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Abstract

Language anxiety (LA) is “the worry and negative emotional reaction when learning and using a second language and is especially relevant in a classroom where self-expression takes place” (Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014, p. 14). In the present study, particular attention is drawn to the development of students’ communicative competence and speaking proficiency in English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) classrooms. The prevalence and effects of foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA) were examined among Swedish EFL lower secondary school students, reporting the triggers of foreign language anxiety (FLA) and FLSA from the perspective of pupils and teachers. A mixed-methods approach was applied to collect data from pupils (N=273) where a self-report questionnaire, a modified version of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) operationalised originally by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) is administered, plus open-ended semi-structured interviews with open-ended and closed questions were conducted with pupils (N=67) and teachers (N=5). The participants were grouped into three categories: low, medium and high anxiety, based on their scores. The results showed that 26% of the participants were assigned as low anxious learners; 59% of the students experienced medium levels of FLSA and 15% of the pupils were highly anxious language learners. Interviews with pupils and teachers explored the effects and the sources of the FLA and FLSA on pupils’ oral and general English language proficiency (fear of negative evaluation (FNE), affective variables, grades, teachers, classmates, pronunciation, and classroom atmosphere), noting that some pupils reported that monologic genres such as long episodes of speaking, evaluation situations and giving an oral presentation present the most anxiety-provoking contexts in EFL lessons.

Keywords:

English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL), foreign language anxiety (FLA), foreign language speaking anxiety (FLSA), language anxiety (LA), fear of negative evaluation (FNE)
# Table of Contents

1. **Introduction** .......................................................................................................................... 1

2. **Literature Review** ................................................................................................................. 5

   2.1 SLA and English as a Second/Foreign Language............................................................. 5
   
   2.1.1 English in a Swedish context...................................................................................... 5
   
   2.1.1 EFL classrooms in Sweden......................................................................................... 7

   2.2 Major Developments in the Conceptualisation of Language Anxiety: An Overview of Previous Research................................................................. 9
   
   2.2.1 The confounded approach .......................................................................................... 9
   
   2.2.2 The specialised approach .......................................................................................... 10
   
   2.2.3 The dynamic approach.............................................................................................. 18

   2.3 Willingness to Communicate (WTC) ............................................................................. 19

3. **Material and Method** ......................................................................................................... 21

   3.1 The Dynamic Approach and the Triangulation of Data Collection ................................ 22
   
   3.2 Questionnaires................................................................................................................. 22
   
   3.3 Adaptation of the Questionnaire ..................................................................................... 24
   
   3.4 Interviews........................................................................................................................ 27
   
   3.5 Participants...................................................................................................................... 28
   
   3.6 Pilot Study – Fieldwork and Observations ..................................................................... 29

4. **Results and discussion** ........................................................................................................ 32

   4.1 Quantitative Analysis...................................................................................................... 32
   
   4.1.1 Interviews with pupils .............................................................................................. 45
   
   4.1.2 Interviews with teachers ........................................................................................... 55

5. **Conclusion** ........................................................................................................................... 58

References ....................................................................................................................................... 61

Appendix ......................................................................................................................................... 71

   Appendix A. Consent Form (questionnaires and interviews)................................................. 71
   
   Appendix B. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)...................................... 72
   
   Appendix C. Horwitz et al.’s Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)............. 73
   
   Appendix D. Interviews Questions with Students................................................................. 74
   
   Appendix E. Interviews Questions with Teachers................................................................. 76
1. Introduction

For many learners, a key aim of learning English is to feel confident and become fluent when speaking English in different contexts. This is referred to in the subject syllabus English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) from the Swedish National Agency for Education (Swe. Skolverket): “teaching in English should essentially give pupils the opportunities to develop their ability to understand and interpret the content of spoken English and in different types of texts” (Skolverket, 2018, p. 34). Specific attention has been paid to learner-specific variables and affective or emotional factors, such as beliefs, self-esteem, motivation, and feeling willing to communicate; anxiety is one of these variables which continues to occupy a prominent place and has been extensively discussed in research on second language acquisition (SLA) for more than four decades (e.g. Alpert & Haber, 1960; Spielberger, 1966; Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991b; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Horwitz & Young, 1991; Aida, 1994; Horwitz, 2001; Ito, 2008; Alrabai, 2014; Nilsson 2019).

Alpert and Haber (1960) suggest that anxiety can be debilitating anxiety or facilitating anxiety. The former refers to the anxiety that hinders language learning, whereas the latter refers to the anxiety that improves performance. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) have described language anxiety (LA) as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking, listening and learning” (p. 284). Gregersen and MacIntyre (2014) describe LA as “the worry and negative emotional reaction when learning and using a second language” and it is said to be “especially relevant in a classroom where self-expression takes place” (p.14). Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) and other researchers such as von Wörde (2003) and Young (1990) point out that LA reduces motivation and strongly affects language learning in a negative way. Von Wörde (2003) reports that LA is “experienced
by learners of both foreign and second language and poses potential problems; perhaps one-half of all language students experience a startling level of anxiety” (p.1).

Horwitz et al. (1986) conceptualise foreign language anxiety (FLA) as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the (foreign) language learning process” (p. 128). FLA, as an affective factor, is fear or apprehension occurring when a learner is expected to perform in a second or a foreign language. Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) propose that two classes of affective variables, motivation on the one hand, and situational anxiety on the other, are important in learning a second language (p. 158). Horwitz (2001) explains that FLA is a situation-specific anxiety construct which is responsible for students’ negative emotional reactions to language learning; it stems from the inherent inauthenticity associated with immature second language communicative abilities (p. 114). More precisely, foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA) is considered to be a situational anxiety experienced in the well-defined situation of the foreign/second language classroom (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a).

There has been a large amount of research which investigate the effects of LA on a language learner’s performance, examining the relationship between foreign language learning anxiety (FLLA) and language performance (e.g. Phillips, 1992; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Dewaele, Petrides, & Furnham, 2008; Dewaele, 2013; Alrabai, 2014; Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014; He, 2018); this research has found that FLLA is a major cause affecting language learning negatively. Moreover, numerous studies’ findings reveal that more anxious students tend to be less motivated to learn and speak EFL/English as a second language (ESL) (e.g. Alrabai, 2011; Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995).

Horwitz et al. (1986) point out that students get anxious in FL classroom settings if they have to speak in the target language (TL) in front of peers and teachers, if they have tests or an oral exercise and they over-study but without any improvements in grades (pp. 126–127). The purpose of this thesis is to describe classroom procedures based on Horwitz et al.’s
description of anxious students as Young (1991) points out that “on the spot” and “in front of the class” are most anxiety-provoking to students.

Traditional studies (e.g. Scovel 1978; Horwitz et al., 1986; Young, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; MacIntyre & Gardner 1994; Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999) have concentrated on: the conceptualisation and measurement of LA, various types of anxieties, correlations between various anxiety measures, links between second language (L2) classroom anxiety and L2 writing anxiety as well as their associations with L2 speaking and writing achievement, effects of LA on cognitive processing in the L2, and various effects of LA on language performance. Some researchers (e.g. Aida, 1994; Dewaele, 2002; Dewaele, Petrides, & Furnham, 2008) have examined and linked LA to variables such as socio-biographical background, age and gender on an L2 among university students. Nilsson (2019) has studied FLA among young learners of English in Swedish primary classrooms using a modified version of the foreign language classroom anxiety scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986).

MacIntyre (2017) identifies a third type of research, a dynamic approach, into LA which begins from a contextualised and dynamic perspective. The present study is based upon the conceptualisation of a dynamic approach, which “emphasises situating anxiety among the multitude of interacting factors that affect language learning and development” (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 23). Further, research regarding LA “will need to foreground more dynamic adaptations that can lead the behavioural outcomes of anxiety both in the positive and negative direction” (Dörnyei & Ran, 2015, p. 180).

The trends in FL and L2 (mentioned above) lead to another interesting theoretical question regarding possible causes of FLSA. However, studies on EFL speaking anxiety that have adopted a dynamic approach within Swedish compulsory schools remain scarce although there are some (Ekström, 2013; Landström, 2015; Landström, 2017; Bergström, 2017). The primary purpose of the present study has come as a response to calls (Gkonou, Dewaele, and Daubney, 2017; Horwitz, 2017) for more research into learners’ experiences with FLSA in their
classrooms, with a consideration of FLSA within a larger complex of individual factors, such as the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) paradigm (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

The present study has a strong emphasis on FLSA, emphasising that research into LA has centred mostly on speaking, as speaking is the skill that seemed to generate the most worry and concern for language learners (Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014, p. 4). There is also a pressing need for additional research to help clarify correlations between FLA/FLSA and performance from contextualised and dynamic perspectives; the present thesis attempts to elucidate the role of FLA/FLA as described by the learners and teachers themselves, as was initially reported by Horwitz et al. (1986). Furthermore, the present study differs from other studies in that it endeavours to delve deeply into in Swedish lower secondary schools in order to examine FLSA/FLA’s role, level and prevalence among school EFL pupils aged 13-16 in their classrooms as well as accessing to what extent FLA and FLSA affects their oral and language learning and proficiency.

The methodology for this study is quantitative (self-report questionnaires) and qualitative (interviews). Classroom routines, practices and instructional activities are observed in a pilot study, to help adapt Horwitz et al.’s (1986) questionnaire to the Swedish school context. FLA and FLSA sources are reported from learners’ and teachers’ perspectives in interviews, exploring learners’ beliefs and experiences in order to address the following research questions:

1. Focusing on EFL, to what extent do pupils in seventh, eighth and ninth grades in this study experience FLSA in Swedish schools? To what extent are there differences across grades?
2. According to the participants, to what extent does FLSA affect their oral and language proficiency in EFL classrooms?
3. What are the reported reasons for FLA and FLSA from the perspective of pupils and teachers?

2. Literature Review

This section discusses SLA and English-as-a-second (ESL) and English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL), English within a Swedish context, EFL classrooms in Sweden, major developments in the conceptualisation of LA: an overview of language anxiety, previous research (confounded phase, the specialised approach and the dynamic approach), and willingness to communicate (WTC).

2.1 SLA and English as a Second/Foreign Language

Spada and Lightbown (2013) explain that SLA “focuses on the developing knowledge and use of a language by children and adults who already know at least one other language” (p. 111). According to Djigunović (2006, p. 6), cognitive and affective or emotional learners’ factors are affected during the learning process of English-as-a-second (ESL) or English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL). Abrahamsson (2009) defines an L2 as the language acquired after the first language (L1) is established or starts to be established (p. 13) whereas, the development of an FL takes place when learning occurs in a country where English is not generally spoken as the main language of communication, such as China and the Middle East. Sundqvist and Sylvén (2014, p. 5) describe “Kachru’s (1985) three concentric circles of English: inner circle (native Anglophone countries), outer circle (postcolonial territories), and expanding circle (countries where English is taught as an FL)”, emphasising that the expanding circle has become expanded and included other countries, such as Sweden.

2.1.1 English in a Swedish context

English has a high status in Swedish society and its presence is strong among Swedes, although it is not an official language. Sundqvist and Sylvén (2014) argue that “a great number of people
in the expanding circle are more fluent speakers of English than people in outer-circle countries, where English is an official L2” (pp. 2-5).

Researchers such as Hyltensam (2002) and Sundqvist and Sylvén (2014) point out that “in recent years, there has even been a debate as to whether English should be regarded as an L2 rather than as an FL” (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2014, p. 5). Forsberg, Mohr and Jansen (2019, p. 37) argue that “the government issued a report in 2002, giving suggestions for how the two languages (English and Swedish) can or should be used”, which came as a response to the media and linguists’ fears, in the 1990’s, that “a continually increasing use of English would have negative effects on the Swedish language”. According to Forsberg et al. (2019, p. 33), “in Sweden, English proficiency is high among almost 90% of the population (Simensen 2010)”.

