

A SPANISH VERSION OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY SCALE: REVISITING AIDA'S FACTOR ANALYSIS

PASCUAL F. PÉREZ-PAREDES
FRANCISCO MARTÍNEZ-SÁNCHEZ
Universidad de Murcia

ABSTRACT. *Among the affective variables which influence Foreign Language Learning, different authors note that Foreign Language Anxiety appears as one of the most outstanding individual differences that can predict learners' success. Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1991) built a theory that accounted for the role of Foreign Language Anxiety in the classroom context. This construct was perceived as situation-specific. The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (F.L.C.A.S.) was developed to test the learners' anxiety levels. Horwitz (1983) and Aida (1994) reported that the instrument was both reliable and valid. This study reduplicates Aida's FLCAS factor structure analysis and concludes that the construct composition is far from clear. Further research into the components of FLA is needed if we want to establish its ultimate nature.*

KEYWORDS. *Foreign language learning, affective variables, foreign language anxiety, factor analysis.*

RESUMEN. *La ansiedad ante el aprendizaje de lenguas es una de las variables afectivas que mejor predice el éxito de un estudiante en el proceso de dominio de una lengua extranjera. Horwitz, Horwitz y Cope (1991) desarrollaron una teoría que explica el papel de esta variable dentro del contexto del aprendizaje académico de una lengua extranjera. El constructo, de tipo específico y no vinculado a la ansiedad como rasgo, utiliza la medida Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (F.L.C.A.S.) para calcular la ansiedad de los aprendices. Horwitz (1983) y Aida (1994) afirman que la escala es fiable y válida en términos estadísticos. El presente trabajo repite el análisis factorial de la FLCAS y concluye que las dimensiones que subyacen al citado constructo han de ser examinadas y planteadas de nuevo con la finalidad de aclarar de manera precisa una composición factorial que se adapte al planteamiento original de Horwitz, Horwitz y Cope.*

PALABRAS CLAVE. *Aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, variables afectivas, ansiedad ante el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, análisis factorial.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Pedagogists currently accept that learners' individual differences play a major role in the process of foreign language learning (Skehan 1989; Oxford & Ehrman 1993;

Arnold 1999). For those involved in Second Language Acquisition research and Foreign Language Teaching, the study and identification of these differences is a must within an increasingly rich and interdisciplinary pedagogic context.

Among the various affective variables which influence foreign language learning, different authors (Gardner 1985; Skehan 1989; Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991) note that Foreign Language Anxiety is most outstanding. This construct is likely to account for some of the learners' individual differences and, accordingly, has attracted the attention of relevant linguists, particularly during the 90's. For example, in a broader context, Arnold and Brown (1999: 2-3) state that understanding affect is important as it can contribute to more effective foreign language learning and, on a different level, teachers and educators can relate their praxis to the emotional facets of their learners, which, in turn, will again benefit students both as learners and as individuals.

2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY RESEARCH

Before the last decade, Scovel (1978), in his review of the literature on anxiety research, found that data were inconclusive. The reasons for such a statement are threefold. First, in the late 70's, anxiety in the foreign language classroom was a complex construct which still remained theoretically unexplored, or at least, a consensus of opinion over its nature had not been reached. Second, researchers devoted their efforts to studying Foreign Language Anxiety either as Trait Anxiety or State Anxiety bound. So, different approaches to the study of anxiety in the language classroom presented unconvincing results. And third, the absence of a valid and reliable psychometric instrument with which to measure Foreign Language Anxiety simply made things worst.

According to Young (1991), it was not until the late 80's that the literature on Foreign Language Anxiety began to cast convincing and conclusive results. This author states that previous research had focused its attention on a wide variety of age spectra, different anxiety constructs, heterogeneous research designs and, last but not least, research had made use of different and diverging language skills with which to evaluate and establish correlations between Foreign Language Anxiety and Language Performance.

