than the first group during Week 5 of the semester. Table 4.6 gives the mean motivation scores of the participants during both administrations.

Table 4.6: Group differences in motivation scores

	Group	Mean	Sig
First administration	1	242.27	.032*
	2	263.88	
Second administration	1	239.00	.074
	2	257.59	

During the second administration of the motivation scale, the mean motivation scores of the second group remained higher than the scores of the first group, but this time the difference of 18.59 points was not statistically significant ( $p = .074$ ), which meant that there was no difference in the motivation levels of the two groups during Week 13 of the semester. Looking at the mean scores of each group separately, we observe that the motivation levels of group 1 decreased by 3.27 points while the motivation levels of group 2 decreased by 6.29 points, which is almost twice the decrease experienced by the first group. A paired samples t-test showed that the decrease in motivation in group 1

was not statistically significant ( $p=.461$ ), but the decrease in motivation levels in group 2 was statistically significant ( $p=.006$ ). It is only when we look at the motivation levels of both the classes separately that we understand that the overall decrease in motivation levels as a group come mainly from the scores of one class alone. Thus far, the results show that there was no statistically significant change in the participants' stated levels of anxiety, but that there was a statistically significant decrease in their levels of motivation from Time 1 to Time 2. The possible reasons for this decrease in motivation levels will be discussed in the section concerning research question 7.

Looking at the participant scores on the autonomy scale, it was observed that the highest individual score at Time 1 was 249 points, which dropped to 222 points at Time 2, but the lowest individual score was not very different during the two administrations. This could have suggested a possible decrease in levels of autonomy, but interestingly, the mean score rose from 177.84 during the first administration to 179.19 during the second administration. However, this increase was statistically non-significant ( $p=.671$ ), so again we understand that as a whole there was no change in the participants' stated levels of autonomy from test to retest.

The next question to explore is whether a change in one of the affective factors experienced by the participants, corresponds to a change in the other two factors. It was observed that the motivation levels within the participants, as a whole group, had decreased from Time 1 to Time 2. To determine if there were any corresponding changes in the other two factors, the difference between the two scores obtained during the first and second administrations was computed for each variable, and a Pearson's Product

Moment Correlations Coefficient test was run to find the correlation among these three differences. Table 4.7 shows the correlation of changes from Test 1 to Test 2.

Table 4.7: Correlation of changes from test to retest

	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>Correlation between anxiety and motivation</b>	-.330	.065
<b>Correlation between anxiety and autonomy</b>	.065	.726
<b>Correlation between motivation and autonomy</b>	.335	.061

The results showed a low negative correlation between motivation and anxiety at  $-.330$  ( $p=.065$ ), which though statistically insignificant was suggestive of a trend. There was a low positive correlation between motivation and autonomy at  $.335$  ( $p=.061$ ), but again, this change was merely suggestive and not statistically significant. In other words, when there is a significant change in the motivation levels in the participants from Time 1 to Time 2, there is no statistically significant corresponding change in the levels of anxiety and autonomy. These were the results when motivation levels were considered in the whole sample. But when the motivation levels of each group were considered separately to identify if a change in motivation showed a corresponding change in anxiety and autonomy, a moderate negative correlation of  $-.613$  ( $p=.015$ ) was found between anxiety and motivation in Group 1. This suggests that a decrease in motivation was accompanied by an increase in anxiety within this group. Table 4.8 shows the corresponding changes that occur when one of the factors changes.

Table 4.8: Changes in one factor showing corresponding changes in others

		<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Group 1</b>	Anxiety – Motivation	-.613	.015*
	Anxiety – Autonomy	.142	.612
	Motivation - Autonomy	.376	.167
<b>Group 2</b>	Anxiety – Motivation	.011	.967
	Anxiety – Autonomy	-.171	.513
	Motivation - Autonomy	.206	.427

Earlier results indicated that the anxiety experienced by the participants is more likely debilitating rather than facilitative, hence it is not very surprising to observe the trend towards an inverse relationship between anxiety and motivation.

#### **Research Question 4**

**What is the correlation between the three affective factors and students' performance, as measured by the French test and the final class grade?**

In order to determine if there is a correlation between the French test scores and the scores obtained by the participants on the questionnaires measuring anxiety, motivation and autonomy, correlation tests were run between the scores of the participants on each of the measures and the French test scores.

Multiple Linear Regression tests were run on different data sets using SPSS 12.0. The first time, correlations between the first administrations of the in-house French test scores and the scores on the questionnaires on anxiety, motivation, and autonomy were measured. The second time, correlations between the second administrations of the French test scores and scores on the anxiety, motivation, and autonomy questionnaires were measured. In order to find if there is a correlation between the final class grades and the scores obtained by the participants on the questionnaires measuring anxiety,

motivation, and autonomy, the same procedure was followed as with the French test scores. Table 4.9 tabulates the results obtained.

Table 4.9: Summary of correlations between the French test scores/class grades and affective factors

	<b>Anxiety</b>	<b>Motivation</b>	<b>Autonomy</b>
<b>First administration of the three questionnaires &amp; proficiency test</b>			
Correlation coefficient	-.625	.224	-.145
Sig	.000*	.232	.437
<b>Second administration of the three questionnaires &amp; proficiency test</b>			
Correlation coefficient	-.399	.107	-.007
Sig	.031*	.637	.975
<b>First administration of the three questionnaires &amp; final class grade</b>			
Correlation coefficient	-.402	.271	.207
Sig	.016*	.186	.311
<b>Second administration of the three questionnaires &amp; final class grade</b>			
Correlation coefficient	-.415	.088	.312
Sig	.015*	.671	.136

The results show that there were statistically significant moderate negative correlations between the French test scores and first anxiety scores at  $-.625$  ( $p < .001$ ), and a low negative correlation between the French test scores and second anxiety scores at  $-.399$  ( $p = .031$ ), but that there were no correlations between the first French test scores and the scores on motivation or autonomy, either during the first or second administrations.

Linear regression tests were also run between the final class grades and the scores on both administrations of the questionnaires on anxiety, motivation and autonomy. Results show that moderate negative correlations were found between the final class grade and the first anxiety score at  $-.402$  ( $p = .016$ ), and between the final class grade and the second anxiety score at  $-.415$  ( $p = .015$ ), but again, there were no correlations between

the final class grades and the scores on either the first or second administrations of the questionnaires on motivation or autonomy.

The results of all four linear regression tests consistently show that there is a statistically significant negative correlation between anxiety and student performance as measured by the French test and final class grade, but no significant correlations between motivation and autonomy, and student performance. These findings suggest that in this sample the higher the levels of anxiety experienced by a participant, the lower his/her performance in class. It does not seem, however, that the students' performance improves with higher levels of either motivation or autonomy because the students' levels of motivation and autonomy did not have a statistically significant effect on either their French test scores or their final class grade.

Earlier studies conducted with university students had similar results. Horwitz's (1986) study had a significant moderate negative correlation between foreign language anxiety and the final class grades. MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) also found significant negative correlations between French Class Anxiety and performance on a vocabulary learning task. Aida (1994) found a significant negative correlation between FLCAS scores and final grades among American second-year Japanese students, and Coulombe (2000) found a small but significant correlation between FLCAS scores and final grades in eleven French classes ranging from beginning to advanced. Thus it is observed that regardless of the foreign language being studied or the level the students are in university, the negative correlation between foreign language anxiety and class performance is consistent.

Thus far, the anxiety levels of all the participants was discussed as a whole, but since moderate levels of anxiety can either be facilitative or debilitating, a decision was made to examine a subset of the participants. An attempt was made to determine whether the anxiety experienced by the moderately anxious students in this study was facilitative. 23 students were moderately anxious during each of the two administrations of the anxiety questionnaire. 18 of these 23 participants were moderately anxious during both Test 1 and Test 2.

The scores of the twenty-three (72%) moderately anxious participants were correlated with their overall class performance as measured by the French test scores. The results showed that during the first administration of the anxiety scale, there was an inverse relationship between anxiety and proficiency scores which was statistically significant at  $p=.043$ . This meant that during the first administration the anxiety felt by the participants had a negative impact on their French test scores. However, the results were no longer statistically significant during the second administration, even though a negative correlation between moderate levels of anxiety and class performance was observed. These results suggest that the moderately anxious students in this study also experienced debilitating, rather than facilitative anxiety. Table 4.10 shows the correlation between the anxiety scores of the moderately anxious participants and their French test scores.