The Education First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI), which ranks countries by measuring English language skills and proficiency of non-native speakers worldwide, has reported that “Sweden scored 625 and ranked 4th out of 100 countries/regions in 2020” (EF EPI, 2020).

Skolverket, as the central administrative authority for the public school system in Sweden, publishes regulatory documents such as the Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age which comprises: national overall goals and guidelines for the school, fundamental values and tasks of the school, how education is to be provided and school syllabuses including English that is taught as an obligatory subject from the first grade and around at the age of seven. According to Sundqvist and Sylvén (2014, p. 5), English became the first FL in Swedish compulsory school in 1962, which is the only compulsory language subject apart from Swedish and some schools use English as the medium of instruction.

Curricula, which are related in the first place to the syllabus in the regulatory documents, “have a major impact on the transmission of English to young speakers” (Forsberg et al., 2019, p. 33). Skolverket (2017a) places a strong emphasis on developing communicative competence and giving students opportunities to develop their oral abilities (in English); such
abilities include social, intercultural and linguistic aspects (pp. 6-7), emphasising that good teaching strategies and practices in EFL classrooms can increase pupils’ oral proficiency.

2.1.1 EFL classrooms in Sweden

Young (1990) reports that “several researchers have found that speaking the foreign language in the classroom is very anxiety provoking” (p. 539) and Gregerson et al. (2014) describe that speaking anxiety in EFL classrooms can increase or decrease due to different factors or situations, such as when the pupils have to speak EFL in front of peers (Young, 1990, p. 540).

EFL teachers have responsibilities to help students develop their communicative competence. According to Skolverket (2018), teaching in English should essentially give pupils the opportunities to develop their abilities to:

- understand and interpret the content of spoken English and in different types of texts,
- express themselves and communicate in speech and writing,
- use language strategies to understand and make themselves understood, (p. 34).

Communication in English can help students to learn the language more effectively in EFL classrooms; they can expand their vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammatical structures through communication in English in classrooms. The Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Swe. Skolinspektionen) reports in a study, which adopted qualitative research methods (classrooms observations and interviews with principals, teachers and pupils) that “too much Swedish used in the English classroom” (Skolinspektionen, 2011, p. 6); around half of the observed lessons should involve more activities that aim to develop pupils’ communicative abilities. Moreover, the teachers used Swedish mainly as an instructional language in English lessons (Skolinspektionen, 2011, pp. 6-7). The report indicates that many students often use English outside the classroom while they are reluctant to answer questions or participate in class discussions in English (Skolinspektionen, 2011, p. 4). Skolverket (2018) proposes that, through
teaching, pupils should be given the opportunity to develop all-round communicative skills. Communication skills cover confidence in using the language and the ability to use different strategies to support communication and solve problems when language skills by themselves are not sufficient (p. 34). In terms of EFL classroom procedures, the students should engage in communicative language teaching (CLT) activities which encourage them to express themselves in relatively varied ways, clearly and coherently. Skolverket (2018) suggests that in oral interaction, pupils should be able to express themselves clearly in different contexts and with ease, and also with some adaptation to the purpose, recipient and situation (p. 41).

The aim of CLT is to enable the students to speak, exchange opinions and to use English without feeling FLSA. Speaking and oral activities are believed to be one of the main sources for LA; “difficulty in speaking in class is probably the most frequently cited concern of anxious foreign language students” (Horwtiz et al., 1986, p. 126). Young (1991) points out that one of the major causes of LA is classroom procedures, where the instructor can do more pair work, play more games, and tailor the activities to the affective needs of the learner in order to decrease anxieties associated with classroom procedures (p. 433). Moreover, He (2018) reports that “Price (1991) also identified four sources of FL classroom anxiety for students

- Having to speak the target language in front of their peers;
- Making errors in pronunciation;
- Failing to communicate effectively; and
- Getting bogged down by difficulties in language classes” (p. 36)

Based on above-mentioned research that discussed the FLA causes, Young (1992) discussed strategies in a teaching context that can alleviate FLCA, such as working in pairs and small groups and not insisting on students speaking in front of others in the classroom (if they are reluctant or not ready) are two teaching methods employed to reduce students’ FLSA in
EFL classrooms. According to McCroskey (1977), some people may have little difficulty with public speaking and they still experience high state CA when forced to talk in a foreign language classroom context (p. 79). Teachers and students can cooperate with each other to alleviate FLCA that comes from the learning environment (Horwitz et al., 1986). Young (1990) elucidates the role of speaking activities which produce the most anxiety from the students’ perspective, and instructor characteristics such as a non-harsh attitude toward error correction, a positive, friendly and relaxed general attitude toward students can reduce students’ anxiety (p. 551).

2.2 Major Developments in the Conceptualisation of Language Anxiety: An Overview of Previous Research

It is possible to say that LA has been the most widely examined variable in the field of SLA in the last four decades (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 11). To fully understand LA as a phenomenon, the research literature on LA can be divided into three broad approaches (confounded, specialised and dynamic), based originally on MacIntyre’s (2017) theoretical insights, for the purposes of tracing and reflecting both historical trends and assumptions about FLA.

2.2.1 The confounded approach

According to MacIntyre (2017), this phase- research on LA before 1980s- is called the confounded approach because the ideas about anxiety and their effect on language learning were adopted from a mixture of various sources without detailed consideration of the conceptualisation of LA for language learners (p. 11).

Scovel (1978, p. 132) explains that some studies have revealed incomplete correlations between anxiety and measures of language proficiency. He also reviews the LA literature explaining that “the research into the relationship of anxiety to FL learning has provided mixed and confusing results”. Moreover, the researchers, at the time, were concerned with defining and measuring LA which might be related to language acquisition and Scovel (1978) argued
that “it is perhaps premature to attempt to relate it [LA] to the global and comprehensive task of language acquisition” (p. 132).

MacIntyre (2017) clarifies that Scovel and other language researchers have adopted measures that were used for various purposes in psychology; “what was not clear at the time was that the measures of anxiety that were adapted from psychology for use in language studies had a little to do with language itself” (p. 12). Scovel reports that anxiety is usually measured in one of three ways: “by behavioural tests, where the actions of a subject are observed; by the subject’s self-report of internal feelings and reactions; or by physiological tests, where measures of heart rate, blood pressure, or palmar sweating are taken and these are assumed to be correlated to the subject’s emotional state” (Scovel, 1978, pp. 134-135). Closer inspection, at the time, reveals that not all types of anxiety that can be defined and measured are likely to be related to language learning; this explains why early research on LA “provided mixed and confusing results” (Scovel, 1991, p. 17) due to “problematic definitions of anxiety, the lack of a reliable and valid measure specific to language learning, and insufficiently sensitive outcome measures” (Yan & Horwitz, 2008, p. 151). MacIntyre (2017, p. 12) states that “Scovel (1978) appealed to the distinction between facilitating and debilitating anxiety”, which was originally discussed by Alpert and Haber (1960). The confounded phase paved the way for the next phase, the specialised approach, where “the emphasis on the uniqueness of language learning extended to anxiety variables” (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 14).

2.2.2 The specialised approach

Horwitz et al. (1986) revolutionised LA research literature; they reoriented the conceptualisation and measurement of LA in SLA. The authors drew upon both the inconsistencies in prior research that were highlighted by Scovel’s (1978) review and the measurement approach to French classroom anxiety that Gardner had been using in the socio-educational model (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 14). For the first time FLA was considered, by Horwitz et al. (1986), as a type of situation-specific anxiety which is significantly different from the trait
and state approaches commonly implemented before “the specialised approach”. He (2018) explains the difference between state anxiety and trait anxiety; the former may be defined as “an immediate, transitory emotional state of subjective, conscious feelings of tension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system reactions in response to a particular stimulus such as giving a speech or taking an examination” whereas the latter is “a comparatively stable likelihood to become anxious in a wide spectrum of situations perceived as threatening or dangerous” (He, 2018, p. 15). MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a) confirmed that trait and state approaches were unable to “capture the essence of FLA or to satisfactorily demonstrate a role for anxiety in the language learning process” and that, instead, new thinking “seems to be leading research toward the situation specific perspective” (p. 87).

Horwitz et al. (1986) established the conceptual framework of FLA by proposing three types of anxieties: communication apprehension (CA), test anxiety (TA) and fear of negative evaluation (FNE). Originally, McCroskey (1977) suggested that CA represents the total of the fears and anxieties and CA was defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977, p. 78), which is closely related to FLA. With the new approach, Horwitz et al. (1986) extended the definition of CA to embrace “a type of shyness characterised by fear of or anxiety about communicating with people” (p. 127), referring to the common FL learning environment which can be (EFL/ESL) classrooms; Young (1986) finds also significant negative correlations between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency. According to Gordon and Sarason (1955), TA is aroused by a fear of failure and is closely related to FL learning. That is to say, TA is “performance evaluation [which] is an ongoing feature of most foreign language classes” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 127). For Horwitz et al., FNE is defined as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (p. 128). Similarly to TA, FNE is not limited to test-taking situations.
occurs in any social or evaluative situation or when speaking EFL/ESL and it “lies in the fact that learners are much more vulnerable to criticism and negative evaluation than in other subjects” (Tsui, 1996, p. 156) in the classroom in the front of the teacher and the other students. In sum, Horwitz et al. argue that FLA is not simply the amalgamation of these fears transferred to FL learning, but rather learners of an FL conceive of LA as a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours. They are related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128).

While studies have differed in the measures employed to examine FLA, Horwitz et al. (1986, p. 125) proposed an instrument to measure LA, foreign language classroom anxiety scale (FLCAS), which is a questionnaire of thirty-three questions, with a 5-point Likert scale. The FLCAS is an example of situation-specific LA, which will be discussed in 3.2. MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1989) study is a clear example of “the development of the situation-specific scales that allowed researchers to examine the correlations between various anxiety measures” (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 16).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1989, p. 251) have attempted to resolve the “ambiguity arising from the conflicting results of past studies” by using eleven anxiety scales that were factor-analysed yielding two orthogonal dimensions of anxiety which were labelled General Anxiety and Communicative Anxiety. The authors point out that the “dimension of general anxiety and those scales that comprise it are not related to language behaviour in a reliable manner” (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989, p. 268). MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) suggest that “analyses of the correlations between the anxiety scales and the measures of achievement show that scales of FLA and state anxiety are associated with performance” (p. 251).

According to MacIntyre (2017, p. 16), further evidence of the differentiation between types of anxiety measures was offered by MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b); they examine the factor structure underlying twenty-three scales assessing LA and other types of anxiety. Factor analysis identified three factors reflecting social evaluation anxiety, state anxiety, and language
anxiety. According to MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b, p. 513), correlations were obtained “between scores based on these factors and measures of short-term memory (a Digit Span test) and vocabulary production (a Thing Category test)”. These two measures were adopted in both L1 (English) and L2 (French) versions. The findings indicated that LA factor was negatively correlated with both Digit Span and Thing Category scores, but only in an L2.

Steinberg and Horwitz (1986, p. 135) examined the effect of induced anxiety on a learner’s oral descriptions, in an L2, of stimulus pictures and they claim that their study has important implications for teachers. The results showed that anxious participants were reluctant to use their L2 to offer novel, personal interpretations of ambiguous pictures. They argued that the subtle effects of anxiety arousal can have a significant impact on the communication of students in the classroom and beyond. In other words, the students who feel the constant pressure of evaluation in the L2 appear unwilling to communicate in a stressful, non-supportive environment or in a classroom setting.