In the 80's, however, FLA research started to throw more conclusive results. McIntyre and Gardner (1989) claim that when learners start learning a foreign language, Foreign Language Anxiety plays a minor role in their learning process. At this point in time, aptitude and motivation are, instead, key concepts. Only after learners go through negative classroom experiences does Foreign Language Anxiety manifest itself. Based on evidence, McIntyre and Gardner (1991) suggest that Foreign Language Anxiety levels increase along with the years, that is, learners' exposure to Foreign Language Learning methodology might give rise to a type of anxiety specific to the learning situation. The effects of Foreign Language Anxiety can be rather pervasive and cumulative (MacIntyre & Gardner 1994), establishing a progressive distinction between students with high and low Foreign Language Anxiety levels. Recent research has shown

that highly anxious students consistently do worse in all major indicators of foreign language proficiency (Pérez Paredes 2000).

Research conducted by Eysenck and Gutiérrez-Calvo (1992) and Gutiérrez-Calvo (1996) shows that those learners with high anxiety levels who seem to be as efficacious as their low-anxiety partners, necessarily, have to allocate many more additional resources (such as extra time, a greater effort and additional processing activities) to the learning task. Consequently, processing efficiency (performance effectiveness divided by effort) is impaired. Eysenck and Gutiérrez Calvo's findings are extremely useful inasmuch as, for the first time, there is a theory which accounts for highly anxious learners performing as effectively as non-anxious individuals. This cognitive view is also explored by Onwuegbuzie, Bailey and Daley (2000: 90) who claim that anxiety at the processing stage debilitates learning as it "may reduce the efficiency with which memory processes are utilized to solve the task".

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1991) understand processes underlying Foreign Language Anxiety as both cognitive and interferential. They developed a theory that explained the role of Foreign Language Anxiety within the language classroom as a construct made of "self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning processes" (p.41). From a social perspective, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope believe Foreign Language Anxiety to be associated to three related performance anxieties: communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. Students with a high Foreign Language Anxiety level typically have problems with listening and speaking activities, with sound and grammar discrimination and also remembering vocabulary. In the same way, they are unwilling to talk if they feel they are being evaluated by others.

Horwitz (1983) developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS, hereafter) to evaluate the students' specific anxiety reaction towards the learning of a foreign language. The scale yielded a .93 Cronbach alpha coefficient and a high test-retest reliability ($r=.83$, $p<.01$). Aida (1994) used the FLCAS to determine the anxiety of 96 university students of Japanese as a foreign language. The results resembled those of Horwitz: .94 Cronbach alpha coefficient and a high test-retest reliability ($r=.80$, $p<.01$). Aida also performed a factor analysis of the FLCAS with Varimax rotation. Her aim was to examine whether or not the structure reflected the three kinds of anxiety reported by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope as components of Foreign Language Anxiety. After an initial run which produced seven factors with eigenvalue greater than one, Aida used a rotated matrix and specified the number of factors as four. The cut-off point for inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor was established at .50 factor loading. The results partially support Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's construct (1994). Aida states that the items reflective of Test Anxiety did not load significantly on any of the four factors which she isolated: Speech Anxiety, Fear of Failing the Class, Comfortableness with the Foreign Language and Negative Attitudes. Being this so, Speech Anxiety and Fear of Failing the Class emerged as the main

components of the Foreign Language Anxiety construct, accounting, respectively, for 37.9% and 6.3% of the variance.

In Spain, Hernández, Horrillo and Pico (1992) used the FLCAS and reported a negative correlation ($r = -0.56$, $p < 0.03$) between classroom anxiety and English (L2) proficiency. These authors measured students' proficiency through grammatical accuracy tasks: two cloze-type activities and one rewrite-the-sentence-type activity. No oral and listening reports were taken into account. Ninety-two young secondary school students took part in the investigation, which also aimed to examine other affective variables. Consistent with previous research, Foreign Language Anxiety is regarded by the authors as the best L2 proficiency predictor whereas shyness and self-concept did not correlate significantly with the proficiency variable. Alcántara (1992) also used the FLCAS to assess the anxiety level of two different groups of young English as a Foreign Language students ($n = 54$). The experimental group received suggestopedic training; the control group learnt English through a much more traditional methodology. No significant differences were reported by the researcher.