Table 4.10: Correlation between anxiety scores of moderately anxious participants and their French test scores

	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>First administration</b>	-.426	.043*
<b>Second administration</b>	-.361	.090

Since the inverse relationship between anxiety and the French test scores during the second administration was not significant at  $p=.090$ , a correlation test was run between the scores obtained by the moderately anxious participants during both administrations of the anxiety scale and their final class grade, in place of the in-house French test scores, to see if the results would differ in any way. The scores from the second administration of the anxiety scale and the final class grades were obtained at the end of the semester, whereas the in-house French test was given at the beginning and the end of semester. This time, the inverse relationship between anxiety scores and class grades was statistically significant at  $p=.027$ . These results are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Correlation between anxiety scores of moderately anxious participants and their final class grades

	<b>Correlation Coefficient</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>First administration</b>	-.609	.007*
<b>Second administration</b>	-.461	.027*

It is interesting to note that there is an inverse correlation even between the first anxiety scores and the final class grades, which is statistically significant at  $p=.007$ . These results may indicate that the final grades of the students were more reliable and valid than the scores obtained from the in-house French test that was created for the purpose of this study. Despite these limitations, it is observed that when the results are statistically significant, the anxiety experienced by the moderately anxious students is debilitating rather than facilitative.

### **Research Question 5**

**In what ways, if any, do the results obtained from the participants in the two intact classes, taught by different instructors, differ?**

An independent samples t-test was run to compare the overall performance of the participants in the two classes. The scores obtained during the first administration of the questionnaires on anxiety, motivation and autonomy were first computed. As noted earlier, it was found that Group 1 had a mean score of 242.27 on the motivation scale, while Group 2 had a mean score of 263.88 (a difference of 21.61 points), a significant difference with  $p=.032$ , meaning that the second group was more motivated than the first group during Week 5 of the semester. As far as the levels of anxiety and autonomy were concerned, it was found that there were no significant differences between the two groups. These results are summarized in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Group-wise mean scores on the three questionnaires during Week 5

	<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>Anxiety mean score</b>	92.20	94.53	.751
<b>Motivation mean score</b>	242.27	263.88	.032*
<b>Autonomy mean score</b>	171.33	183.59	.178

A second independent samples t-test was run to compare the overall performance of the two groups during the second administration of the instruments. Table 4.13 provides the participant mean scores on the three questionnaires during Week 13.

Table 4.13: Group-wise mean scores on each questionnaire during Week 13

	<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>Anxiety mean score</b>	94.33	89.24	.496
<b>Motivation mean score</b>	239.00	257.59	.074
<b>Autonomy mean score</b>	176.80	181.29	.504

This time, the higher levels of motivation in Group 2 were no longer statistically significant during Week 13 of the semester, but may be suggestive of a trend. In other words, it is possible that Group 2 experienced marginal levels of motivation and that a

small difference in levels would indicate that these high levels were statistically significant.

Group 2 had higher levels of motivation during week 5 than during Week 13 of the semester. Although they were not as motivated at the end of the semester as they were toward the beginning, they were still marginally, but not significantly more motivated than the participants in Group 1. These results show that the motivation levels within each group did not change a great deal. Some possible reasons for the marginal decrease in motivation levels within the sample will be discussed later in this chapter.

### **Research Question 6**

#### **Are motivation and autonomy distinct factors?**

A correlation test showed that there is a moderate correlation between participant scores on motivation and autonomy. Test 1 had a correlation coefficient of .623 ( $p < .001$ ), while Test 2 had a coefficient of .624 ( $p < .001$ ). In order to find out if motivation and autonomy are distinct factors, it may be helpful to examine the scores of participants who are both motivated and autonomous during Test 1 and Test 2 and observe if any pattern emerges from the data. Table 4.14 summarizes this information.

Table 4.14: Students who are highly motivated and highly autonomous during Test 1 and/or Test 2

<b>Participant</b>	<b>TEST 1</b>		<b>TEST 2</b>	
	<b>Motivated</b>	<b>Autonomous</b>	<b>Motivated</b>	<b>Autonomous</b>
<b>A03</b>	X	X	X	X
<b>A05</b>	X		X	
<b>A08</b>	X		X	X
<b>A11</b>	X	X	X	
<b>A12</b>	X		X	
<b>A17</b>	X			
<b>A20</b>	X			
<b>B01</b>	X		X	
<b>B02</b>	X		X	
<b>B06</b>	X		X	

Table 4-14: Continued

Participant	TEST 1		TEST 2	
	Motivated	Autonomous	Motivated	Autonomous
<b>B08</b>	X		X	
<b>B10</b>	X	X	X	X
<b>B11</b>	X		X	
<b>B12</b>	X		X	
<b>B13</b>	X	X	X	
<b>B17</b>	X	X	X	X
<b>B18</b>	X		X	
<b>B19</b>	X		X	
<b>B21</b>	X		X	

As mentioned in the discussion of research question 2, during the first administration of the instruments in this study, 19 students (59%) were highly motivated but only 5 of them (16%) were also highly autonomous, meaning 14 students (74%) were motivated but not autonomous. During the second administration, 17 students (53%) were highly motivated and only 4 (13%) were highly autonomous. In other words, 13 students (76%) were motivated but not autonomous. The data indicates that it is possible for the students in this sample to be highly motivated, but not highly autonomous. None of the students who were highly autonomous lacked high motivation, which implies that to be highly autonomous a student needs to be highly motivated. Three students (50%) were highly motivated during both administrations of the motivation scale, but were highly autonomous during only the first or second administrations of the autonomy scale. More students are motivated than autonomous in this sample, which implies that there are greater chances of students being motivated than autonomous in a given classroom.

The three students who were both highly motivated and highly autonomous during both tests are A03, B10, and B17. Two students, A11 and B13, were autonomous during Test 1 but not Test 2. Interestingly, A08 was not autonomous at the beginning of the semester, but was so toward the end of the semester. Results shows that two students,

A17 and A20, were highly motivated during Test 1 but were only moderately motivated during Test 2, which implies that they lost some of their motivation. This is always assuming that the participants answered the questionnaires honestly and reliably. Their responses on the AMTB show that they had lost some confidence in using French both inside and outside the classroom. They even began to think that most foreign languages sounded crude and harsh, and that they would prefer to spend more time on courses other than French. It seems that their attitude toward learning French was not as positive as it was during Test 1.

A17 did not write any journal entries, nor was she interviewed, hence her responses on the questionnaires cannot be corroborated. A20, however, expressed her feelings in the journal entries she submitted. Mid-way through the semester, she said that the French class was getting progressively harder as they were learning more every day, and earlier concepts were being built upon. She felt that most of the material was “foreign” to her and that she was easily confused with the many concepts that were presented in class. Her main reason for taking the French class was to fulfill the language requirement. Her overall feelings about learning French do not seem very positive at this point in the semester because she says, “I honestly do not feel that motivated to learn French because of all the tedious work that is involved in it. Five days of foreign language class per week is a lot for a college student with many other classes to handle.” She wished the instructor would “slow down the pace of the class as much as possible in order not to confuse or discourage students.”

These results indicate that participants who are motivated and/or autonomous at one point in the semester may or may not remain this way at another point in the

semester. They may either gain or lose that characteristic at any stage of their language learning experience indicating that the state of being motivated or autonomous is not a constant. These results concur with the views of researchers (e.g. Holec, 1981; Little, 1991) who posit that autonomy is not a steady state that learners achieve once and for all, and that it can fluctuate at different stages of the language learning experience.

It should be noted that while trying to formulate questions that target motivation, it is possible for some facets of autonomy to be included in those questions, because of the high correlation between these two affective factors. The AMTB included some questions on autonomy, for example, and the students had to indicate whether they kept up to date with French by working on it almost every day, whether they wanted to learn French so well that it would become second nature to them, whether they ignored the feedback they received in French class, and whether they ignored distractions when studying French. The responses of the students who were only motivated, and those who were both motivated and autonomous were examined. The results did not show any significant difference in the way that these two groups of students responded to those questions on autonomy, which indicates, once again, that there is a strong interface between motivation and autonomy.

In examining the questionnaire on autonomy, however, there was a difference in the way that students who were motivated but not autonomous answered questions from those who were both motivated and autonomous. The autonomous students were confident that they would be good at choosing learning objectives and materials, evaluating their own learning, identifying their weaknesses, and deciding what they should learn next in the French class. Such was not the case with those who were only

motivated. So, how do we distinguish motivation and autonomy? It is observed that the autonomous students have the ability to take charge of their learning and to make responsible decisions about all aspects of their learning. Characteristics such as working hard on French almost every day, wanting to learn as much French as possible, asking the instructor for help, and sticking to the job at hand while ignoring distractions, overlap and are found in motivated as well as autonomous students, but the previously mentioned characteristics can be found only in autonomous students. The responses of the students, described below, show that both motivation and autonomy are highly correlated, but they are not one and the same factor with different names or labels. As was mentioned earlier, clearly identifying and distinguishing between the affective factors of motivation and autonomy is a challenging task. It seems that in assessing students' levels of motivation, the focus is on the degree of effort the students put into their language learning, whereas in assessing students' levels of autonomy, the focus is on their ability to determine language learning objectives, to select methods and techniques that will help meet their objectives, and to be able to evaluate what they have learnt (Holec, 1981).