Research in the LA area managed to prosper after constructing LA as a situation-specific concept. MacIntyre (2017, p. 17) states that attention was drawn to the identification of LA sources which can affect language learning and processes. Possible effects range from academic effects (lowered grade and poor academic achievement), and cognitive effects (increased self-related cognition: thoughts of failure, performance worry, self-deprecating thoughts) to social effects (reduced linguistic self-confidence, motivating influence for the language learner). Phillips (1992) examines the effects of LA on students’ oral test performance of French and investigates attitudes of highly anxious students towards that exam. Phillips (1992) suggests that LA has a debilitating impact on students’ linguistic abilities to communicate verbally in a TL and the oral skill is problematic for L2 learners. She argues that, although many variables may interact to affect language learning, FLA should be of particular concern to language teachers and students because of its debilitating impact on both performance and students’ affective reactions. Phillips (1992, p. 20) argued that because the
FLCAS did not measure students’ anxiety related to the specific oral test, “the more specific the anxiety measure is to the performance measure, the more likelihood there is of a correlation” (p. 20).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) have examined specific cognitive processes and the fallouts from anxiety on L2 acquisition in terms of a three-stage model of learning: Input, Processing, and Output at which knowledge of the language can be demonstrated. They proposed measuring both anxiety and performance at each of these stages which have been represented in a set of nine tasks (input stage: word span, digit span, t-scope; processing stage: French achievement, paragraph translation, paired associates learning; output stage: thing category, cloze test, and self-description). Input was concerned with the initial representation of items in memory whereas the processing stage involves cognitive operations such as organisation and storage developing language competence. On output tasks, LA was associated with lower-quality performance. This was consistent with Horwitz et al. (1986) and the results show that significant correlations are obtained between stage-specific anxiety scales and stage-specific tasks (e.g., output anxiety with output tasks) suggesting that the effects of LA may be both pervasive and subtle (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994, p. 283). What MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) highlighted is the fact that LA is looked at from the perspective of different stages of language learning, making a distinction between (a) input, (b) processing and (c) output. One of the aims of the present thesis is to identify if LA has any effects on EFL leaners in Swedish lower secondary schools at the output stage (production: speaking); the output stage is related to language production and the development of students’ abilities to produce and speak in EFL/ESL lessons.

He (2018) suggests that EFL learners may experience different levels of LA depending on which language skill (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) is being learnt (p. 29). Investigating LA regarding specific language processes has led to a special interest in specific language skills areas. According to MacIntyre (2017, p. 18), “spoken language has been
strongly implicated in the measures of LA including the different measures developed by Horwitz and Gardner”. Cheng et al. (1999) investigated the correlations between FLCAS, operationalised by Horwitz et al. (1986), and L2 writing anxiety which is standardised, Likert-type writing apprehension test of the L2 version of the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test (SLWAT), as well as their associations with L2 speaking and writing achievement. The findings suggest that FLCAS and L2 writing anxiety scale are two related but independent constructs. The results indicate that FLCAS variables had stronger associations with speaking performance than with writing performance, whereas SLWAT is language-skill-specific anxiety which was more related to L2 writing performance than to L2 speaking performance (Cheng et al., 1999, pp. 417-432). Furthermore, Saito, Garza and Horwitz (1999) propose the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS), which is a self-report questionnaire, containing 20 items, each of which is answered on a 5-point Likert scale. FLRAS reflects students’ perceptions of reading difficulties in their TL, and their perceptions of the relative difficulty of reading as compared to the difficulty of other language skills (Saito et al., p. 204). They concluded that “students’ reading anxiety levels increased with their perceptions of the difficulty of reading in their FL, and their grades decreased in conjunction with their levels of reading anxiety and general FL anxiety” (Saito et al., 1999, p. 202). Their findings showed that students with higher levels of FLA also tended to have higher levels of FL reading anxiety and vice versa (Saito et al., 1999, p. 211). Listening in EFL/ESL causes LA for some students in classrooms; “Scarcella and Oxford (1992) note that anxiety can be exacerbated when learners believe they must understand every word or fear losing the meaning of the communication” (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 18). Scarcella and Oxford’s findings were supported by Zhang (2013) who investigated the possible causal correlation between FL (English) listening anxiety and English listening performance using a foreign language listening anxiety scale (FLLAS) and IELTS tests. The results demonstrated that FL listening performance was affected by FL listening anxiety and
“the causal relationships may be attributed to the situation specific nature of FL listening anxiety” (Zhang, 2013, p. 164).

According to MacIntyre (2017), other studies have explored LA and its relationship to “other broader learner factors, such as learner personality, perceived competence and willingness to communicate” along with studies that examined the communicative, linguistic and specific learning of LA in detail (p. 19). MacIntyre and Charos (1996) have pointed out that the effect of personality seems to be channelled through more specific variables, such as L2 confident, stressing the importance of affective variables, such as attitudes, motivation, perceived competence and anxiety, in predicting success in L2 learning and communication (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, p. 3). Along similar lines, MacIntyre, Noels and Clément (1997) have examined perceived competence in an L2 as a function of actual competence and LA. MacIntyre et al. (1997) have found that second language LA, perceived L2 competence, and actual L2 competence are closely correlated. They have concluded that the consistent negative correlations between anxiety and output quality indicated that anxious students tended to communicate less information and underestimate their actual linguistic ability to use an L2 compared with more relaxed students. These results are consistent with Dewaele, Petrides and Furnham (2008), who found that higher levels of trait emotional intelligence (EI), which “concerns individual differences in emotion-related self-perceptions, such as emotion control, emotion expression, empathy, and adaptability” (Dewaele et al., 2008, p. 913), corresponded to significantly lower communicative anxiety (CA) /FLA scores; moreover, they refer to the fact that “the knowledge of more languages, a higher frequency of use, a stronger socialisation in a language, a larger network of interlocutors, and a higher level of self-perceived proficiency in a language were also linked to lower levels of communicative anxiety /FLA” (Dewaele et al., 2008, p. 912).

Yan and Horwitz (2008) investigated learners’ perceptions of how students’ anxiety works together with other variables in influencing language learning; they examined LA from
the learners’ perspectives and the factors that language learners associate with FLA. They identified the sources and L2 affinities [variables] related to LA: regional differences, language aptitude, gender, FLA, language learning interest and motivation, class arrangements, teacher characteristics, language learning strategies, test types, parental influence, achievement and comparison with peers. Yan and Horwitz (2008) explain that the regional differences are these “comments referred to the social and cultural differences that the students perceived to exist between different geographical areas in China, including differences in primary language, educational systems, and economic development” and FLA is the comments referred to specific anxious feelings toward FL learning experienced by the students (Yan & Horwitz, 2008, p. 158).

The question “is LA a cause or an effect of language performance?” has become a topic of heated debate across various studies such as Sparks and Ganschow (1995), who argue that LA is a cause of problems with a language. Originally, Young (1986) argued whether LA is a cause or consequence “once the effect of an individual’s language proficiency was accounted for, oral performance no longer decreased as anxiety increased” (p. 439). On the other hand, Horwitz (2000) argues that “the cognitive deficit hypothesis also fails to explain why advanced and highly successful learners also report FLA” (p. 257) which disproves that LA stems from poor language proficiency. According to MacIntyre (2017), this issue has become a standard point of discussion in reviews of LA that has been done over the years; for him it is unfortunate that the debate itself has produced little more than a self-perpetuating cycle of summarising the debate (pp. 20-21). In sum, MacIntyre (2017) suggests that “there clearly is a progression of thought from an initial confounding of anxiety types to a clear delineation of a specific type of anxiety applicable to language situations” (p. 27), after reviewing the significant trends in the confounded and specialised approaches. It could be argued that every approach in the long history of LA has been marked with a question to raise:

- The confounded approach: Is anxiety facilitating or debilitating?
• The specialised approach: Is anxiety a cause or an effect of language performance?

Now discussion and debate are being opened in the dynamic approach to confirm whether LA is an internal state or socially constructed. Further, MacIntyre (2017) argues that “it would be counterproductive to spend research time debating whether anxiety is an internal experience or one constructed in the social context” (p. 27).

2.2.3 The dynamic approach

A third strand is the dynamic approach, which has been emphasised “continuous, complex interaction between anxiety and a host of other factors, thereby rejecting the notion of simple causality out of hand” and placing LA among “the multitude of interacting factors that affect language learning and development” (MacIntyre, 2017, pp. 11-27).

Gregersen, Macintyre and Meza (2014) give an example of the dynamic approach. They examine LA, its sources and interpretations of rapidly changing affective reactions for a short period of time by involving different types of research methods: physiological, idio-dynamic, interviews, and FLCAS of three high and three low proficiency language learners. Gregersen et al. (2014) explain that the idiodynamic method “assesses how different interacting internal emotional and psychological variables change from moment to moment and it gives us [the researchers] the ability to track learners’ rapidly changing affect in a context on a per-second basis and to have learners account for these fluctuations in stimulated recall interviews” (p. 576). The respondents wore a heart rate monitor, and they were video-recorded during the presentation in their FL lessons. The idiodynamic procedure (MacIntyre, 2012) was followed, which produces a continuous set of ratings of anxiety of approximately one per second and provides a continuous graph of changes in the variable, anxiety, in real time and the respondents later explained their reactions in an interview. Pedagogical implications were drawn for dealing with both positive and negative emotions that allow language learners to “remain active in communication exchanges, and invoking the positive power of preparation, planning, and rehearsal” (Gregersen et al., 2014, p. 574). MacIntyre (2017) explains that these results,
Gregersen et al.’s (2014) findings, indicate that students can experience high levels of LA (even if they are typically comfortable in their L2) and that “the emerging anxiety experience can be influenced by several interacting factors” (p. 24).

In sum, the dynamic perspective is both complex (influenced by multiple interactions) and more complicated because it emphasises that learners’ experience of language and communication is both continuous and integrated (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 27). The dynamic approach is adopted as the most relevant for the present thesis, to clarify correlations between FLA/FLSA and performance from the contextualised perspective. As MacIntyre, (2017) points out, dynamic studies emphasise the complex interactions of multiple factors that influence the anxiety reaction, including the ongoing interactions among learner variables such as perceived competence, anxiety, the features of the learning/communication situation and willingness to communicate (p. 26).

2.3 Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

WTC is one of a wide range of issues discussed in LA research, and it has been argued that language is best learnt through communication; interaction in EFL provides learners with opportunities to receive comprehensible input, to produce and modify their output. MacIntyre et al. (1998) have noted that “McCroskey and Baer’s (1985) original formulation of WTC defined a relatively enduring characteristic of a person’s communication” (p. 549). MacIntyre et al. (1998) give an account of the linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables that might affect one’s WTC, integrating psychological, linguistic, and communicative approaches into their “pyramid” model of WTC. MacIntyre et al. (1998) point out that examination of WTC offers the opportunity “to integrate psychological, linguistic, and communicative approaches to L2 research that typically have been independent of each other” (p. 545). They suggest that many learners’ willingness to communicate (WTC) change significantly over time and in different circumstances. MacIntyre et al. (1998, p. 547) propose
the Heuristic Model of Variables Influencing WTC which shows the range of potential influences on WTC in the L2. The correlations among the variables are demonstrated in a pyramid-shaped structure, shown in Figure 1.
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Figure 1: MacIntyre et al.’s (1998, p. 547) *Heuristic Model of Variables Influencing WTC*

In Figure 1, there are six categories (layers) which are divided into two basic structures: layers I, II, & III represent situation-specific influences on WTC at a given moment in time, whereas layers IV, V, & VI represent stable, enduring influences on the process (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547). They suggest potential correlations are suggested among these variables by reviewing a comprehensive conceptual model that may be relevant in describing, explaining, and predicting L2 communication (p. 545). Positive feelings, a high degree of FL/L2 proficiency, self-confidence and motivation variables profoundly affect WTC, and as a consequence they cause lower/higher levels of FLSA among language learners across different situations.