3. PURPOSE AND RATIONALE FOR THE CURRENT STUDY

Understanding Foreign Language Anxiety is crucial if we want to gain insight into the learners' affective domain. We know that the FLA construct correlates with grades in language courses, proficiency test performance, performance in writing and speaking tasks, self-confidence in language learning and self-esteem (Oxford 1999: 61). Onwuegbuzie, Bailey and Daley (1999: 219) collect evidence that there exists a moderate negative relationship between language anxiety and different measures of language achievement: course grades, oral performance, vocabulary production and teachers' ratings of achievement. Because of the importance of these correlations, Aida's factor analysis of the FLCAS, should be carefully scrutinized. For a start, the variance of three of the four factors she obtained (numbers 2, 3 and 4) is not statistically significant. Second, one single factor emerges as dominant, namely speech anxiety. It follows that minor adjustments could improve the validity of the scale and the underlying construct.

This article sets out to examine the FLCAS factor structure using a group of adult and young adults native speakers of Spanish who learn English as a foreign language in Spain. To fulfill this aim, we have investigated a population which is similar to that used by Aida in terms of proficiency and foreign language study profile homogeneity. Similarly, the instruments, procedures and statistical tools reduplicate Aida's approach.

4. METHOD

4.1. *Subjects*

A sample of one hundred and ninety eight Spanish individuals was used, fifty-eight men (29.3%) and one hundred forty women (70.7%). Their ages ranged from fourteen

to sixty-five ($\bar{x} = 24.74$; $S_x = 8.19$). At the time of this investigation, all of the subjects were post-beginner students of English at a Spanish Official School of Languages. In Spain, these are state-run institutions whose main aim is to teach young adults and adults modern languages.

4.2. *Instruments*

All subjects were evaluated with the FLCAS. This instrument is composed of thirty three items, each of which is answered on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. For each individual a score was derived. The theoretical range of the scale is from thirty three to one hundred and sixty-five. This Spanish version of the FLCAS was developed by Spanish psychologists and linguists fluent in both languages. Minor changes in the way statements were presented to students tended to reflect peculiarities of the Spanish education system. See Appendix 2 for details.

4.3. *Procedures*

Subjects completed the FLCAS during the first week of the academic year. The researchers read the instructions and told the learners to think of their previous English learning experiences at the Official School of Languages. Learners were assured that, whatever the results, these would not have any kind of effect on their final grade or on their academic record. As for the information to be gathered, the researchers attested to its confidentiality. All the students took part in the experiment voluntarily. For each subject, an anxiety score was derived by totalling his/her ratings on the thirty-three items. Those negatively-worded were conveniently treated and the ratings were reversed.

In order to perform a factor analysis of the FLCAS, the data correlation matrix was subject to different explorations. To do so, the following criteria were established: (1) to consider those factors with one eigenvalue above one (Kaiser criterion); (2) to include exclusively items with a factor loading greater than .50, and (3) to consider only those items which load significantly on one factor.

4.4. *Results*

4.4.1. *Reliability*

This version of the FLCAS yielded an internal consistency of .89 ($X = 89.07$ and s.d. 18.98) using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which provides information about the degree to which the items in a scale measure similar characteristics. The scale in this experiment yielded a high test-retest reliability ($r=.9041$, $p<.000$) over three weeks ($n=50$). In Table 1, we can compare our results to those of Horwitz and Aida:

	Present study	AIDA	Horwitz et al.
Sample size	198	96	108
Foreign language	English	Japanese	Spanish
Student's FL level	False beginners	Beginners	Beginners
Cronbach's alpha	.89	.94	.93
Mean	89.07	96.7	94.5
Standard deviation	18.98	22.1	21.4
Range	49/ 140 (91)	47/ 146 (99)	45/ 147 (102)