The information obtained from students' journals and interviews was examined to better understand how motivation and autonomy are correlated, yet distinct. First of all, two students who are both highly motivated and highly autonomous, but have different perspectives of their language learning experiences, are discussed. Next, other participants who are motivated, but not autonomous are discussed to ascertain whether the qualitative data corroborates the results from the questionnaires, showing that motivation and autonomy are distinct factors.

B10 and B17 were both highly motivated and highly autonomous during both administrations of the test. B10 enjoyed the class, liked her instructor and thought he sincerely wanted them to understand the language. She appreciated the fact that her instructor would talk in French “all the time.” Outside of class she reported that she practiced speaking French with her friends and enjoyed watching French movies. B10 was also an independent learner and showed signs of being responsible for her own learning. In one of her journal entries, she writes:

I keep up with the listening manual and workbook. I read before each lesson and I show up to every class. I study for the tests and do all the review exercises and I think I am doing really well in class. ...I follow all the instructions and have top marks in the class. I feel that in this class I am in control of my own learning but by following the guidelines set for me.

These remarks show that this participant is both highly motivated and highly autonomous. She confidently states that she is in control of her own learning, yet behaves differently from what one would expect from an autonomous student. She has full faith in the instructor, the syllabus and the structure of the class and feels she controls her own learning, not by creating a new or different plan of study, but by following the guidelines set for her because they produced the desired results in her learning and the curriculum was working for her. One might assume that being as highly motivated as she was, if the curriculum had not worked for her, she might have actively found ways to modify it so that her learning would be effective. We observe this participant's motivation in the effort she exerts to achieve her goals, and her autonomy in her identification of the course of action that will give her the desired results. Both the qualitative and quantitative data on this participant show that B10 was highly motivated and highly autonomous in her French class.

According to the scores on the questionnaires, B17 was also highly motivated and highly autonomous during both administrations of the test, but the data from the journals and interview give a preliminary impression that B17 was neither motivated nor autonomous in class. Though B17 had the same instructor as B10, she had a very different perspective of him. In her journal, she states that she lost her motivation to study French because her instructor is “very bad at teaching . . . . This makes me very frustrated and unmotivated to study.” Yet her scores on the motivation scale indicate that she was highly motivated during both Weeks 5 and 13 of the semester. It is possible that B17 was unmotivated to study, but that she was still motivated to learn French, as is observed in the efforts she puts in, according to her journal entry, while studying with her sister. In another journal entry she writes, “Sometimes I get a little disheartened because of class but lately I feel more motivated. Especially now that I have more time.” This remark shows that the participant is more motivated at this point in the semester, not because the instructor has made any changes in his teaching style but because she reportedly has more time. This student’s levels of motivation depend more on factors within her control, in this case, her time, rather than the quality of instruction in her French class. She also writes:

I made an easy A in French last semester and I don’t feel like it will be that way this semester. Luckily, though, when I do study the course material is really helpful. The book is easy to understand that [sic] the oral section online is very useful. I also like that the syllabus shows us everything that will be going on . . . I hate the fact that it is just random things what [sic] we spend our class time on. This subject could be really interesting but it isn’t right now.

It seems as if B17 is unable to recognize the reasons for her apathy in class. During the interview, she stated that her lack of motivation was due to the fact that her instructor spoke in French for long periods of time and she tended to switch off, that he went “on

and on about things that are irrelevant” and also because he “grades rather harsh for a beginning class,” yet when she has a little more time for her studies, she feels motivated, finds the textbook easy to understand when she takes the time to read through it, finds the course material helpful, and the online oral section useful. Not only does this student feel motivated when she does her part, puts some effort into her studies, and takes responsibility for her learning by studying for her language course, but at home, she usually goes over the entire book, making study guides on grammar and vocabulary. The first impression we get about B17’s lack of motivation and autonomy from her qualitative data, is not substantiated by her behavior during the semester. Even though B17 thinks she is unmotivated and apathetic in class, she does take responsibility for her learning, determines what will help her learn, and sets out to accomplish her goals. We observe, yet again, that the qualitative data do corroborate the quantitative data and show that B17 is highly motivated as well as highly autonomous, even though she reported being dissatisfied with her class and thinks the instructor is ineffective.

We notice that B10 was very positive in her assessment of the class and had a final class grade of 97%, whereas B17 was not as positive, and had a final class grade of 87%. It is possible that the attitude of a language learner plays a role in the class performance, or even that class performance plays a role in motivation. Motivation and autonomy tap different emotions in different language learners, and from the quantitative and qualitative data provided, we observe that varying degrees of interactions between these two affective factors may produce varying degrees of success in different students, or varying degrees of success at different times within the same student. Success, in this case, is evidenced by class grades. Research (e.g. Wang and Palincsar, 1989) shows that

when learners take responsibility for their own learning and make independent choices to facilitate their goals, their motivation increases and they are better able to achieve their goals. It is obvious that both B10 and B17 have taken responsibility for their learning, and are also motivated to work hard and succeed in their French class.

In an attempt to observe differences between students who are both autonomous and motivated, and those who are only motivated, six students, A18, B01, B02, B06, B18, and B21, who were highly motivated during both administrations of the AMTB, but were not also highly autonomous, were examined. Some of the comments they made in their journals and interviews were that: they did not make any specific plans as to how to improve their language skills, they did not try to improve their skills outside class, they did not think about how to best study for the class, and they never paid attention to the objectives of the class. These comments suggest that these participants were not aware of what they could do to improve their language skills and how they could control their learning. They did not come up with any goals and objectives of their own, nor did they evaluate what they had learnt, which is characteristic of autonomous behavior. However, the participants were definitely motivated to learn French, as is seen from their interest in purchasing French materials such as cassette tapes and short story books, writing short paragraphs in French, singing French songs, reading French newspapers and making flashcards to learn vocabulary. They were enthusiastic to learn the language and made the effort to do better in class. In other words, these participants were motivated, but not autonomous. Hence we observe from both the quantitative and qualitative data that although motivation and autonomy are closely related these two constructs are indeed distinct and manifest themselves in different ways in second language learners.

### **Research Question 7**

**What are some possible reasons for a change, if any, in the levels of anxiety, motivation, and autonomy experienced by the participants from test to retest?**

In the discussion of Research Question 3, it was noted that there were no significant changes in the levels of anxiety and autonomy experienced by the participants, but that there was a statistically significant decrease in motivation in the sample from Week 5 to Week 13 of the semester. It was also stated that the motivation levels of Group 2 were higher than those of Group 1 at the beginning of the semester. Both groups experienced a decrease in their levels of motivation during Week 13 of the semester, but only the decrease in Group 2 was statistically significant. In the discussion of this question, however, the two groups are not considered separately because there was a decrease in motivation levels in both groups. Also, most of the qualitative data has been collected from Group 2. Eight of the eleven students who wrote journals were from Group 2, and five of the six interviews conducted were with students from Group 2.

In order to understand what some possible reasons may be for this decline in motivation levels, we examine some background information about the two classes that was obtained through classroom observations.

The two instructors who taught the two intact classes in this study had different teaching styles. Instructor 1 used a deductive method of teaching in class, stating the language rule he wanted to teach that day and then giving the students many examples to help them understand the concept. The teacher would speak in French most of the time, but did not require his students to answer him in French. As a result, the students mostly answered comprehension questions or questions concerning the presentation in English. When the instructor asked students to read a few sentences from the textbook or was

teaching vocabulary and asked for the French equivalents, the students would make an effort to speak in French, usually uttering words or phrases rather than complete sentences. The teacher would call on the students at random to answer questions, making sure that each one had a chance to answer at least one question. In a 50-minute class of about 20 students, the students got an opportunity to answer a question in French twice, on an average. The teacher occasionally asked the students to read a few lines from the textbook out loud, which gave them some practice in reading the language. The teacher mostly focused on teaching grammar and vocabulary in this class, and stated, during the interview, that the students were more interested in learning about culture than grammar. This French class was observed at least once a week. During these times, the students were never engaged in any pair work or group work. This was probably one of the reasons why the students would come to the classroom and wait for the class to begin without engaging in any small talk or having any interactions amongst themselves and were “just there,” as the instructor put it during the interview. When the teacher came in early, he would usually greet the students and then read something or keep himself occupied until it was time to begin the class. No efforts were made to walk around the class and interact with the students, which, in turn, might have developed a sense of rapport between the students and the instructor and also among the students. When the students asked the instructor any questions he would always spend time answering them.