MacIntyre et al. argue that the WTC model presented in Figure 1 explains why particular students are willing to communicate because “they feel self-confident” and want to say something to their teachers and classmates. According to MacIntyre et al. (1998), students’ prior language learning has led to the development of self-confidence, which is based on a lack
of anxiety combined with a sufficient level of communicative competence, arising from a series of reasonably pleasant L2 experiences (p. 548).

WTC and LA are closely correlated and discussed particularly in the specialised approach; Liu and Jackson (2008) reported the results of the range of WTC and LA among 547 EFL Chinese learners and they concluded that more than one third of the students experienced anxiety in language class and feared being negatively evaluated. Horwitz et al. (1986, p. 128) argued that “the language learner’s self-esteem is vulnerable to the awareness that the range of communicative choices and authenticity is restricted” and “any performance in an L2 is likely to challenge an individual’s self-concept as a competent communicator leading to reticence, self-consciousness, fear or even panic” even in low-stakes environments such as EFL classrooms.

Gregersen et al. (2014, p. 574) mentioned that “language learning is an emotionally and psychologically dynamic process that is influenced by a myriad of ever changing variables and emotional vibes that produce moment-by-moment fluctuations in learners’ adaptation”. As discussed in 2.2.3, WTC is an example of complex interactions of multiple factors that influence speaking in EFL, which is often cited by students as their most anxiety-producing experience (Young, 1990, p. 539), noting that the fear of speaking in an FL may be related to a variety of complex psychological constructs such as communication apprehension, self-esteem, and social anxiety (Young, 1990, p. 540).

3. Material and Method

The methodological approach, the data collection, the conduction of a pilot study, and analytical processes used will be described in this chapter.
3.1 The Dynamic Approach and the Triangulation of Data Collection

In the present study, FLA/FLSA will be examined as situation-specific, and as fluctuating on a moment-to-moment basis from the learners’ experiences in classrooms which centres on MacIntyre’s (2017) description of LA, within the dynamic approach, as “an emotion that fluctuates over time and that might be examined on a timescale of seconds and minutes, as in the rising and falling of anxiety during communication” (p. 23). The study also adopts Gregersen and MacIntyre’s (2014) definition of LA as “the worry and negative emotional reaction when learning and using a second language [which] is especially relevant in a classroom where self-expression takes place” (p.14).

According to Starfield (2010), “multiple methods help the research provide the thick description” (p. 57) considered essential for a FLSA study and enable triangulation; in the present study, a multi-method design is proposed in order to arrive at answers to the research questions. The key issue associated with mixed research methods is the integration of quantitative and qualitative data (questionnaires and interviews), based originally upon a pilot study, to maximise the theoretical implications of the study’s findings. The data collection procedure for the present study involves four stages: a pilot study and fieldwork, questionnaires, interviews with pupils, and interviews with teachers. The triangulation at the data collection stage increased the likelihood of measuring what the research questions intended to address.

3.2 Questionnaires

The prevalence of FLSA in the present study was examined and measured through Horwitz et al.’s (1986) questionnaire (FLCAS) with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree), which deals specifically with anxiety that learners experience in classroom interactions with their teachers. Foreign language classroom anxiety is conceptualised as based on language students’ description of their experiences that
are particularly anxiety-provoking in the classroom. The three types of anxiety measured are: CA, TA, and FNE, as described in 2.2.2.

Although FLCAS has been widely used in a large number of research projects and in different contexts around the world (Horwitz, 2010), few scholars criticise and challenge the method, as mentioned in Trang (2012).

The validity of the FLCAS has been questioned by Sparks and Ganschow (1991, 1996, 2007) who claim that it “is likely to be measuring students’ perceptions of their language learning skills” (Sparks & Ganschow, 2007, p. 260), but that it does not measure FLA levels. Sparks and Ganschow (1991) argue that the students who experience difficulties learning an FL/L2 may have native language problems that impact on their FL/L2 learning as it is currently taught in schools (p. 3). The FLCAS has been criticised for excluding native first language or/and FL aptitude (language skills) “neither the students’ native nor FL aptitude was assessed to ascertain if highly anxious students have learning problems in their native language or poor aptitude for L2 learning” (Sparks & Ganschow, 1991, p. 6). Furthermore, Sparks and Ganschow (1991) argued that 20 statements out of 33 in FLCAS involve a comfort level with expressive, such as statement 1 “never feel sure when speaking in class” or receptive language e.g. item 12 “In language class, get so nervous I forget things I know” (Sparks & Ganschow, 1991, p. 7). Five items involve verbal memory for language, four statements involve difficulty with reading and writing, and four items involve speed of language processing (Sparks & Ganschow, 1991, pp. 6-7). Trang (2012, p. 72) points out that other researchers such as “Aida (1994) and Rodríguez and Abreu (2003) have posited that the FLCAS appears to measure anxiety primarily related to speaking situations”. The present study has adopted Horwitz’s (2016) stance that the validated scale-FLCAS-gave researchers an instrument that enabled them to further “examine the role of anxiety in language learning, the incidence of anxiety in various groups of learners and language learning circumstances, and the relationship of language anxiety to other learner characteristics” (p. 933).
Regardless of all of the criticism, FLCAS has played a vital role in measuring FLA; “FLCAS has become the standard measure of language anxiety” (Horwitz, 2010, p. 158). According to Horwitz (2016), “the most important finding of the foreign language classroom anxiety scale (FLCAS) studies is that a consistent 30% to 40% of language learners report at least moderate levels of language anxiety” (p. 934) at all levels of instruction investigated worldwide. Horwitz (2017) argues that the “relatively small amounts of shared variance between the FLCAS and the other anxiety measures support the construct validity of the FLCAS” (p. 34).

3.3 Adaptation of the Questionnaire

The first method for data collection in the present study was a self-report questionnaire which was based mainly on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) by Horwitz et al. (1986) (see Appendix C). The items in the original FLCAS included thirty-three statements, whereas the items in the adapted self-report questionnaire involved seven statements plus a new item was added. The present study adopted Nilsson’s (2019) modification of FLCAS, as Nilsson has already confirmed that there is a need for such a modified version of FLCAS to be adapted for the Swedish classroom context (Nilsson, 2019, p. 7). The original FLCAS examined FLA in the U.S. among university students and learners of Spanish and French. FLCAS needed to be modified for Swedish classrooms and for school pupils aged 13-16. The original FLCAS was designed to examine and measure three types of LA, (CA, TA and FNE), but this study targets important components of FLSA in classrooms addressing on the main research question, focusing on EFL, to what extent do pupils in seventh, eighth and ninth grades in this study experience FLSA in Swedish schools? To what extent are there differences across grades?

The questionnaire was adapted based on the pilot study, fieldwork, field notes, observations, and a previous study (Nilsson, 2019). Items found irrelevant for the research questions were removed. These included items referring to tests (8, 10, 21), taking more English
lessons (5), walking to lessons (2, 17, 20, 28), formative evaluation and correction (15, 19),
English lesson moves so quickly (25), feeling nervous and distracted during the lessons (6, 12),
grammar (30), thinking that peers are better in English (7, 23), general anxieties (11, 16, 22).
Fieldwork, field notes, conversations with pupils and teachers outside the classrooms and
Nilsson’s (2019) study revealed that pupils preferred to speak in pairs and in small groups and
for this reason a new item was added “I feel more confident when I speak English in pairs or
small groups”. FLA is strongly correlated with oral performance in compulsory school
(Thompson & Sylvén, 2015); speaking with native speakers was ruled out (14, 32) since the
present study focused on the school classroom.

The statements were revised to reflect the participants’ attitudes to each of these
different components of FLSA. The study aimed to target the specific construct of FLSA by
limiting and combining the number of items that examined the same components of the FLCAS.
FLCAS items (1, 18, 27) were combined and FLCAS items (4, 29) were rephrased as one
statement. The adapted self-report was proposed to target learners’ actual experiences in
classrooms. FLCAS items (9, 33) were merged and FLCAS items (24, 31) were restructured to
one item. These eight statements measured particular components of FLSA in a classroom
setting. The modified questionnaire includes the following eight items:

1. I am quite sure of myself when I speak English in lessons.
2. I feel more confident when I speak English in pairs or small groups. (New item)
3. I get nervous if I don’t understand everything the teacher says in English.
4. I feel anxious when I speak without preparation or when the English teacher asks
   questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.
5. I have no problem answering my questions in English.
6. I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class.
7. I feel more tense and nervous in my English lessons than in my other lessons.
8. I feel confident to speak in front of other students without being afraid that they will laugh at me when I speak English.

According to Wagner (2010, p. 26), the major advantage of using questionnaires such as FLCAS is that they may be administered to a large number of participants (N=273 pupils in this case) easily and they can be objectively scored. The items were awarded 1–5 points (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree nor disagree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree), so that the total possible score ranged from 8 (indicating no anxiety at all) to 40 (the maximum level of FLSA). All of the positively worded statements of the adapted questionnaire (1, 5, 6, 8) were reverse scored. For example, if the participant chose “strongly agree” for the positive statement “I am quite sure of myself when I speak English in lessons”, “strongly agree”, which receives five points as a negative statement, is given one point in order to allow a scoring system to measure anxiety, since more points refer to higher anxiety and vice versa.

The participants were assigned to low, medium or high anxiety groups based on their total score: (8-18) indicates low anxiety, (19–29) refers to medium anxiety and (30–40) shows high anxiety. The use of quantitative data “is to help uncover trends among learners probed into possible causes for these trends, brought to the foreground a strong emic perspective” (Gkonou, 2017, p. 135). The data was analysed quantitatively using SPSS and presented in descriptive tables. Eleven questionnaires out of 273 were excluded from the study because the respondents did not answer all the questions. All statements were translated into Swedish (see Appendix B), and the researcher explained in detail-in both English and Swedish-how the respondents should answer the questionnaire. The internal consistency of the modified questionnaire, with the eight statements referring to FLSA, scored (Cronbach’s alpha=.783) which is a good value according to George and Mallery (2003).
3.4 Interviews

Interview questions were based on He (2018, pp. 203-205) and the interviews were conducted to find out about pupils’ experiences that the researcher could not directly observe, examine and measure, such as feelings and thoughts about FLA/FLSA within a school context. Wagner (2010) argues that interviews are quite rich and are used to get more in-depth information (p. 26). The interview protocol with students and with teachers were divided into three sections (see Appendix D and E) where a standardised structured format was followed in which all participants were asked the same questions and in the same order (Wagner, 2010). The first section of interview with pupils comprised structured questions to acknowledge how the pupils describe their feelings about the English language and EFL lessons. The second section consisted of questions to elucidate the teacher’s role from the respondents’ perspectives, and the third section discussed the causes of and strategies to reduce FLSA in a classroom context. The interview protocol with teachers consisted of five introductory questions, such as if the teacher is qualified to teach English in grades 7 to 9, general questions about principles of inclusive schooling and education, four questions about FLA and seven questions about FLSA.