Table 1. *FLCAS properties in different studies*

It is apparent that FLA levels are lower in our study, and so is the reliability coefficient. However, the standard deviation and the range (both values are measures of the spread or dispersion of a set of data.) are smaller, which points out to the fact that the population studied was more homogenous in terms of FLA self-assessment. All data considered, the results in all three pieces of research yield means of .92 for the Cronbach's alpha coefficient and a mean of 93.42. Range mean is 97.3.

4.4.2. *Factor Analysis*

Factor analyses attempt to identify underlying variables, or factors, that account for the pattern of correlations within a set of observed variables. A factor analysis is commonly used in data reduction to identify a small number of factors that explain most of the variance observed in a much bigger number of variables.

First, a Principal Component Analysis produced eight factors with eigenvalue greater than one. Although the solution accounted for 58.5% of the total variance, we found that such grouping produced a much fragmented factor arrangement. Only four components were composed of items loading .50 or above: component 1 explained 27.43% of the variance and comprised 20 items, component 2 explained 5.53% of the variance and comprised 3 items, component 3 explained 5.35% of the variance, comprising three items as well and, finally, component 6 explained 3.85% of the variance and comprised one single item. Table 2 charts these components:

FACTORS	ITEMS
Component 1: items loading >.50	1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32
Component 2: items loading >.50	5, 6, 17

A SPANISH VERSION OF THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM ANXIETY SCALE

FACTORS	ITEMS
Component 3: items loading >.50	8, 14, 32
Component 6: items loading >.50	10

Table 2. *FLCAS Principal Component Analysis: components with items loadings >.50*

Six items did not load significantly on any of the eight principal components: items 2, 11, 15, 22, 25 and 28.

In order to further clarify the underlying structure of the FLCAS, we performed a Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization on the same principal component analysis. We decided on this type of orthogonal rotation for congruence with Aida's work and because this solution usually shows both simplicity of data analysis and a coherent data interpretation. Nonetheless, the components show a high degree of fragmentation. See Table 3 for details:

FACTORS	ITEMS
Component 1: items loading >.50	1, 3, 9, 12, 13, 18, 20, 23, 24, 27, 31, 33
Component 2: items loading >.50	4, 19, 29
Component 3: items loading >.50	7, 8
Component 4: items loading >.50	15, 25
Component 5: items loading >.50	6, 17
Component 6: items loading >.50	14, 32
Component 7: items loading >.50	26, 28
Component 8: items loading >.50	11

Table 3. *FLCAS Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation: components with items loadings >.50*

Seven items did not load significantly on any of the eight principal components: items 2, 5, 10, 16, 21, 22 and 30. Obviously, the results we obtained with such rotation are far from being satisfactory in terms of ease of interpretation. Despite the fact that the correlation matrix specifies eight factors, we decided to reduplicate Aida's approach and the next analysis established the number of factors as four. Such Principal Component analysis returned a solution which accounted for 43.5% of the total variance. The following table shows the results:

FACTORS	ITEMS
Component 1: items loading >.50	1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33
Component 2: items loading >.50	5, 6, 17
Component 3: items loading >.50	8, 14, 32
Component 4: items loading >.50	—

Table 4. *FLCAS Principal Component Analysis (4-factor specified): components with items loadings >.50*

A rotated Varimax method produced the following:

FACTORS	ITEMS
Component 1: items loading >.50	1, 3, 9, 12, 13, 18, 20, 24, 27, 31, 33
Component 2: items loading >.50	4, 7, 15, 16, 23, 25, 29, 30
Component 3: items loading >.50	8, 14, 32
Component 4: items loading >.50	6, 17

Table 5. *FLCAS Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation (4-factor specified): components with items loadings >.50*