Instructor 2, on the other hand, used an inductive method of teaching, writing a few sentences or examples on the chalkboard, and asking the students to examine the structure and come up with the language rule to be studied that day, based on the given examples. The teacher would speak in French most of the time and also required his

students to answer him in French. The students would try their best to answer in complete sentences. This instructor would not call on individual students as much as the previous instructor for answers, but would explain a concept for a few minutes then ask the students to practice the concept or grammar item in pairs or in groups of three, depending on the seating arrangements in class. In this way, the students got a fair amount of practice in using the language regardless of whether or not they always used grammatically correct structures with each other. This teacher also occasionally asked the students to read aloud some dialogues from the textbook, which gave them some practice in reading the language. Instructor 2 believed that grammar should be taught in the cultural context and remarked, during the interview, that his students asked many questions on vocabulary and grammar, especially conjugations. This was probably because the focus of teaching in this class was not always on grammar and vocabulary, as it was in the previous class, and the teaching style was inductive rather than deductive. The dissatisfaction of the students in each of these classes indicates that neither the inductive nor the deductive teaching style met the needs of all the students in the class. This class was also different from the first with regards to student interaction. The students would come to the classroom and interact, in English, with the others sitting in their general vicinity while waiting for the class to begin. This was probably because most of the time the instructor would require the students to practice or complete an exercise in pairs or small groups, which involved interactions on a regular basis. The students may have formed a bond which made it easier for them to interact with one another even when they were not required to.

The decrease in the overall levels of motivation within the participants could have occurred for a variety of reasons examined below. These comments were extracted from the journal entries and interviews that were conducted with the students and instructors, and support the possible reasons given for a decrease in motivation in their language classes. It must be noted that the following comments are made by students whose motivation levels decreased from test to retest.

### **Test Anxiety**

The participants who were highly motivated in this study said that they experienced test anxiety. B02 was anxious just before tests because that is when she realized that she did not know as much as she should. She said that the teacher did not require them to complete the assignments, and as a result, she had fallen behind and was very worried about the final exam. B 06, B17 and B18 felt that being nervous was a waste of time because classes and tests are within the student's control, so either they knew the answers or they did not. B17 added that when a person is apathetic, there is no anxiety. B18 reported being frustrated with her test grades because she knew more French than what her test reflected.

### **Extensive Material**

None of the students said that the material was very difficult to grasp, but they felt that they might have been more inclined to do the daily assignments if there had not been so much to do every day that it became very tedious. Even if they did the assignments, they were not motivated to bother about quality because the instructors did not read what was written, but only checked to see if the work was done. A18, who was highly motivated only during Test 1, said "I am not sure that I'm retaining much of what I am learning because I have to concentrate so hard on learning each new lesson and chapter

that I forget what we've studied previously." Also, the students were not very motivated to do the writing exercises in the workbook because it did not prepare them for the tests, which included multiple choice answers or word banks from which to choose answers.

### **Fast Pace of Class**

It was also felt that the pace of instruction was too fast and because new material was being taught every day, the students did not have time to assimilate or practice what was taught, so they were not learning as much as they could. A17, who was highly motivated only during Test 1, felt that if the pace of class was slower, she would not be as confused or discouraged while learning French. This aspect of class was probably one of the factors that lead to a decrease in her motivation level.

### **Language Requirement**

Some students disliked the fact that they had to take the French class because of a language requirement policy of the university. In connection with this policy, B18 said that she hated people telling her what to do. A18 said that she was taking the class as a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory option so that she didn't have to work very hard, and came to class only for the attendance. This aspect and the fact that there was so much to learn in class probably were the reasons for A18's decrease in motivation.

### **Communication with Instructor**

In one of the classes, the students felt that the teacher could not understand the questions they asked him in English, so they gave up asking questions after a while. They also felt that he could not explain some concepts well because of his lack of fluency in English, and wished that he could give them examples of the concepts taught and their English equivalents. Two other students said that when they got an answer wrong, the instructor just said "it's wrong" without giving them any hint as to how to get the right

answer. Their disappointment with the method of instruction in class probably dampened their enthusiasm to learn French.

### **Dissatisfaction with Class**

The students were also dissatisfied with the way the class was taught. One of the instructors focused a great deal on teaching grammar and vocabulary, and called on the students to answer questions. The students in this class felt that they needed to learn how to communicate in French in full sentences, rather than to learn a lot of grammar and vocabulary. The second instructor frequently asked the students to do some activities in pairs or small groups, and the students in this class thought there was not much point in interacting with their classmates because they did not know the right answers, anyway. These students said they would have preferred to be called upon to answer questions and did not think that it would be an anxiety-provoking experience. This may be so because this group usually interacted with each other in class.

These were some possible reasons for the decrease in motivation observed within the participants, especially within Group 2. The comments made by the students give an insight into their frustrations. It is quite clear that the students were more motivated at the beginning of the semester, but that as the semester progressed, some of them lost interest and their motivation levels decreased.

There is no doubt that the students were frustrated in their French class, but the interviews with the instructors revealed that they also had their share of frustrations. There were times when they felt that they could not do much to improve the situation in the classroom because it was beyond their control. They were very frustrated when the students complained about the tests and said that the grading was harsh because the students did not put much effort into their studies, were fine with a grade of 'B,' and

came to the tests unprepared. It was also frustrating when the students would walk into class very late and even read the college paper during composition days instead of spending that time in their writing. Teaching the students grammar was a challenge because they were unfamiliar with the grammar terms even in English so they were not really interested in grammar. The students also complained that they were not prepared in class for the final oral exams, but the instructors believed that doing an oral exercise in class was preparation for that exam. This mismatch of student-instructor perception of the final oral exam might have been prevented if the students were reminded throughout the semester that any oral communication they engage in during class is practice for the final oral exam.

Some of the concerns the instructors had about the class were regarding the amount of grading that needed to be done. Since it was not possible to grade all the work that was done, they mainly checked for completion, hoping that the students had learnt something from actually doing the exercises. Another area of concern the instructors had was about the SAT II placement tests that were conducted only during the first two days of the semester. When a student decided to join the French class on the third or fourth day, they had to decide which class s/he should attend. This was a challenging task because if a mistake was made in assigning the student to the appropriate class, they were 'stuck' with that student for the rest of the semester.

These remarks made by students and instructors alike give an insight into the frustrations experienced on both sides and could serve as possible reasons why the motivation levels within the participants decreased over the course of the semester. This was only one side of the story, however, because there were some students who were

very happy with their instructors. At the same time, the instructors had some very positive comments to make about some of the students. Nevertheless, because the results show that there was an overall statistically significant decrease in motivation levels in this group of students, some possible reasons for this change was explored.

In this study, out of a total of 32 participants, during Test 1 eight participants (25%) experienced high levels of anxiety, 19 participants (59%) were highly motivated, and five participants (16%) were autonomous. During Test 2, seven participants (22%) experienced high levels of anxiety, 17 participants (53%) reported being highly motivated, and four participants (13%) were autonomous. No correlations were found between anxiety and motivation or between anxiety and autonomy, but there were statistically significant moderate correlations between motivation and autonomy. Results shows that the participants' motivation levels decreased from Time 1 to Time 2. As far as correlations between the affective factors and class performance was concerned, anxiety had a statistically significant moderate negative correlation with class performance.

## CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the results obtained in this study, suggests pedagogical implications, discusses the limitations of this study, and outlines avenues for possible future research.

### **Summary**

An attempt was made to discover how the affective factors of anxiety, motivation and autonomy correlate with one another, and to observe their effect on participants' class grades. The results indicated that there were correlations only between the levels of motivation and autonomy in the participants, but that there were no correlations between anxiety and motivation, or between anxiety and autonomy. Both the qualitative and quantitative data provided in this study supports earlier research, which shows a strong relationship between motivation and autonomy.

As far as the stability of these factors over an eight-week period was concerned, there was a statistically significant decrease in the participants' levels of motivation from the first administration of the motivation scale to the second, which was toward the end of the semester. A change in the participants' levels of motivation did not correlate with a significant change in the other two factors, but there are trends toward changes occurring in both anxiety and autonomy at 'p' values of .065 and .061, respectively. As to the effect of these affective factors on class performance, the results of this study corroborated earlier research, which shows that anxiety has a negative effect on students'

class performance. However, it was found that neither motivation nor autonomy seemed to have any effect on the class performance of this sample.

The participants in this study were from two intact classes taught by different instructors, yet the results of both classes were not very different. There were no differences in the levels of anxiety and autonomy in the two classes during either the first or second administration of the instruments. With regards to motivation, Group 2 was more motivated than Group 1 during the first administration of the motivation scale, but not during the second administration. However, the results showed a likelihood of Group 2 still being marginally more motivated than Group 1 at a 'p' value of .074. Hence, we can safely assume that there was minimal teacher effect on these two classes.