The interviews with the teachers involved one phase: the interview questions were sent by email to the teachers who wrote and sent their answers back to the researcher. This procedure was used due to time limitations. The interview procedure with the pupils involved two phases: the pupils first received the interview questions, in English and Swedish, in their Google Classroom. They wrote and submitted their answers either in English or in Swedish and the translated examples from Swedish into English are marked by an asterisk in 4.1.1. Some pupils’ original statements were difficult to understand and these responses were modified to be more in accordance with standard English. The second phase involved the researcher reviewing all the questions face-to-face with the interviewees (the students) individually, in pairs and in small groups (between 3-4 pupils) to get an in-depth discussion and analysis of what the respondent wrote. All the interviewees, pupils, have been given letters (A, B, C…) and numbers (7, 8, 9).
to refer to them in 4.1. For example, (A/8) means that the participant is a pupil in eighth grade. The teachers were called T1, T2, T3, T4, and T5.

All the interviews were extensively documented through the participants’ own writing and the researcher’s remarks, including the unstructured interview questions that were raised during the interviews. The interviews included open-ended and closed questions. The benefit of the open-ended questions is to encourage the participants to give more details and to reveal what they thought was important (e.g. Stewart & Cash, 2014, p. 48). The causes of FLA/FLSA were largely reported by learners’ experiences as agents, whose learning was largely contextualised within a classroom setting. Based on Gkonou (2017), the focus was shifted to a “person-in-context” view of the learner which reveals complex and dynamic patterns among individuals, their contexts and their personal histories (p. 136). Interview questions about learners’ feelings were constructed in order to gain a deep understanding of FLA/FLSA’s role in language learning.

3.5 Participants

The participants in the questionnaire were lower secondary school pupils (N=273). The study was conducted in fifteen classes (91 pupils in year 7, 101 pupils in year 8, and 81 pupils in year 9) in three schools. The schools are situated in a town in the north of Sweden.

Both teachers and pupils were interviewed. The teacher participants were all experienced teachers in the subject of English (N=5). Four of the teachers spoke Swedish as their L1 and one teacher spoke English as a native language; four teachers were qualified for teaching English in Swedish compulsory school. Among the pupils, there were sixty-seven participants in the interviews (N=21 pupils in seventh grade, N=28 pupils in eighth grade and N=18 pupils in ninth grade), from two schools. The learners were not homogeneous when it comes to exposure to English, since some pupils have extra English lessons as a language choice, which may affect their language proficiency. A consent form, based on Bergström
(2017), was sent via a school platform (see Appendix A) to the pupils’ legal guardians to give permission to pupils to participate in the present study. The aim of triangulation of the research design and data collection (questionnaire and interviews with pupils and teachers) is to confirm the validity of the present study’s findings, noting that the participation was high: about 93% of the pupils filled in the questionnaire and about 24% of the participants were interviewed.

3.6 Pilot Study – Fieldwork and Observations

A pilot study was conducted in three EFL classrooms on 3 occasions per week over the course of one month to adapt the data collection procedure, especially the questionnaire, for the Swedish compulsory school context. Teachers’ pedagogical approaches and language learners’ behaviour were observed, following classroom routines and instructional activities. The fieldwork aimed to provide a description and interpretive explanatory account of what the pupils and teachers did in the classroom, and what meaning their interactions and communication had for them (Starfield, 2010, p. 57). Discussions with the pupils in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades, inside and outside the classroom, were very valuable to the present pilot study.

The teachers in three classrooms made use of technology which was very supportive to teachers and learners alike (see e.g. Sun, 2016). For example, the lesson plan was announced in Google Classroom before the lesson started, and all the recordings for the required texts were available for the students in their Google Classroom. The exercises had to be done in Google Documents which were unmarked, and the students got the key answers in their Google Classrooms in order to correct what they had already written by themselves.

It was observed that the teachers in three classrooms used plain and simple English as a language of communication and interaction, and it had been noted that most students spoke English in the English lessons and even a few students spoke English outside the classroom. According to Mackey (2002), language interaction (in English) “provides opportunities for
learners to receive comprehensible input and negative feedback, as well as to modify their own output, test hypotheses, and notice gaps in their interlanguage” (p. 380). Translanguaging was clear in EFL lessons in three observed classrooms. It was observed that the teachers used Swedish to varying degrees during the lesson particularly when working with grammar and giving instructions regarding what students should do and how to answer assignments and exercises. The seventh-grade teachers used more Swedish to communicate with the students compared to the teachers in eighth and ninth grades during different instructional classroom activities. This observation seems consistent to the Swedish Schools Inspectorate’s (2011) study, previously referred in 2.1.1, which reports that teachers use Swedish mainly as an instructional language in English lessons and many students often use English outside the classroom (Skolinspektionen, 2011, pp. 4-7).

One teacher confirmed that “we need to ascertain where our students are in their learning to adjust instruction to meet our students’ needs”. The teachers’ questions attempt to motivate the students’ thinking and to acknowledge the educators where the students are in their learning and what to do next. Wiliam (2019) explains that “there are only two good reasons to ask questions in class: (1) to cause thinking and (2) to provide information for the teacher about what to do next. The other reason to ask questions (during the lesson) is to collect information to inform teaching” (p. 91).

Teachers allowed students to choose whether to participate or not in particular cases - for example, by allowing them to raise their hands to show that they have an answer in open discussion. In other cases, teachers selected students at random, implementing the “no hands up” rule (Wiliam, 2019) to assure that all students in the classroom had a chance to communicate in English. The teacher selected a student to answer a question by picking an ice lolly stick in a jar on which the student’s name was written. All teachers in the three classrooms provided positive and constructive feedback to students in a friendly and warm atmosphere and it was observed that no student laughed at, or made fun of any, other student’s answer.
The lessons were teacher-centred, where the educator acted as the leader of the teaching and learning process in the classroom; students worked individually, in pairs, and in groups according to the teacher’s instructions. Moreover, the teachers’ relationships with the students were cooperative. Such a relationship takes into account the recommendations of the Swedish National Agency for Education that “the teacher together with the pupils develop rules for working and participating in their own group” (Skolverket, 2018, p. 11).

Students were given an opportunity to practise their communicative skills, reflecting their own experiences, living conditions and interests. When the students had to demonstrate their linguistic and communicative skills, the teacher asked students to work in groups or in pairs in and out of the classroom. On other occasions, the students could record their voices and share them with the teacher, who provided constructive feedback online without FNE.

The teachers’ didactic behaviour and approaches were in line with overall goals and guidelines of teaching English as defined by the Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket, 2020). The teachers were aware of individual differences in the three classrooms; “the term individual differences suggests that each learner is different in their approach to learning a foreign language” (Gkonou, 2017, p. 135), so school activities were composed to satisfy the students’ different needs (special needs education) such as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and dyslexia. It was observed that all teachers followed the principles of inclusive schooling and education “one school for all” (Swe. en skola för alla); six students out of 68 were dyslexic; they received support, for example an assistant teacher sat next to him/her and wrote the test for him/her; there are special teaching materials such as electronic books and websites www.inlasningstjanst.se, which are equipped with oral functions and texts recordings in different languages.

Informal conversations with the students outside of the classroom revealed the fact that there were some students who did not interact with the teacher, not because of FLA, but they “were not interested in what the teacher was saying”, as one student said. One teacher
described ADHD students as “unmotivated students and they generally refused to participate in English lessons”. On the other hand, some students had a good deal of enthusiasm and knowledge about the subject, and they tried to answer every question, following all the teacher’s instructions. As could be expected, all classrooms were multicultural and not all students spoke Swedish as their first language; this variable, however, was not taken into consideration in the present study.

4. Results and discussion

The quantitative data will be presented in descriptive tables which show FLSA prevalence in a whole group and in different groups. Comparison among subjects in different grades are made, and the pupils’ responses to each statement in the questionnaire are illustrated in charts to answer the first research question. The qualitative data, derived from the interviews with pupils and teachers, will be provided to identify specific practices and instructional activities in classrooms in order to answer the second and the third research questions, defining according to the participants to what extent FLSA affects pupils’ oral and language proficiency and reporting the triggers for FLA and FLSA from the perspective of pupils and teachers. Interviews with teachers attempt to acknowledge to what extent teachers know about LA as a phenomenon and what pedagogical approaches and teaching methods are employed to alleviate the effects of FLA/FLSA among pupils in seventh, eighth and ninth grades in their EFL lessons.

4.1 Quantitative Analysis

The whole group of subjects (N=262) were identified as low, medium and high anxiety (in Table 1), according to their total scores as described in 3.3. The frequency, the percent, the mean of the participants’ scores and the standard deviation were calculated and are provided in Table 1.
Table 1. Questionnaire results in the whole group – (7th, 8th and 9th grades).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils in 7th, 8th, 9th</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety learners</td>
<td>8 - 18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium anxiety learners</td>
<td>19 - 29</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>59 %</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety learners</td>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15 %</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1 - 40</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>22.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 reveals that 26% of the participants reported a low total score. Interestingly, the majority (59%) of the pupils (155 out of 262) experienced medium levels of speaking anxiety, showing a mean of 23.63. There were 38 out of 262 pupils (15%) who scored higher than 29 points which indicates high anxiety. These findings seem to support Horwitz’s (2016) statement that “the most important finding of the foreign language classroom anxiety scale (FLCAS) studies is that a consistent 30% to 40% of language learners report at least moderate levels of language anxiety” (p. 934) at all levels of instruction investigated worldwide.

Table 2 illustrates the FLSA distribution and the results of a comparison among learners in seventh, eighth and ninth grades. Each group’s total frequency, percent, mean and standard deviation were included, plus pupils’ anxiety levels were identified according to the score criteria.
Table 2. FLSA distribution among learners in 7th, 8th and 9th grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety learners in 7th grade (N=89)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety learners in 8th grade (N=94)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low anxiety learners in 9th grade (N=79)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium anxiety learners in 7th grade (N=89)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium anxiety learners in 8th grade (N=94)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium anxiety learners in 9th grade (N=79)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety learners in 7th grade (N=89)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety learners in 8th grade (N=94)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High anxiety learners in 9th grade (N=79)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Table 2 reveal that the subjects in seventh grade reported the lowest total score (low anxiety learners), followed by pupils in eighth and ninth grades, respectively. Table 2 illustrates that the medium anxiety levels among pupils in eighth and ninth grades, which are distributed evenly with a different mean. In other words, 64% of the participants in eighth grade and 64% of the participants in ninth grade reported medium levels of FLSA, while only 49% of the respondents in seventh grade were medium anxiety learners. Participants in eighth grade (18%) reported high anxiety when speaking English in the classroom, preceded by pupils in ninth grade (17%) and participants in seventh grade (9%), respectively. Employing FLCAS as an instrument of measuring FLCAS among EFL lower secondary students has resulted in the
findings in Tables 1 and 2, which support Horwitz’s (2013, p. 158) statement that “FLCAS has become the standard measure of language anxiety”. The results of the present study perhaps lend support to Horwitz’s (2017) conclusion that foreign language classroom anxiety is primarily responsible for the debilitating effects of anxiety on L2 learning and achievement, arguing that “many students report anxiety reactions in the course of their attempts to learn a new language, and many teachers report their own or their student’s anxiety in language learning” (p. 32).