In the Principal Component Analysis (4-factor specified) only three factors emerged, which means that no >.50 loadings could make it into factor four. Factor 1 consists of twenty items, while factors 2 and 3 have three items each. Seven items don't load significantly on any component: 2, 10, 11, 15, 22, 25 and 28. The Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation (4-factor specified) offers a slightly different picture. Factor 1 is composed of eleven items, all of which are present in Principal Component Analysis (4-factor specified) factor 1. Factor 2 is composed of eight items, again present in Principal Component Analysis (4-factor specified) factor 1, except number 15 and 25. Factor 3 is identical with its counterpart, and so is factor 4 with Principal Component Analysis (4-factor specified) factor 2.

In this Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation (4-factor specified), factor 1, *Communication Apprehension*, contains items indicating anxiety, shyness and bodily reactions towards speaking in the foreign language. Factor 2, *Anxiety about Foreign Language Learning Processes and Situations*, contains a group of items indicating circumstances and components of the foreign language learning context. These, as a result of cognitive appraisal, are understood as ego-threatening and result in an anxiety response. Items 29, 15 and 4 are related to the students' fear of not understanding their teacher, items 7 and 23 are related to the students' fear of doing worse than their classmates, failing in learning the foreign language (items 25, 30) and distress during the lesson (item 16).

Factor 3, *Comfortableness in Using English inside and outside the Classroom*, is made up of items reflecting students' ease when using English, either at School or with native speakers outside. Item 8 reflects attitudes towards test-taking. Lastly, items 6 and 17 comprise Factor 4, *Negative Attitudes toward Learning English*. This factor accounts for different learners' feelings which ultimately result in distressful foreign language learning experiences.

5. DISCUSSION

FLA research literature has paid considerable attention to Aida's 1994 work. As previously stated, the main applications of factor analytic techniques are, first, to reduce the number of variables and, second, to detect structure in the relationships between variables. In a few words, the extraction of principal components amounts to a variance maximizing rotation of the original variable space. This type of rotation is intentionally called variance maximizing because the criterion for the rotation is to maximize the variance of the new variable, that is, the factor, while minimizing the variance around the new variable. In our reduplication of Aida's analysis, factor 1 appears as the most outstanding component of the Foreign Language Anxiety construct. McCroskey (1984) explains the range of conducts which the different items in this factor reflect. Communication Apprehension (CA) is conceptualised as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (p.13). He distinguishes the following types of CA: Traitlike CA, Generalised-Context CA, Person-Group CA and Situational CA. Within Generalised-Context CA, McCroskey finds the following subtypes: fear of public speaking, CA about speaking in meetings or classes, CA about speaking in small group discussions and CA about speaking in dyadic interactions. It is worth noting that the three last subtypes of Generalised-Context CA occur in the foreign language classroom, that is, students usually speak in front of the rest of their classmates, they do take part in small group-work activities and, certainly, pair-work is probably the most widely used communication procedure in the language classroom. Moreover, McCroskey defines

Generalised-Context CA as “a relatively enduring personality-type orientation toward communication in a given type of context” (p. 16).

Although factor 1's (Principal Component Analysis 4 factors specified with Varimax rotation) composition coincides roughly with the results reported by Horwitz (1983) and Aida (1994), it is necessary to note here that the number of items reported by Aida is considerably greater (eighteen) than those of our study. All eleven items are included in Aida's Factor 1 and, in addition, four items (1, 13, 27 and 31) constitute Sánchez-Herrero and Sánchez's (1992) Anxiety Scale. This Anxiety Scale yielded an alpha coefficient of .66. These authors claim these four items to be enough to measure students' foreign language anxiety. Aida affirms likewise that Speech Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation (according to Aida, factor 1 explaining 37.9% of the variance) greatly account for the Foreign Language Anxiety construct.