### **Pedagogical Implications**

#### **Anxiety and Motivation**

The results showed that there was no correlation between the levels of anxiety and motivation experienced by the participants in this study, which meant that anxious students were not necessarily unmotivated, as suggested by earlier research. Students in any classroom have different personalities and react to situations in different ways, and instructors may benefit from understanding that even though students show signs of being anxious in a language classroom, which may or may not adversely affect their grades, those students can still be motivated to learn effectively. Therefore, teachers should not give up on their anxious students assuming that anxious students are likely to be less motivated to learn. Given this knowledge, instructors can channel their efforts in motivating students and also reducing their anxiety. An insight into these results may lessen the perplexity teachers feel about active and motivated students who show unanticipated signs of being anxious in class. When instructors recognize that a student

who is enthusiastic and motivated in completing class work or engaging in class activities can also experience language anxiety, which could manifest itself in any form, such as feelings of discomfort or inadequacy, they may use anxiety-reducing techniques to teach those students.

### **Anxiety and Autonomy**

No correlations were found between the anxiety and autonomy levels in the participants. These results suggest that instructors should not assume that their anxiety-ridden students cannot take charge of their learning and show signs of being autonomous. By the same token, teachers need to be aware that autonomous students who seem to have taken charge of their own learning may still feel anxious about their foreign language learning experiences, which in turn, could affect their class grades. For example, students may be anxious about whether the objectives and plans they have set up for their own study will be effective or not. A teacher will definitely need to lend a helping hand and be supportive of even those students who seem to need no help from them.

### **Motivation and Autonomy**

In this sample, motivation and autonomy were highly correlated, which means that the more motivated a student is, the more chances there are that this student may also be autonomous. Similarly, the more autonomous a student is, the greater the likelihood that this student will be motivated in the language classroom. But since the results showed that neither motivation nor autonomy has an effect on class grades, it cannot be said that the more motivated or the more autonomous the students are, the greater are their chances of getting better grades. Also, in this sample, there were far more students who were motivated than who were autonomous. If such is the case in most classrooms, teachers

might benefit from understanding this phenomenon in their classrooms. It will help them understand the behavior of the students in their classrooms, decide the instructional strategies they would prefer to employ, and possibly adapt their teaching style to one that targets motivated, rather than autonomous students.

Over a period of eight weeks, there were no changes in the levels of anxiety or autonomy in the participants, but there were changes in their levels of motivation. These results should not be very surprising, because intuitively one would imagine that it might take longer than eight weeks to significantly reduce or dispel students' foreign language anxiety. Conversely, autonomy seems to be more an ability or capacity that a language learner has, rather than a transient feeling or a "mood". Results do show, however, that there was a change in the levels of motivation. If teachers understand that there are higher chances of the motivation levels in students changing, they can plan their instructional strategies to enhance motivation in the language classroom.

### **Anxiety, Motivation and Class Grades**

Classroom anxiety levels of the participants had a consistent strong negative influence on the in-house French test scores as well as the final class grades during both the first and second administrations of the anxiety scale. Teachers are sometimes confused or even frustrated with the low grades that some of their students earn in class, despite the fact that the students seem active and motivated, and put in a great deal of effort in their work. According to the results of this study, we have seen that levels of motivation have little or no effect on class grades, but anxiety levels are highly correlated with class grades. Hence, it may be advisable for teachers to focus on reducing the anxiety that students feel in the classroom, which may then improve class performance.

**Teacher Effect**

The participants in this study belonged to two different classes taught by different instructors with very different teaching styles and personalities, yet we see that there wasn't much difference in their students' levels of anxiety, motivation or autonomy when comparing the two classes to each other. This observation indicates that there was little or no teacher effect on the participants in this study, which is an encouraging thought to instructors. Every class has students whose learning styles may not match perfectly with the teaching style adopted by the teacher, so there will always be some students whose needs are not fully met.

**Possible Reasons for Lack of Motivation**

The quantitative data in this study show that there was a decrease in the participants' levels of motivation towards the end of the semester. The qualitative data obtained from journal entries and interviews indicates that some of the possible reasons for the decrease in motivation could be because the students were unhappy with the way the class was taught, because their needs were not met in the class, or because there was too much homework. If teachers are aware of these possible reasons for a decline in students' motivation levels, they can make every effort to avoid some of these situations. In this way, the students could remain motivated during the entire language learning experience.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study involved adult students who were learning French. Much of the classroom instruction, the in-house French test, and the class activities were in French. It is very unfortunate that I did not know the language. As a result, I had to ask teachers and students to explain certain situations that occurred in the classroom, and about the

topic that was taught in class that day. I could not understand the teacher-student interactions in French. As a result, it is very possible that I missed some valuable information and insights that could have enriched the data collected in this study.

Not knowing the French language, I had to depend on the Assistant Director of the language program to devise the in-house French Test. There were a few typos in the test, which I was unable to spot or correct before it was administered to the students.

Also, I wanted to have at least 30 participants in my study, but since none of the sections had 30 students enrolled in them, I had to enlist the help of students from two different intact classes. It would have been much better if all the participants were from the same class to control for variables that might influence results.

It would have been interesting to observe a three-way interaction between the three variables, instead of two-way correlations between them. It was difficult to identify a statistical test that would achieve a three-way interaction, hence the researcher was limited to discussing two-way interactions.

### **Future research**

It would be interesting to replicate this study with not only a different group of students learning French but also with students learning other languages to observe if similar results are obtained where there are correlations only between motivation and autonomy, and none between anxiety and motivation, or between anxiety and autonomy.

The data in this study were collected over a period of eight weeks and results showed that there was a change only in the motivation levels of the participants. Investigations could be made with shorter and longer time periods in between the two administrations of the instruments to examine if the time in between administrations determined changes in the variables under consideration.

The French language program in this study had a very detailed daily syllabus set out for all the instructors to follow. It might be worth our while to observe if there is any teacher effect in programs that do not have such a detailed syllabus, and where the instructors are more independent in planning their own courses.

The two classes that were observed met at about the same time of day, from 10:40 a.m. until 12:35 p.m. If the two classes had met during different times, for example, one class in the morning and another in the late afternoon, would the results obtained have been different, in terms of changes in affective factors and the teacher effect? It would be interesting to find out if the time a language class is conducted makes a difference.

The results of this study show that motivation may be a necessary condition for autonomy to be present in a language learner. It would be interesting to observe if similar results are obtained in other settings, such as with a different language group or with a different age group. It might also be worthwhile to investigate if motivation would be sufficient to ensure autonomy or if some other individual differences are necessary too.

This is the first known study that has looked at the interplay between these three variables, anxiety, motivation and autonomy, and their influence on class performance. Further, the quantitative results were compared and corroborated with the qualitative data that were collected. Further research also needs to be done to examine the effect of motivation and autonomy on class performance of students and to determine which variable, if any, the teachers can try to enhance in their students.

APPENDIX A  
PARTICIPANT BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Participant Information Form

*The contents of this form are **absolutely** confidential. Information identifying the respondent will **not** be disclosed under any circumstances.*

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Code:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone number:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Gender:** Female \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_ *(please put an 'X')*

**Age:** \_\_\_\_\_ years

**Major / Department:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Year in school:** Freshman    Sophomore    Junior    Senior    Master    Doctoral  
*(circle)*

**Expected month and year of graduation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Foreign countries visited:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Length of time spent in French-speaking countries:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Foreign languages studied in high school (with length of time):** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Native (First) Language:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Languages spoken at home (other than English):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Approximate number of hours you speak French out of class every week:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Approximate number of hours you spend studying French every week:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Expected grade for this language course:** A B+ B C+ C D+ D F  
(circle)

~ Thank you for your participation ~

APPENDIX B  
IN-HOUSE FRENCH TEST

**French Test**  
**1131/1116**

**Nom** \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Choisissez le pronom approprié pour remplacer la phrase soulignée.**

1. Je voudrais un kilo de pommes de terres.

Je \_\_\_\_\_ voudrais un kilo.

- a) y    b) en    c) le    d) les

2. Elle est toujours en France.

Elle \_\_\_\_\_ est toujours.

- a) y    b) en    c) le    d) la

3. Marie telephone souvent à ses parents.

Marie \_\_\_\_\_ telephone souvent.

- a) y    b) les    c) leur    d) leurs

4. Ses enfants n'aiment pas du tout les legumes.

Ses enfants ne \_\_\_\_\_ aiment pas du tout.

- a) en    b) les    c) leur    d) leurs

5. Le professeur a répondu à la question.

Le professeur \_\_\_\_\_ a répondu.