Table 3 shows descriptive data; the mean and standard deviation were calculated for each item in the adapted questionnaire. Item 2 “I feel more confident when I speak English in pairs or small groups” scored the highest mean, which indicates that most of the participants prefer speaking either in pairs or in small groups in the classrooms, which was also supported by the informal discussions with pupils during the pilot study. On the other hand, statement 7 “I feel more tense and nervous in my English lessons than in my other lessons” got the lowest mean, which demonstrates that most subjects in the present study feel comfortable in English lessons. Items 1 “I am quite sure of myself when I speak English in lessons” and 8 “I feel confident to speak in front of other students without being afraid that they will laugh at me when I speak English” scored the same mean 2.51. Item 6 got mean 2.50 exploring if pupils feel afraid of making mistakes in front of peers, followed by item 5 which indicates that around half of the students have no problem answering in EFL. In item 4, the participants scored mean (2.71 out of 5), reporting that they feel anxious when they speak without preparation or when the English teacher asks questions which they have not prepared in advance. Item 3 revealed that a majority of the participants (2.71 mean) reported getting nervous if they don’t understand everything the teacher says in English.
Table 3. The Means and Standard Deviations of the 8 Items in the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am quite sure of myself when I speak English in lessons.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel more confident when I speak English in pairs or small groups.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I get nervous if I don’t understand everything the teacher says in English.</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel anxious when I speak without preparation or when the English teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have no problem in answering my questions in English.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel more tense and nervous in my English lessons than in my other lessons.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel confident to speak in front of other students without being afraid that they will laugh at me when I speak English.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in 2.2.2 (The specialised approach), Young (1990, p. 540) described that the fear of speaking in an FL may be related to a variety of complex psychological constructs, such as communication apprehension, self-esteem, and social anxiety. 114 out of 262 participants felt quite sure when they spoke English in lessons; the pupils (69%) in seventh grade agreed (N=32) and strongly agreed (N=29) when they were asked to answer the first item, while the participants (46%) in eighth grade strongly agreed (N=17) and agreed (N=26); the students (51%) in ninth grade strongly agreed (N=11) and agreed (N=29). Apparently, pupils
in seventh grade feel more comfortable when they speak English in comparison with pupils in eighth and ninth grades, as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Figure 2.** Responses to questionnaire statement 1.

The pilot study revealed that pupils preferred speaking in pairs and small groups than speaking English in front of the teacher and classmates; the participants (69%) from seventh grade strongly agreed (N=31) and agreed (N=30) on item 2 (illustrated in Figure 3), preceded by the pupils (72%) in eighth grade and the students (76%) in ninth grade. Interestingly, 22 out of 89 pupils (25%) in seventh grade opted for a neutral response (neither agreed nor disagreed). As discussed in 2.2.2 (the specialised approach), the classroom procedure is one of the main sources of LA, suggesting that working in pairs and small groups is a strategy adopted to reduce students’ FLSA in a classroom setting (Young, 1991, p. 433).
Participants were asked if they got nervous when they did not understand everything the teacher said in English, as illustrated in Figure 4. Pupils’ responses varied among pupils in different grades: respondents in seventh grade showed their disagreement on item 3: 51 pupils (57%) expressed their disapproval that they became nervous when not understanding what the teacher said in English. On the other hand, the pupils (70%) in eighth grade strongly disagreed (N=33) and disagreed (N=33), and the students (62%) in ninth grade chose “strongly disagree” (N=27) and “disagree” (N=23). The results of Figure 4 seem to be consistent with what MacIntyre (2017, p. 18) noted, as reported in 2.2.2, that “anxiety can be exacerbated when learners believe they must understand every word or fear losing the meaning of the communication”.

Figure 3. Responses to questionnaire statement 2.
Figure 4. Responses to questionnaire statement 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I GET NERVOUS IF I DON’T UNDERSTAND EVERYTHING THE TEACHER SAYS IN ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 7 (N = 89)</th>
<th>Grade 8 (N = 94)</th>
<th>Grade 9 (N = 79)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.17
SD = 1.09

Trait anxiety assumes that some learners are more prone to FLSA than others. Young (1986) found significant negative correlations between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency. In this sense, Figure 5 illustrates that the pupils (32%) in ninth grade strongly agreed (N=14) and agreed (N=11) on item 4 when they were asked if they got anxious when speaking English or answering the teacher’s questions without preparation in advance. The informants from seventh grade (26%) strongly agreed (N=7) and agreed (N=16) with item 4, while the students (24%) in eighth grade strongly agreed (N=8) and agreed (N=15) with the same statement.
As stated above, Thompson and Sylvén (2015) pointed out that FLA is strongly related to oral performance in compulsory schools, arguing that LA could be best conceived as situation-specific within particular settings (i.e. EFL classes) where learners are expected to perform through limited linguistic means (Gkonou, 2017). The respondents (75%) from seventh grade strongly agreed (N=36) and agreed (N=31) with statement 5 “I have no problem in answering my questions in English”; the students (57%) in ninth grade, 45 out of 79, strongly agreed (N=22) and agreed (N=23), and the pupils (52%) in eighth grade strongly agreed (N=24) and agreed (N=25) with statement 5, as illustrated in Figure 6.
With regard to Horwitz et al.’s (1986, p. 128) definition of FNE which is “apprehension about others’ evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively”, item 6 in the questionnaire referred to the worry and anxiousness about making mistakes in EFL lessons. The participants (58%) in seventh grade strongly agreed (N=27) and (N=25) agreed that they did not worry if they made mistakes in front of both teacher and classmates. 33 out of 79 students strongly agreed (N=11) and agreed (N=22) with the same item “I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class”, while the respondents (55%) from eighth grade strongly agreed (N=21) and agreed (N=31) with statement 6, as illustrated in Figure 7.
The purpose of item (7) “I feel more tense and nervous in my English lessons than in my other lessons” is to compare English to other school subjects in order to examine the situation-specific aspect of FLSA (Nilsson, 2019) since “students’ anxiousness about language learning may be confident and resilient in most other contexts, for example their history or math classes” (Gkonou, 2017, p. 137). Interestingly, most participants’ answers showed disagreement with statement 7, which indicates that pupils, as a group, did not feel more tense and nervous in English compared to other school subjects. The participants (71%) from seventh grade strongly disagreed (N=50) and disagreed (N=13) being more tense in English than other school subjects. The respondents (73%) from eighth grade strongly rejected (N=44) and rejected (N=25) the same statement, whereas the students (61%) in ninth grade strongly disagreed (N=34) and disagreed (N=14) with the content of question 7, as illustrated in Figure 8.
Figure 8. Responses to questionnaire statement 7.

Mean = 2.00
SD = 1.19

55% of the participants felt confident to speak in front of other students without being afraid that other peers would laugh at them when they spoke English; 54 out of 89 pupils in seventh grade agreed (N=35) and strongly agreed (N=19) when they were asked to answer item 8 while the pupils (49%) in eighth grade strongly agreed (N=18) and agreed (N=28), and the students (57%) in ninth grade strongly agreed (N=25) and agreed (N=20) with statement 8, as illustrated in Figure 9. A possible explanation for item 8 is that MacIntyre and Charos (1996, p. 3) found that there is a significant correlation between LA and communication competence, stressing the importance of affective variables, such as attitudes, motivation, perceived competence and anxiety (FNE), in predicting success in L2 learning and communication.
Addressing the first research question “focusing on EFL, to what extent do pupils in seventh, eighth and ninth grades in this study experience FLSA in Swedish schools? To what extent are there differences across grades?”, the findings of the present study revealed that 74% of the participants experienced medium and high levels of FLSA: 26% of the pupils experienced low levels of speaking anxiety; 59% of the respondents were medium anxiety learners and 15% of the participants were classified as high-anxiety speakers in English in the classroom setting. Furthermore, the pupils in seventh grade were the lowest anxiety learners, followed by pupils from eighth grade. On one hand, there was no sharp distinction among learners in seventh and eighth grade; on the other hand, participants from ninth grade were the most anxious EFL learners (see Table 2 and figures above). These findings are in line with the results of other similar studies, discussed in the literature review, on FLA and FLSA such as von Wörde (2003, p. 1) who reported that “one-half of all language students experience a startling level of anxiety” and other studies conducted in Sweden (Nilsson, 2019; Nessler, 2018; Bergström, 2017; Landström, 2016; Ekström, 2013; Utbildningsradion, 2012), noting the levels of LA are varied among the participants of the above-mentioned studies.

As discussed above, a self-report FLCAS is an example of situation-specific LA (as referred above). Moreover, research on anxiety and language learning involves other affective
factors associated with EFL learning (Alrabai, 2015, p. 164) which were discussed in interviews with pupils and teachers. Affective factors such as FLA, FLSA, beliefs, self-esteem, motivation, feeling willing to communicate are associated with language learning which strongly affect language proficiency. Moreover, researchers such as Gregersen and MacIntyre (2014), von Wörde (2003), MacIntyre et al. (1998), Young (1990), and Horwitz et al. (1986) view LA as a negative emotion that hinders learner interaction and inhibits the acquisition, retention and production of the TL within a classroom context.

4.2 Qualitative analysis

In regard to Horwitz et al.’s (1986, p. 128) description of FLA as a “distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process”, the second and the third research questions investigate to what extent FLSA affects oral and language proficiency, according to the participants reporting FLA/FLSA-provoking causes. Interviews with pupils about their feelings about language learning plus interviews with teachers identified the factors that language learners perceived as being of greatest importance in affecting their interaction and willingness to speak English.

4.1.1 Interviews with pupils

Attempting to answer the second research question, to what extent FLSA affects the participants’ oral and language proficiency in classrooms, some of the pupils reported that they felt incapable, frustrated, and sometimes they felt scared especially when they had to perform give an oral presentation in the classrooms, whereas others did not.

I get nervous when I read and speak in front of the class. It’s scary (Z/8).
*I have a problem speaking in front of all pupils in the classroom (A/9).
I put my hand in my pockets (U/7).
I stand on my toes (N/9).
I use many “emm ahhh” (I/9).

I pause a lot (B/9).

*I keep spinning my rings (L/7).

*I get nervous and it becomes worse when I speak a second language (A/8).

I speak very fast when I stand up to speak so I can sit down as soon as possible (X/8).

I hate English. It is a foreign language (Y/8).

The pupils from different grades gave accounts of what they felt about FLSA. Similar statements were made by Horwitz et al.’s (1986) participants when they described their feelings and “many language learners find FL learning, especially in classroom situations, particularly stressful” (p.125). According to Mak (2011), “the finding that feeling exposed when speaking provokes higher speaking-in-class anxiety” (p. 209). Many researchers such as Young (1991), Steinberg and Horwitz (1986), MacIntyre and Charos (1996), MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) and Cheng et al. (1999), previously mentioned in Chapter 2, have attempted to quantify the effects of FLSA on language learners.

Some pupils in eighth grade expressed strong feelings of FLSA in classrooms. They considered that FLSA strongly interfered with their classroom performance and perhaps made them feel scared.

I blush when I speak English (Y/8).

*My physical reactions are that I get a higher heart rate and start talking nervously. Actually, I have no idea if that is the case, but at least that’s how I feel (F/8).

*I do not know why it feels stressful when speaking in front of everyone (N/8).
These statements seem to be supported by with Young (1991) and Yan and Horwitz (2008) who found that “the students believed that anxiety strongly interfered with their classroom performance and made them feel incapable, frustrated, and sometimes even angry” (Yan and Horwitz, 2008, p. 160).

Clément et al. (1994) argued that self-confidence, in using ESL, is defined in terms of low anxious effect and high self-perceptions of language proficiency and competence.

*I don’t have anxieties because I know English very well. I like speaking English in my classes (C/7).

I don’t really get disturbed. I personally feel safe; nothing will not disturb me in English classes. There are no reasons to worry when speaking English because I know that everyone makes mistakes (B/7).

*I don’t feel anxious [when speaking English] I speak it everyday in school and in my free time. For example, when I play games and English is an international language (Q/9)

*I do not feel anxious when speaking English. I think that it is cool (U/8)

The interviewees revealed that affective variables such as self-confidence and self-esteem were correlated with EFL which appeared to support findings by Horwitz et al. (1986), Young (1992), Phillips (1992), Clément et al. (1994), MacIntyre and Gardner (1994), Yan and Horwitz (2008), Mak (2011) and Alrabai (2015).