All factors 1 considered (se Appendix 1 for details), it is visible that the FLA construct is, to a large extent, moulded around the speaking component and its interaction with individuals' cognitions and interpretations of events both inside and outside the language classroom. Items 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, 18, 20, 24, 27, 31 and 33 remain in all four analyses in our study, as well as in Aida's. All of them reflect anticipated anxious behaviour: item 1 (*...sure of myself.*), item 3 (*I tremble...*), items 9, 12, 27 and 33 (*I panic/ get nervous...*), item 13 (*It embarrasses me...*), item 18 (*...feel confident...*), item 20 (*...heart pounding...*), item 24 (*...feel self-conscious...*) and item 31 (*...others will laugh at me...*). The weight of this component is consistent with Onwuegbuzie, Bailey and Daley's (1999) setwise multiple regression analysis which revealed the group of variables which contributed significantly to the prediction of FLA. Among them we find *expected final foreign language course average*, *perceived self-worth* and *perceived scholastic competence*. The authors (p.229) state that self-esteem and self-concept play a role in determining levels of foreign language anxiety. It is sensible to think that we might be facing a complex construct made up of a myriad of emotions and affective states that, more than with any other academic subject, interferes the learning process. It is not surprising, then, that Arnold and Brown (1999: I) believe that affect conditions behaviour.

We have gathered evidence that Factor 2 of the Principal Component Analysis 4 factors specified with Varimax rotation might explain the cognitive device that triggers anxiety, and more specifically, the detection of threatening signals associated to potentially dangerous events. The speaking component seems confined to factor 1. The following sub-taxonomy of dangers is illustrative: (A) not understanding the teacher; (B) doing worse than his/her classmates; (C) not learning efficiently and, in accordance, failing the learning experience and (D) the classroom as a distressing environment. Aida's factor 1, Speech Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation, is fragmented in our studies and some of the items indicating Fear of Negative Evaluation (23 and 7, for instance) are found within Factor 2 in our study.

Factors 3 and 4 practically coincide with those described by Aida. Items indicating Test Anxiety, according to Horwitz et al (1992), 2, and 19, don't load on any factor, while item 6 does on factor 4. Aida claims Test Anxiety not to be "conceptually related to other components of foreign language anxiety" and, apparently, although Comfortableness in Using English inside and outside the Classroom and Negative Attitudes toward Learning English may play a role in the FLA construct, these factors are far from presenting themselves as coherent and well-separated from, say, Factor 2. The results in our study support the view that test-anxiety is independent of FLA construct. This is confirmed by Monteagudo (1995) who reports that test anxiety reduction and English as a foreign language performance are autonomous.

The theoretical formulation of the FLA construct clashes somehow with the factor structures of the FLCAS discussed here. The discrepancies that were found between this study and Aida's, make it necessary that future researchers re-explore the construct/measure relationship. In this sense, Cheng, Horwitz and Schallert (1999) argue that FLA is a general type of anxiety about learning a second language with a strong speaking anxiety element. They point out to the fact that specific skills anxieties should be analysed. In fact, this is a very recent trend in FLA research which includes writing anxiety (Cheng, Horwitz and Schallert 1999) and reading anxiety (Saito, Garza and Horwitz 1999) investigations.

Additionally, the initial principal component analyses presented by Aida and this study, with seven and eight factors respectively, raise the issue of one single factor, Speech Anxiety or Speech Anxiety and Fear of Negative Evaluation, as the sole and most influential component of the FLA construct. Possibly the three classical FLA components are mere analogies and perhaps FLA is something else or something different.

Therefore, we believe that future research should strive for a further clarification of the FLA construct and, thus, establish a valid FLA theory that can account for the effect of anxiety within the context of foreign language learning and academic performance.