- a) y    b) lui    c) la    d) leur

**B. Choisissez la forme appropriée du verbe.**

1. S'il pleut, je \_\_\_\_\_ mon parapluie.

- a) prendrai    b) prendrais    c) prenais    d) ai pris

2. Cet après-midi nous \_\_\_\_\_ au restaurant.

- a) mangeons    b) allons manger    c) mangerons    d) mangerions

3. Quand ils étaient jeunes, ils \_\_\_\_\_ chez leur grand-mère après l'école.

- a) vont    b) iraient    c) allaient    d) sont allés

4. Voulez-vous que je \_\_\_\_\_ au téléphone?

- a) reponds    b) répondrai    c) répondrais    d) réponde

5. Si j'avais su, je vous \_\_\_\_\_ un gâteau.  
 a) fais    b) ai fait    c) aurais fait    d) avais fait

**C. Lisez le passage puis répondez aux questions.**

**Le Musée d'Orsay**

**Renseignements utiles:**

62, rue de Lille, 75005 Paris. Entrée principale: 1, rue de la Légion-d'Honneur  
 01-45-49-11-11

Mét. Solférino ou RER C: Musée d'Orsay

Internet: [www.musee-orsay.fr](http://www.musee-orsay.fr)

Ouvert les Mardi, Mercredi, Vendredi et Samedi de 10h à 18 h: le Jeudi jusqu'à 21h45; le Dimanche, ouvert de 9h à 18h. Entre le 20 juin et le 20 septembre, ouverture à 9h. Fermé le Lundi. Attention: la vente des billets s'arrête une demi-heure avant la fermeture. Tarifs: 40F pour les adultes, gratuité jusqu'à 18 ans, 30F le Dimanche pour les adultes.

Possibilité de visites générales ou thématiques (par artiste, par genre, etc.) guides (durée: 1h30)

**Petit Historique:**

Le Musée d'Orsay est une ancienne gare ferroviaire. Utilisée comme gare pendant une quarantaine d'années (1889-1939), elle a été laissée à l'abandon après la deuxième guerre mondiale. En 1970 la ville de Paris a accordé un permis de démolition pour cette immense structure métallique.

À l'idée de voir disparaître ce bel édifice, exemple témoin des techniques de construction utilisées à la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle, les Parisiens se sont émus. Ils ont fait inscrire le bâtiment à l'inventaire des Monuments historiques, et ils ont fait appel à l'architecte italienne Gai Aulenti pour le transformer en musée. Aujourd'hui il réunit les œuvres des peintres, des sculpteurs, et des artistes graphiques des années 1848-1905.

1. On which day of the week is it **not** possible to visit this museum? \_\_\_\_\_
2. If you would like to visit the museum around 7 pm, on which day should you go?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. On which day can adults get in at a reduced price? \_\_\_\_\_

4. The building, which houses the Musée d'Orsay, was not always a museum.

(a) What was its former function? \_\_\_\_\_

(b) For how long did it serve this function? \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Vocabulaire

Select the one best answer.

1. Chaque fois que tu vas \_\_\_\_\_ Charlotte, tu la trouves plus jolie.

- (a) visiter
- (b) regarder
- (c) voir
- (d) entendre

2. Après un repas dans un restaurant, il faut payer \_\_\_\_\_.

- (a) l'addition
- (b) la note
- (c) le billet
- (d) le prix

3. Je vais \_\_\_\_\_ une Toyota l'année prochaine si j'ai assez d'argent.

- (a) prendre
- (b) vendre
- (c) acheter
- (d) venir

4. Véronique, ce \_\_\_\_\_ desire voir quelque chose dans les imperméables pour femmes, de haute qualité.

- (a) homme
- (b) monsieur
- (c) personne
- (d) type

5. L'informatique est moins connue en France qu'aux Etats-Unis et tout le monde n'a pas l'ordinateur \_\_\_\_\_ lui.

- (a) à
- (b) pour
- (c) comme
- (d) chez

6. Monique et Daniel sont toujours les derniers à \_\_\_\_\_ mes soirées.

- (a) partir
- (b) sortir
- (c) quitter
- (d) laisser

7. Paris est divisée en vingt \_\_\_\_\_, numérotées de I à XX.

- (a) provinces
- (b) centers
- (c) arrondissements
- (d) departments

APPENDIX C  
QUESTIONNAIRE ON ANXIETY

CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**Role of Emotions in Language Learning**

*Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.*

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neither Agree or Disagree

Agree

Strongly Agree

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my French class.
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in French class.
3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in French class.
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in French.
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.
6. During French class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am.
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my French class.
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in French class.
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my French class.
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over French classes.
12. In French class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my French class.

14. I would not be nervous speaking in French with native speakers.
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
16. Even if I am well prepared for French class, I feel anxious about it.
17. I often feel like not going to my French class.
18. I feel confident when I speak in French class.
19. I am afraid my French teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in French class.
21. The more I study for a French test, the more confused I get.
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for French class.
23. I always feel that the other students speak French better than I do.
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking French in front of other students.
25. French class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my French class than in my other classes.
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my French class.
28. When I'm on my way to French class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the French teacher says.
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak in French.
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of French.
33. I get nervous when the French teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.
34. I get just as nervous in my other classes as I do in my French class.
35. I am usually calm and not easily upset.
36. I am a high-strung person.

**37. I avoid meeting new people even though they are English speakers.**

S D N A S  
D A

**38. I am satisfied with the progress I am making in all my classes, except French.**

**39. I go through periods in which I lose sleep over worry.**

**40. It doesn't bother me when I am not in control of a situation.**

~ Thank you for your participation ~

APPENDIX D  
QUESTIONNAIRE ON MOTIVATION

CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**Learning a Foreign Language**

*Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.*

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Studying French is important because it will make me appear more cultured.					
2. When called upon to use my French, I feel very much at ease.					
3. I would really like to learn many foreign languages.					
4. I may not be completely fluent in French, but I feel confident speaking it.					
5. I hate French.					
6. I make a point of trying to understand all the French I see and hear.					
7. I wish I could speak another language perfectly.					
8. I am more confident in my ability to speak French than others who know as much French as I do.					
9. I often wish I could read newspapers and magazines in another language.					
10. Knowing French isn't really an important goal in my life.					
11. Studying a foreign language is not a pleasant experience.					
12. I have less confidence in my French skills than others who know as much French as I do.					
13. It doesn't bother me at all to speak French.					

	<b>S</b> <b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>S</b> <b>A</b>
14. Despite the fact that I may not be completely proficient in French, I am self-assured conducting myself in French.					
15. I would get nervous if I had to speak French to someone in a store.					
16. I'm not as confident in my ability to use French as other people who know as much French as I do.					
17. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in our French class.					
18. French is really great.					
19. I sometimes daydream about dropping French.					
20. Speaking French bothers me.					
21. I really enjoy learning French.					
22. I wish I had begun studying French at an early age.					
23. I love learning French.					
24. I would feel quite relaxed if I had to ask street directions in French.					
25. I really have no interest in foreign languages.					
26. I keep up to date with French by working on it almost every day.					
27. If it were up to me, I would spend all my time learning French.					
28. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our French class.					
29. I want to learn French so well that it will become second nature to me.					
30. Studying French can be important for me because it will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.					
31. I would rather spend my time on courses other than French.					
32. I would like to learn as much French as possible.					
33. I plan to learn as much French as possible.					
34. I don't usually get anxious when I have to respond to a question in my French class.					
35. I find the study of French very boring.					
36. I don't pay too much attention to the feedback I receive in my French class.					
37. I feel confident when asked to participate in my French class.					

	S D	D	N	A	S A
38. It would bother me if I had to speak French on the telephone.					
39. I'm not as self-assured using French as other people at my level of ability.					
40. I do not get anxious when I am asked for information in my French class.					
41. Even when I make mistakes speaking French, I still feel sure of myself while trying to communicate.					
42. Most foreign languages sound crude and harsh.					
43. Learning French is a waste of time.					
44. I don't bother checking my corrected assignments in my French courses.					
45. I'm as self-assured conducting myself in French as anybody else who knows as much French as I do.					
46. When I have a problem understanding something we are learning in my French class, I always ask the instructor for help.					
47. I am as confident using French as other people who know as much French as I do.					
48. I find I'm losing any desire I ever had to know French.					
49. It worries me that other students in my class seem to speak French better than I do.					
50. Studying French is important because it will give me an edge in competing with others.					
51. I wish I were fluent in French.					
52. I am confident when having conversations with French-speaking people despite any errors I may make.					
53. Studying French can be important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.					
54. I would feel uncomfortable speaking French under any circumstances.					
55. I would feel comfortable speaking French in an informal gathering where both English and French speaking persons were present.					
56. I tend to approach my French homework in a random and unplanned manner.					
57. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my French class.					
58. Regardless of how much French I know, I feel confident about using it.					
59. Studying French is important for me because it will increase my ability to influence others.					
60. I really work hard to learn French.					
61. I have a tendency to give up when our French instructor goes off on a tangent.					