“I can get nervous if I say something wrong in front of my class as everyone will see it” (D/7).

The participants reported some reasons leading to FLA and FLSA, addressing the third research question. The interviews showed that some pupils’ anxiety increased during long
speaking and evaluation situations, such as when they present a topic in English using Google Slides.

*I get very nervous and stressed when I have to report. I often forget how to pronounce words and start talking fast and reading very quietly because I know that I have failed*’ (N/7).

Yan and Horwitz (2008) reported that language aptitude was the theme of many participants’ comments which referred to their abilities and talents that they viewed them, as specifically related to language learning.

*I get anxious when I speak English because I’m so bad at it. I almost find it embarrassing when I speak English because I feel that my English is so bad*” (F/8).

Some participants perceived that speaking in front of classmates and/or teachers was anxiety-provoking. Horwitz et al. (1986) argued that some language learners felt “anxious” in front of their classmates and teachers; when the pupils in seventh and eighth grades were asked “which is more anxiety-arousing to you: speaking English in front of your classmates or teachers”, many learners reported that speaking in front of classmates was more causing-anxiety to them because there were “many people” and their peers would probably “judge, giggle, bully, or laugh” at them when they speak EFL.

*Speaking in front of my classmates is more anxiety-arousing to me because I know my teacher will not bully me* (E/7).

*I don’t prefer speaking English in my class because there are many people* (J/7).
They [peers] will tell me that I did a mistake then they will make a joke about it (C/7).

* I’m more worried when I speak in front of my classmates. It’s worse to talk in front of my classmates because I feel that they will judge me (N/7).

They are going to giggle and I don’t feel good about it (Q/7).

I feel anxious when I speak in front of both teachers and classmates (B/8).

They laugh or look at me weirdly and I become angry, but this does not prevent me from speaking English (Q/9).

MacIntyre (1999) described state anxiety as “the moment-to-moment experience of anxiety; it is the transient emotional state of feeling nervous that can fluctuate over time and vary in intensity” (p. 28). That is to say that many pupils in ninth grade reported feeling anxious when speaking only in front of the teachers as they believed that making mistakes in the presence of teachers would lower their grades. MacIntyre (2017, p. 17) explains that the effects of LA on speaking EFL/ESL stem from academic effects (lowered grade and poor academic achievement), as noted earlier in Chapter 2.

*I do not want to speak in front of my teacher because her job is to evaluate my English (A/9).

*She is judgmental (G/9).

Teachers give my grades (K/9).

I feel more anxious to speak in front of my teachers because I want to get a better grade (I/9).

Teachers are anxiety-arousing to me because it might lower my grades (J/9).
In respect to item 4, “I feel anxious when I speak without preparation or when the English teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance”, in the questionnaire, a few pupils commented that they felt anxious/scared when answering EFL spontaneously without preparation in advance.

*It is scary when my teacher asks me to answer in English spontaneously in front of the classroom (U/8).*

The participant’s statement is in line with Young (1991) and Mak (2011) who found that “speaking in front of the class in a second/foreign language classroom without preparation is the most speaking-in-class anxiety-provoking factor” (Mak, 2011, p. 209). Some participants indicated that pronunciation in English was a possible cause for their FLSA.

*I get nervous about the words which I can’t pronounce (A/9).*

*I am scared of saying or pronouncing English words in the wrong way (Z/8).*

*I have a bad dialect and I always don’t pronounce words correctly (S/7).*

*I feel a little anxious when I speak because of my pronunciation (G/7).*

*I become nervous when I speak English because I don’t have a good accent (Q/7).*

Some pupils reported that their feelings influenced them, and they got nervous if they did not understand everything the teacher said in English, which is previously referred to in item 3 in the questionnaire.

*I sometimes get a little stressed when I don’t understand what the teacher speaks and explains (K/9).*
Many participants perceived that speaking in the classroom was one of the major anxiety-provoking tasks they performed. They felt more comfortable when speaking and working in an informal and anxiety-free atmosphere such as in pairs and small groups, which lends support to item 2’s findings in the questionnaire. Moreover, many pupils reported that they could perform better when they work in small groups such as language choice lessons.

*I stutter, stammer, and even shake, when I speak English in the classroom, but I don’t have any anxiety in language choice lessons (O/9).

Classmates would laugh at me if I made a mistake in ordinary English classes but I and my peers would consider my mistake as funny and we all laugh at it [student’s mistake] in language choice lessons (K/9).

Many participants reported that their teachers played a role in their feelings either good or bad during English lessons.

He [the teacher] is caring and funny; he is always there when we need him (N/9).

*He has become a friend to us, not only a teacher (O/9)...I like English and I have great English teachers (B/7).

*She [the teacher] has supported me to understand English (R7).

*I have good feelings towards my teacher who is helpful (D/8).

*I like my teacher and she does her best to improve English lessons even if we have a bad day (L/7).
According to Rubio-Alcalá (2017, p. 204), “the role of the teacher may also exert considerable influence, since highly anxious students reported feeling more relaxed with certain teachers”. On the other hand, a few participants expressed their opinions that their teachers can be anxiety-provoking either when evaluating and giving grades, as mentioned above, or when pupils do not understand the teacher’s instructions.

I have bad feelings towards my teacher. I feel that I am going to hell when I am called to English lessons (O/7).

The teacher sometimes makes me feel frustrated even though I was in a good mood before the class (E/9).

Some participants reported that their teachers did not have any role in their feelings during EFL lessons. Some pupils believed also that they did not learn very much in their English lessons, but rather they learn English mainly outside the school (online gaming, parents, tourism) and their teachers’ role is just to support them. This may lend support to findings of Swedish nationwide survey of the school subject English, where “more than half of the 5th graders indicate that they have learned English as much, or more, outside of school as in school” (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2014, p.5).

*I think the teacher has not made a big difference whether I like the language or not. I learn most English at home. The teacher’s role is to support, but not a source of inspiration (A/9).

I learn English a lot from playing games online (D/7).
I learned most of my English from strangers and from my mom. I learn a lot from playing online and I have feelings that no one will judge or laugh at me when I speak [when the participant (E/7) plays online]; it is not a test context (E/7).

I speak English everyday not only in my school but in my free time when I play games online (Q/9).

One participant commented that “what bothers her is that the teacher gives instructions in English so she does not understand what she is supposed to do” (F/8). Such classroom routines can provoke LA among language learners. According to Gkonou (2017, pp. 137-138), after repeated experiences with the L2, language learners begin to associate feelings of FLA with the language class. If the learner has negative experiences in the classroom, FLA is likely to develop. Although the classroom is supposed to be a low-stakes atmosphere, with the exception of test contexts, the classroom atmosphere was reported as a reason for FLSA for some participants, particularly when other pupils make a noise around them when they want to speak or read. As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, Steinberg and Horwitz (1986) described that the students who felt the constant pressure of evaluation in the L2 appeared unwilling to communicate in a stressful, non-supportive environment or in a classroom setting.

*What usually bothers me during the English lessons is when there are talks in the classroom because then it becomes difficult to concentrate (F/7).

What disturbs me is maybe when someone talks loud and I want to speak (Q/9).

Loud noises are very distracting when I want to read (B/8).
Interviews with the pupils revealed to what extent FLSA affected pupils’ language proficiency and the reasons for FLA and FLSA from the participants’ perceptions. Some pupils reported that they felt unable, and sometimes scared when speaking English in EFL classrooms. As previously mentioned in Chapter 2, Horwitz et al. (1986) found that students got anxious in EFL classroom settings if they had to speak in the TL in front of classmates and teachers. Some participants experienced high levels of FLSA when they spoke English in front of classmates and/or teachers, showing physical anxiety reactions such as standing on toes, spinning rings, shaking, blushing and even increased heart rate. Interviewees explained the reasons for their FLA and FLSA; some pupils’ FLSA increased during long speaking and evaluation situations, such as when they present a topic in English using Google Slides. Item 4 in the questionnaire, supported by the interviews, indicated that some pupils felt anxious when speaking without preparation or when the English teacher asked questions which they had not prepared in advance. Other pupils expressed their views towards FNE particularly when speaking in front of classmates, assessing the impact of affective variables such as self-confidence, self-perceptions and self-esteem specifically related to language learning. Grades were perceived as anxiety-provoking to some pupils when performing speaking activities in front of teachers. Pronunciation, dialect, accent and classroom atmosphere were the theme of many participants’ comments which referred to their FLA and FLSA in a classroom setting. Some participants reflected their comfortableness when working in an informal and anxiety-free atmosphere such as in pairs and small groups in language choice lessons, which lent support to item 2’s results in the questionnaire. Not understanding every single word their teachers said was perceived as an anxiety-provoking factor for some participants; for example, when the teacher gave instructions in English and the students did not understand what they were supposed to do. Teachers played a role in some pupils’ feelings either good or bad during EFL lessons and a few students questioned the school’s and teacher role, claiming that they learned English mainly
outside the school (through gaming, parents, and tourism) and their teachers’ role was just to support them.

4.1.2 Interviews with teachers

The interviews with teachers attempted to reveal the teachers’ knowledge about FLA and FLSA, and their teaching methodologies to include all pupils in “inclusion education” particularly when speaking EFL in classrooms, exploring the physical and psychological reactions of highly anxious pupils.

Interviewees reported that they [teachers] adjust the tasks according to the students’ needs and they attempt to apply the principle “pupil’s influence” (Swe. ‘elevinflytande’) to include all pupils in the learning and teaching process which was previously discussed in 2.2. Pupil’s influence indicates the democratic principles of enabling pupils to influence, take responsibility and be involved over their education (Skolverket, 2018, p. 13).

I give written and oral instructions; the students can choose discussions and topics by themselves. I have individual classes with some students who are in need of special teaching (T2).

I try to adjust the tasks; they can talk/discuss with me about the topic we are supposed to do. I sit with pupils one-to-one as much as possible (T3).

The teachers described FLA and FLSA from different perspectives, relating FLA and FLSA to the difficulties of learning a new language.

When you speak other languages than your mother tongue it can be stressful to try to communicate in other languages, especially in classrooms in the school (T/1).
From my perspective, it is the need to have time to formulate what to say when speaking in a second, third, or fourth language. It is quite easy to say something so completely wrong in the new language. The problem may be that FLA is most often classroom-based (and not a real need) (T/4).

The interviewees confirmed that speaking is the most anxiety-provoking task for some pupils. The teachers reported the similar reactions of highly anxious pupils, which were previously referred to in interviews with pupils. These statements seem to be consistent with other studies, discussed in Chapter 2 (e.g. Horwitz et al., 1986; Phillips, 1992; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Alrabai, 2014; Dewaele, 2013; Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014; He, 2018) which quantified the effects of LA on language learners.

I think speaking is the most stressful because they [pupils] are often asked to speak to the class. And it is a one-time chance (T/3).

Physical reactions have been everything from blushing to full panic attacks.

The most common reaction that I’ve experienced is refusing to speak (T/2).

Interviewees stated that pupils were very sensitive to FNE in which items’ 6 and 8 findings in the questionnaire showed and supported by what the participants-pupils- had reported when it came to speaking in front of classmates in a classroom setting.

“Classmates judge and are quick to laugh at failed attempts” (T/4).

“I have some students that say they are afraid of saying the wrong thing and that their classmates would laugh or make fun of them” (T/3).
Teachers reported that pronunciation was anxiety-provoking for some pupils and many students preferred working in pairs and in small groups. Teachers’ comments were in line with item 2’ results in the questionnaire and with what the pupils had reported in the interviews.