	<b>S</b> <b>D</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>S</b> <b>A</b>
62. I would feel calm and sure of myself if I had to order a meal in French.					
63. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English.					
64. To be honest, I really have little desire to learn French.					
65. I don't understand why other students feel nervous about using French in class.					
66. When I am studying French, I ignore distractions and stick to the job at hand.					
67. When I finish this course, I shall give up the study of French entirely because I am not interested in it.					
68. I feel confident using French regardless of my ability.					
69. I am sometimes afraid the other students will laugh at me when I speak French.					
70. I can't be bothered trying to understand the more complex aspects of French.					
71. I haven't any great wish to learn more than the basics of French.					
72. I feel anxious if someone asks me something in French.					
73. Students who claim they get nervous in French class are just making excuses.					
74. I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.					
75. I would rather see a foreign film dubbed in English than see the film in its original language with English sub-titles.					

~ Thank you for your participation ~

APPENDIX E  
QUESTIONNAIRE ON AUTONOMY

CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**The Roles of Learners and Teachers**

**Section 1 - Responsibilities**

**In your French class, indicate to what extent it should be “your” or “your teacher’s” responsibility to accomplish the following:**

*Please indicate your opinion after each question by putting an ‘X’ in the appropriate box beside both “Yours” and “Your teacher’s” boxes.*

	Not at all	A little	Some	Mainly	Completely
<b>1. make sure you make progress during lessons.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>2. make sure you make progress outside class.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>3. stimulate your interest in learning French.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>4. identify your weaknesses in French.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>5. make you work harder.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>6. decide the objectives of your French course.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>7. decide what you should learn next in your French lessons.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>8. choose what activities to use to learn French in your French lessons.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>9. decide how long to spend on each activity.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>10. choose what materials to use to learn French in your French lessons.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				
<b>11. evaluate your learning.</b>	Yours				
	Your teacher’s				

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 12. evaluate your course.                | Your teacher's |
|  | Yours          |
| 13. decide what you learn outside class. | Your teacher's |
|  | Yours          |
|  | Your teacher's |

**Section 2 - Abilities**

If you have the opportunity how good do you think you would be at:

*Please indicate your opinion after each question by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates your view.*

- |   |           |      |    |      |           |
|---|-----------|------|----|------|-----------|
|   | Very Poor | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good |
| 14. choosing learning <u>activities</u> in class.               |           |      |    |      |           |
| 15. choosing learning <u>activities</u> outside class.          |           |      |    |      |           |
| 16. choosing learning <u>objectives</u> in class.               |           |      |    |      |           |
| 17. choosing learning <u>objectives</u> outside class.          |           |      |    |      |           |
| 18. choosing learning <u>materials</u> in class.                |           |      |    |      |           |
| 19. choosing learning <u>materials</u> outside class.           |           |      |    |      |           |
| 20. evaluating your learning.                                   |           |      |    |      |           |
| 21. evaluating your course.                                     |           |      |    |      |           |
| 22. identifying your weaknesses in French.                      |           |      |    |      |           |
| 23. deciding what you should learn next in your French lessons. |           |      |    |      |           |
| 24. deciding how long to spend on each activity.                |           |      |    |      |           |

**Section 3 - Motivation**

Please put an 'X' in the appropriate space.

**25. How would you describe yourself?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Highly motivated to learn French.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Well motivated to learn French.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Motivated to learn French.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Slightly motivated to learn French.

\_\_\_\_\_ Not at all motivated to learn French.

#### Section 4 - Activities

During the last semester, indicate how often you have done the following OUTSIDE class:

*Please indicate your opinion after each question by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates your view.*

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
26. read grammar books on your own.					
27. done assignments which are not compulsory.					
28. noted down new words and their meanings.					
29. written French letters to pen pals.					
30. sent emails in French.					
31. read books or magazines in French					
32. listened to French songs.					
33. talked to foreigners in French.					
34. practiced using French with friends.					
35. had French study groups.					
36. done grammar exercises.					
37. watched French language movies.					
38. written a diary in French.					
39. used the internet in French.					
40. done revision not required by the teacher.					
41. collected texts in French (e.g. articles, brochures, labels, etc.).					
42. gone to see your teacher about your work.					

During the last semester, indicate how often you have done the following **INSIDE** class:

*Please indicate your opinion after each question by putting an 'X' in the box that best indicates your view.*

Never  
Rarely  
Sometimes  
Often  
Always

- 43. asked the teacher questions when you didn't understand.
- 44. noted down new information.
- 45. made suggestions to the teacher.
- 46. taken opportunities to speak in French.
- 47. discussed learning problems with classmates.

~ Thank you for your participation ~

APPENDIX F  
TOPICS FOR JOURNAL

**Journal Entry 1 - Week 8**

You have been in this language class (FRE 1131) for the last few weeks. What were your thoughts, feelings and impressions about the syllabus, course materials, classroom atmosphere, instructor, etc. when you first began this course? Have those initial thoughts and feelings changed in any way? Why? At the beginning of this semester, did you make any specific plans on how you would improve your language skills throughout the semester? Have you been able to achieve what you had planned to do?

After writing one page on the information asked, you can include further information on any aspect of your French class that you feel strongly about.

**Journal Entry 2 - Week 10**

How do you feel about your French class? Describe some classroom situations when you are confident and relaxed in class. Describe other situations when you are nervous, tense and worried in class. Are your reactions and feelings the same regardless of whether you are in French class or in any of the other classes you are taking this semester? Please explain.

After writing one page on the information asked, you can include further information on any aspect of your French class that you feel strongly about.

**Journal Entry 3 - Week 12**

What are your reasons for taking this French class? What do you hope to achieve after completing this course this semester? How do you plan to make use of the language skills you have learnt in this course? What are some of the ways in which you try to improve your language skills outside of class even though they are not assigned to you by your teacher? How excited and motivated do you feel while learning this foreign language?

After writing one page on the information asked, you can include further information on any aspect of your French class that you feel strongly about.

**Journal Entry 4 - Week 14**

How do you think your French class is going? Do the syllabus, course materials, class activities and the pace of instruction meet your needs as a learner? If you were the instructor, what changes would you make to the different aspects of the course? Are the objectives for this class clear, and do you think they are being met? Have you come up with your own plan of study in this course knowing that it will work better for you than the plan set up by your instructor? How do you think you learn best? How do you study at home when you are in control of your own learning?

After writing one page on the information asked, you can include further information on any aspect of your French class that you feel strongly about.

APPENDIX G  
QUESTIONS FOR STUDENT INTERVIEWS

The interviews are semi-structured. The researcher encourages the participants to express themselves without much interruption. When necessary, and in order to initiate the conversation, the researcher will use the questions given below:

1. What were your reasons for taking this French class?  
What are the minimum requirements for this course?  
Are these requirements reasonable?  
Do you think having a language requirement helps a student in the long run?  
How are you planning to use the language skills you have learnt in this class?
2. How do you feel as you walk towards your French class every day?  
What thoughts go through your mind?  
Have those thoughts changed in any way in the last two months?
3. Do you feel comfortable in French class at some times / most of the time?  
What are some of the activities that you dread?  
Do you avoid interacting with the instructor for any reason? If so, in what situations? Do you think you are an anxious person?
4. At the beginning of the semester, did you make any plans on how you were going to get an “A” in this class?  
Did you do all that the instructor required of you?  
Was that a reasonable amount of work?  
Did you do anything beyond what you were asked to do as part of the course?  
Do you think you were very motivated in this class? Why? Why not?  
Were you enthusiastic when involved in class activities most / some of the time?
5. What are some of the learning strategies you use to study for this class?  
Did your instructor’s teaching style help / hinder you?  
Do you think you would have learnt better if he had done some things differently?  
If you could, what are some aspects of this class that you would change?  
How would you make this class more effective?

## APPENDIX H QUESTIONS FOR TEACHER INTERVIEWS

The interviews are semi-structured. The researcher encourages the instructors to express themselves without much interruption. When necessary, and in order to initiate the conversation, the researcher will use the questions given below:

1. Students have daily work book / lab manual assignments. Do you think the students complete their work everyday? How do you monitor that? What are your thoughts about grading that work? Do the students who complete the assignments get better grades on their tests?
2. What kinds of questions do students ask in class?  
How do you deal with questions that are not related to the topic of the day?
3. What are some of the class activities the students enjoy – reading out loud from the text – practicing pronunciation – watching videos – playing language games – learning grammar – learning vocabulary – pair / group work – writing compositions.
4. Do you have any ground rules in the class?  
Do you have any expectations of your students – in any area?  
Do you think the students have any expectations of you?
5. What are some ways you would recognize that students are anxious in class?  
Can you identify any students who you think might be anxious?  
What do you think makes them anxious?
6. How would you describe students who are motivated in your class?  
Describe their behavior. Can you identify any motivated students?
7. Are there any students in your class who you think are independent learners?  
Have you seen any indication of students devising their own plans to learn French better.
8. How is the oral proficiency test conducted? Do you prepare students for it?  
How many tests and exams do you have throughout the semester?  
How is the final grade of the student computed?