“Often the pronunciation is not what they are used to in their native tongue” (T/4).

“I believe they prefer working in smaller groups or individually” (T/2).

The teachers’ responses seem to support He (2018, p. 36), who reports that having to speak the TL in front of their peers and making errors in pronunciation are sources of foreign language classroom anxiety. The teachers reported some traits and state anxiety among pupils. As previously referred to in Chapter 2, trait anxiety is viewed as a distinct personality trait, which remains stable over time and across a variety of situations, whereas state anxiety is the moment-to-moment experience of anxiety in a specific situation, such as a classroom setting.

They [pupils] lose their confidence when it comes to speaking English. They carry that feeling [FLSA] with them for a long time and their attitude to speaking is “I will never speak English in a class again”. They avoid my look because they [pupils] are afraid that I will ask questions directly to them and they look down at their desks (T/3).

To sum up, the teachers had different perspectives about FLSA, relating FLA and FLSA to the difficulties of learning a new language. They based their teaching methodologies on the principles of inclusion education and pupil’s influence in order to include all the pupils in the teaching process regardless of the individual differences and the pupil’s difficulties. This seems consistent with what Young (1991, p.) discussed: that one of the major causes of LA is classroom procedures, where the teachers can do more pair work to decrease anxieties.
associated with classroom procedures. The teachers explained the physical and psychological reactions of highly anxious pupils and reported some reasons leading to FLSA among pupils which are pronunciation and FNE plus pupils’ tendency to work in pairs and in small groups.

5. Conclusion

The primary objective of this study was to offer an illustration of FLSA among EFL pupils in seventh, eighth and ninth grades in Swedish schools. The other purposes of the study were to examine to what extent FLSA affects the pupils’ oral and language proficiency, and to explain the reported reasons for FLA and FLSA, according to the participants’ perceptions and experiences in the classrooms. The study was carried out in fifteen classrooms in three Swedish lower secondary schools in a town in the north of Sweden. A triangulated approach was adopted in order to collect data by means of multiple instruments – a pilot study, a modified version of a self-report FLCAS questionnaire, interviews with pupils, and interviews with teachers. Although the study was designed to be specific by minimising the number of variables, such as gender, age and multilingualism, the study nevertheless provided interesting findings related to FLSA and FLA.

A key finding from this research revealed that 74% of the participants experienced medium and high levels of FLSA. The role of interviews appeared to determine to what extent FLSA affects the participants’ oral proficiency. FLSA, as a situational variable, was found to be a complex and dynamic variable subject to change over time. The present thesis identified the factors that influenced pupils’ willingness to communicate in the classroom from the point of view of learners and teachers. Research on LA has progressed by considering the role of anxiety as described by the learners themselves (MacIntyre, 2017, p. 20) Interviews with pupils and teachers provided the similar sources of the pupils’ FLA and FLSA in a classroom setting which were FNE, grades, teacher, classmates, pronunciation, classroom atmosphere, reporting
that monologic genres such as giving an oral presentation presented the most anxiety-provoking contexts in EFL lessons.

The results showed that 26% of the students experienced low levels of FLSA; 59% of the participants were assigned as medium anxiety learners and 15% of the participants were highly anxious school pupils. The results of the present study have confirmed that FLSA is a factor that must be recognised as important in a school context. It is important for teachers and educators to acknowledge FLSA and FLA, which exist in a classroom context. Obviously, an increased knowledge of FLA and FLSA and their potential effects on pupils’ oral proficiency would assist teachers and educators to be more effective when developing classroom routines, particularly speaking activities. The interviews reported the triggers for FLA and FLSA from the pupils’ perspectives which can be taken into account by teachers. The interviews in the present study confirmed that speaking activities produce the most anxiety from the students and teachers’ perspectives, and instructor characteristics such as a non-harsh attitude toward error correction, a positive, friendly and relaxed general attitude toward students can reduce students’ anxiety (confirming what was stated in Young, 1990, p. 551). The teacher’s role in the classroom was questioned by a few pupils, reporting that some pupils learned more English outside the school through parents, tourism and gaming online. As mentioned above, teachers and students can cooperate with each other to alleviate foreign language classroom anxiety that comes from the learning environment (Horwitz et al., 1986). Teachers can comfort pupils that their participation in speaking activities will not lower their grades even if they make mistakes. According to Young (1992), pupils should not be put “on the spot” or their errors be focused on, nor should they be forced to speak before they are ready, and the input should be interesting (He, 2019, p. 36). A pedagogical method adopted to reduce pupils’ FLA and FLSA is by letting pupils speak and work in pairs and small groups inside and outside the classrooms. Technology can be a useful instrument used to alleviate FNE and pupils can get more opportunities to practise their oral performance through presentations (Google Slides); they get used to
presenting and speaking to audience and at the same time they learn to work in a digital environment which conforms to regulatory documents by Skolverket (2018).
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Appendix

Appendix A. Consent Form (questionnaires and interviews)

Samtyckesformulär

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kontaktinformation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Högskolan Dalarna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdullah Amouna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:abdamouna@xxxx.com">abdamouna@xxxx.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studiens huvudsakliga syfte är att upptäcka och påvisa det potentiella sambandet mellan oro inför att tala på engelska i klassevrummet för att således bidraga till att fler lärare medvetandegörs gällande vikten av att uppmärksamma och motverka språkångest.


Det finns inga rätt eller fel svar och du kommer inte bli bedömd på något sätt, så svara helt enkelt efter hur du känner inför varje fråga. Dina svar är viktiga för min undersökning och det är avgörande för resultaten att du svarar ärligt. Tack så mycket för ditt deltagande!

Här med intygas att jag väljer att delta i denna studie och att denna enkät får användas som material för analys. Jag har erhållit muntlig och skriftlig information angående enkätstudiens syfte samt läst och accepterat ovanstående information.

____________________ __________________
Ort                                      Datum

__________________________________
Namnteckning

________________________________________
Namnförtydligande
Appendix B. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

Mark the alternative which best corresponds with your own perceptions.
1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree
1 = inte hålla med alls; 2 = inte hålla med; 3 = Håller varken med eller inte; 4 = Hålla med; 5 = Helt hålla med

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am quite sure of myself when I speak English in lessons.</th>
<th>I feel more confident when I speak English in pairs or small groups.</th>
<th>I get nervous if I don’t understand everything the teacher says in English.</th>
<th>I feel anxious when I speak without preparation or when the English teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.</th>
<th>I have no problem answering my questions in English.</th>
<th>I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class.</th>
<th>I feel more tense and nervous in my English lessons than in my other lessons.</th>
<th>I feel confident to speak in front of other students without being afraid that they will laugh at me when I speak English.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Horwitz et al., 1986:129f.)

Thank you for your participation

Please write your name here if you want to participate in interview about how do you feel when you speak English.
Vänligen skriv ditt namn här om du vill delta i intervjun om hur du mår när du pratar engelska.

___________________________________
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Appendix C. Horwitz et al.'s Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

Mark the alternative which best corresponds with your own perceptions.

1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree

I experience the following during my classes in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don’t worry about making oral mistakes in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It wouldn’t bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>During English class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am usually at ease during oral tests in my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don’t understand why some people get so upset over English classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In English class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Even if I am well prepared for English class, I feel anxious about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I often feel like not going to my English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel confident when I speak in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I can feel my heart pounding when I’m going to be called on in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The more I study for an oral English test, the more confused I get.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I don’t feel pressure to prepare very well for English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>English class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>When I’m on my way to English class, I feel very sure and relaxed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the English teacher says.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Horwitz et al., 1986:129f.)
Appendix D. Interviews Questions with Students

Please answer the following questions either in English or in Swedish (There is no need to write your name on the paper).
Vänligen svara på följande frågor antingen på engelska eller på svenska (Du behöver inte skriva ditt namn på papperet).
Please support your answers with your own experiences as a pupil that you had during English lessons.
Vänligen stödja dina svar med dina egna erfarenheter som du hade under engelska lektioner.

1. Please describe your feelings about your English class.
Beskriv dina känslor under din engelska lektion.

2. Please tell me what you like best about your English class.
Snälla berätta vad du gillar bäst med din engelska lektion.

3. Please tell me what disturbs you the most in your English class.
Vanligen berätta vad som stör dig mest i din engelska lektion.

4. How do you think people in your classroom will react if you make mistakes?
Hur tror du att dina klasskamrat i ditt klassrum kommer att reagera om du gör misstag?

5. Has your teacher played a role in your feelings, either good or bad during English lessons?
Har din lärare spelat en roll i dina känslor under lektionen, antingen bra eller dåliga, om engelska som språk?

6. Do you feel anxious in English more than in other subjects when it comes to speaking in front of others?
Känner du dig orolig på engelska lektioner mer än i andra ämnen särskilt när det gäller att prata framför andra?

7. Do you feel anxious when speaking English? If yes, what are your physical or psychological reactions?
Känner du dig orolig när du pratar engelska? Om ja, vilka är dina fysiska eller psykologiska reaktioner?

8. What are the reasons leading to your anxieties in speaking English?
Vilka är anledningarna som bidrar till att du oroar dig för att tala engelska?

9. Which is more anxiety-arousing to you: speaking English in front of your classmates or teachers? Why?
Vilket är mer oroande för dig: att prata engelska framför dina klasskamrater eller lärare? Varför?

10. Do you have any strategies to reduce your anxiety when speaking English?
Har du några strategier för att minska din oro när du talar engelska?

11. What are the strategies helping reduce your anxieties in speaking English?
Vilka är de strategier som hjälper dig att minska din oro för att tala engelska?

12. If you were the English teacher, what would you do to reduce students’ anxieties in speaking English?
Om du var engelska lärare, vad skulle du göra för att minska elevernas oro för att tala engelska?

13. What features should an English teacher have to help reduce students’ speaking anxieties?
Vilka egenskaper ska en engelska lärare ha för att minska elevernas talanoro?

14. It is an educated guess that 40% students believe that “when speaking a foreign language, they often seem to know all the words they need but still fail to express themselves easily”, do you agree with this? Why?
Några tror att 40% studenter tror att ”när de talar ett främmande språk (engelska) verkar de ofta känna till alla orden de behöver men ändå misslyckas med att uttrycka sig lätt”, håller du med om detta? Varför?
Appendix E. Interviews Questions with Teachers

To teachers

Introductory questions
1. Are you qualified for teaching English from Skolverket?
2. How do you include all your students even those with special needs (dyslexia, ADHD, autism) in your teaching process when it comes to speaking English?
3. Do you speak English all the time in your lessons?
4. What is foreign language speaking anxiety (FLA) from your own perspectives?
5. Do you insist that your students speak?

Questions related to foreign language anxiety
1. How anxious do you think your students are when using English, reading, writing, listening, speaking, and translation? Which activity is more anxious to them? Why?
2. How does FLA affect your students’ language learning?
3. Do you that FLA is one cause of poor foreign language achievement? How do did you know this?

Questions about foreign language speaking anxiety
1. Do you think your students feel anxious when speaking English? If yes, what are their physical or psychological reactions from your point of view?
2. What are the reasons leading to your students’ anxieties in speaking English?
3. Which is more anxiety-arousing to your students: speaking English in front of their classmates or teachers? Why?
4. Do you know any strategies that your students use to reduce their anxiety when speaking English?
5. What can you do to reduce students’ anxieties in speaking English as a language teacher?
6. What strategies should an English teacher have to adopt to reduce students’ speaking anxieties?
7. It is an educated guess that 40% students believe that “when speaking a foreign language, they often seem to know all the words they need but still fail to express themselves easily”, do you agree with this? Why?