APPENDIX I  
 OVERVIEW OF PARTICIPANTS WHO EXPERIENCED HIGH LEVELS OF  
 ANXIETY, MOTIVATION, AND AUTONOMY

Participant	Highly Anxious		Highly Motivated		Highly Autonomous	
	Test 1	Test 2	Test 1	Test 2	Test 1	Test 2
A01						
A02						
A03		X	X	X	X	X
A05			X	X		
A06						
A08	X		X	X		X
A11	X	X	X	X	X	
A12			X	X		
A13						
A14						
A17			X			
A18		X				
A20	X	X	X			
A21						
A22						
B01			X	X		
B02			X	X		
B03						
B06			X	X		
B08			X	X		
B09						
B10			X	X	X	X
B11			X	X		
B12	X		X	X		
B13			X	X	X	
B14	X					
B15		X				
B17	X		X	X	X	X
B18	X	X	X	X		
B19			X	X		
B21			X	X		
B22	X	X				
<b>Total No.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's construct of foreign language anxiety: The case of students of Japanese. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 155-168.
- Alpert, R., & Haber, R. N. (1960). Anxiety in academic achievement situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, 207-215.
- Backman, N. (1976). Two measures of affective factors as they relate to progress in adult second language learning. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 10, 100-122.
- Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: Looking at and through the diary studies. In H. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 67-102). Rowley: MA: Newbury House.
- Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. (2000). Study habits and anxiety about learning foreign languages. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 90, 1151-1156.
- Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (1998). Anxiety about foreign language among students in French, Spanish, and German classes. *Psychological Reports*, 81, 1007-1010.
- Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Harlow: Longman.
- Chastain, K. (1975). Affective and ability factors in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 25, 153-161.
- Coulombe, D. (2000). *Anxiety and beliefs of French-as-a-second-language learners at the university level*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Laval, Québec, Canada.
- Crook, T. H. (1979). Psychometric assessment in the elderly. In A. Raskin & L. F. Jarvik (Eds.), *Psychiatric symptoms and cognitive loss* (pp. 207-220). New York: Halstead.
- Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. W. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 469-512.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination*. New York: Plenum.

- Dickinson, L. (1995). Autonomy and motivation: A literature review. *System*, 23(2), 165-174.
- Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign-language learning. *Language Learning*, 40(1), 45-78.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 273-284.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43-59.
- Dornyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(3), 203-229.
- Dornyei, Z., & Schmidt, R. (2001). *Motivation and second language acquisition*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Ehrman, M. E., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of language learning success. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 67-89.
- Ely, C. M. (1986). Language learning motivation: A descriptive and causal analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 28-35.
- Eysenck, M. W. (1979). Anxiety, learning and memory: A reconceptualization. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 13, 363-385.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second-language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London, England: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (1988). The socio-educational model of second-language learning: Assumptions, findings, and issues. *Language Learning*, 38, 101-126.
- Gardner, R. C. (1996). Motivation and second language acquisition: Perspectives. *Journal of CAAL*, 18, 19-42.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation and second language acquisition. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and second language acquisition* (pp. 1-19). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Gardner, R. C., Day, J. B., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1992). Integrative motivation, induced anxiety, and language learning in a controlled environment. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 197-214.

- Gardner, R. C., Ginsberg, R. E., & Smythe, P. C. (1976). Attitude and motivation in second-language learning: Course related changes. *Canadian Modern Language Review / Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 32(3), 243-266.
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., & Moorcroft, R. (1985). The role of attitudes and motivation in second language learning: Correlational and experimental considerations. *Language Learning*, 35(2), 207-227.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13(4), 266-272.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 43(2), 157-194.
- Gardner, R. C., Moorcroft, R., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1987). *The role of anxiety in second language performance of language dropouts*. (Research Bulletin No. 605). London, Ontario: The University of Western Ontario.
- Gardner, R. C., Padric, S. C., & Garnet, R. B. (1977). Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation and French achievement. *Language Learning*, 27, 243-261.
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1975). Motivation and second-language acquisition. *Canadian Modern Language Review / Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 31(3), 218-230.
- Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. (1981). On the development of the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 37, 510-525.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A. M. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(iii), 344-362.
- Hatch, E., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. New York: Newbury House.
- Henmon, V. A. C. (1929). Prognosis tests in the modern foreign languages. In V. A. C. Henmon (Ed.), *Prognosis tests in the modern foreign languages* (pp. 3-31). New York: Macmillan.
- Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.

- Hunt, E. (1989). Introduction: Historical perspective and current considerations. In T. Hunt & C. J. Lindley (Eds.), *Testing older adults* (pp. 1-17). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Karabenick, S. A., & Knapp, J. R. (1988). Help seeking and need for academic assistance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*, 406-408.
- Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Kleinmann, H. H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, *27*, 93-107.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York, New York: Pergamon Press.
- Kuhl, J. (1994a). A theory of action and state orientations. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and personality* (pp. 9-46). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Kuhl, J. (1994b). Action vs. state orientation: Psychometric properties of the Action Control Scale (ACS-90). In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and personality* (pp. 47-59). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Little, D. (1990). Autonomy in language learning. In I. Gathercole (Ed.), *Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 7-15). London: CILT.
- Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.
- Littlewood, W. (1996). "Autonomy": An anatomy and a framework. *System*, *24*(4), 427-435.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganschow. *Modern Language Journal*, *79*(1), 90-99.
- MacIntyre, P.D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second-language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, *39*(2), 251-275.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, *41*(1), 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994a). The effects of induced anxiety on cognitive processing in computerised vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *16*, 1-17.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994b). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, *44*(2), 283-305.

- MacIntyre, P. D., MacMaster, K., & Baker, S. C. (2001). The convergence of multiple models of motivation for second language learning: Gardner, Pintrich, Kuhl, and McCroskey. In Z. Dornyei & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 461-492). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 16-25.
- Mishkin, M., & Appenzeller, T. (1987). The anatomy of memory. *Scientific American*, 256, 80-89.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. In N. Research in Education Series (Ed.): Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: Some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Or & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Taking Control: Autonomy in Language Learning*: Hong Kong University Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Christine, D. E. (2000). The validation of three scales measuring anxiety at different stages of the foreign language learning process: The input anxiety scale, the processing anxiety scale, and the output anxiety scale. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 87-117.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (1999). Factors Associated with Foreign Language Anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 20(2), 217-239.
- Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *Modern Language Journal*, 76(1), 14-26.
- Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan.
- Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self-assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 279-290.

- Rubin, R. B. (1990). Communication competence. In G. M. Phillips & J. T. Woods (Eds.), *Speech communication: Essays to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Speech Communication Association* (pp. 94-129). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(2), 239-251.
- Schumann, J. H. (1994). Where is cognition? Emotion and cognition in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 231-242.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28(1), 129-142.
- Sellers, V. D. (2000). Anxiety and reading comprehension in Spanish as a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 512-521.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1972). *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research: I*. New York, N.Y.: Academic Press.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research*, 6(3), 245-266.
- Steinberg, F. S., & Horwitz, E. K. (1986). The effect of induced anxiety on the denotative and interpretive content of second language speech. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 131-136.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet TESL Journal*, VI(11).
- Tomkins, S., S. (1970). *Affect as the primary motivational system*. New York: Academic Press.
- Trylong, V. L. (1987). Aptitude, attitudes, and anxiety: A study of their relationships to achievement in the foreign language classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 48(10), 2564-A.

- Wang, M. C., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Teaching students to assume an active role in their learning. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*: Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426-439.
- Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell, and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25(2), 157-172.
- Young, D. J. (1994). New directions in language anxiety research. In C. Klee (Ed.), *Faces in a Crowd: The Individual Learner in Multisection Courses*. Boston, MA.: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Manjula Shinge completed her first bachelor's and master's degrees in English literature and enjoyed the time she spent teaching poetry and drama to students in India for six years. After completing a teacher training course, Bachelor in Education, she relocated to Hong Kong where she taught EFL classes for 11 years. While she was in Hong Kong, she served as the head of the English department and also completed the Postgraduate Course in Education Certificate, an in-service diploma for teachers. Manjula felt the need to specialize in teaching English as a second/foreign language and enrolled at the University of Florida, USA, and completed a master's degree in linguistics in 2001. She was also awarded the Teaching English as a Second Language Certificate at this time. She continued her studies at the University of Florida and was awarded a Doctor of Philosophy degree in 2005. Her interests lie in the areas of teaching English as a foreign language and second language acquisition.