APPENDIX 1

Factor composition of different factor analyses of FCLAS

Analysis Type	Number of factors	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8	Items failing to load
Principal Component Analysis	8	1 3 4 7 9 12 13 16 18 19 20 21 23 24 26 27 29 30 31 33	5 6 17	8 14 32			10			2 11 15 22 25 28
Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation	8	1 3 9 12 13 18 20 23 24 27 31 33	4 19 29	7 8	15 25	6 17	14 32	26 28	11	2 5 10 16 21 22 30
Principal Component Analysis 4 factors specified	4	1 3 4 7 9 12 13 16 18 19 20 21 23 24 26 27 29 30 31 33	5 6 17	8 14 32						2 11 15 22 25 28
Principal Component Analysis 4 factors specified with Varimax rotation	4	1 3 9 12 13 18 20 24 27 31 33	4 7 15 16 23 25 29 30	8 14 32	6 17					
Aida's Principal Component Analysis 4 factors specified with Varimax rotation	4	1 3 4 7 8 9 12 13 16 18 20 21 23 24 27 29 31 33	10 22 25 26	11 14 32	5 17					

APPENDIX 2

FLCAS ADAPTATION

Instrucciones: *Las siguientes afirmaciones se refieren a diversas situaciones frecuentes en el aprendizaje de un idioma. Su tarea consiste en valorar su grado de acuerdo o desacuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones, utilizando para ello la siguiente escala.*

No es preciso, si no lo desea, que ponga su nombre, pero sí su edad y sexo. GRACIAS.

1 Estoy totalmente de acuerdo	2 Estoy de acuerdo	3 No sé	4 No estoy de acuerdo	5 Estoy totalmente en desacuerdo
--------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------	------------------------------	---

1. Nunca estoy completamente seguro de mí mismo cuando hablo en la clase de idioma extranjero
2. No me preocupa cometer errores en clase.....
3. Tiemblo cuando sé que me van a preguntar en clase
4. Me asusta no entender lo que el profesor está diciendo en idioma extranjero ..
5. No me molestaría en absoluto asistir a más clases de idioma extranjero
6. Durante la clase, me doy cuenta pienso en cosas que no tienen nada que ver con la clase.....
7. Pienso que a los otros compañeros se les dan mejor los idiomas que a mí.....
8. Normalmente estoy a gusto cuando hago exámenes en clase
9. Me pongo muy nervioso cuando tengo que hablar en clase y no me he preparado bien.....
10. Me preocupa las consecuencias que pueda traer el suspender
11. No entiendo por qué alguna gente se siente tan mal por las clases de idioma extranjero
12. En clase, me pongo tan nervioso que se me olvidan algunas cosas que sé
13. Me da corte salir voluntario en clase.....
14. Creo que no me pondría nervioso si hablara el idioma extranjero con una persona nativa
15. Me irrita no entender lo que el profesor está corrigiendo
16. Aunque vaya con la clase preparada, me siento nervioso
17. A menudo no me apetece ir a clase

18. Me siento seguro a la hora de hablar en la clase
19. Me da miedo que mi profesor corrija cada fallo que cometo.....
20. Siento cómo mi corazón palpita cuando sé que me van a pedir que intervenga en clase.....
21. Cuanto más estudio, más me lío
22. No tengo ninguna presión ni preocupaciones para prepararme bien las clases
23. Tengo la sensación de que mis compañeros hablan el idioma extranjero mejor que yo.....
24. Me da mucho corte hablar en la lengua extranjera delante de mis compañeros...
25. Las clases transcurren con tal rapidez que me preocupa quedarme atrasado
26. Comparativamente, estoy más tenso y me siento más nervioso en la clase de idioma extranjero que en otras clases o que en mi propio trabajo
27. Me pongo nervioso mientras hablo en clase
28. Antes de entrar a clase, me siento seguro y relajado.....
29. Me pongo nervioso cuando no entiendo cada una de las palabras que mi profesor dice
30. Me abruma la cantidad de cosas que hay que aprender para poder hablar otro idioma
31. Temo que mis compañeros de clase se rían de mí cuando hablo en otro idioma..
32. Creo que me sentiría a gusto hablando entre nativos que hablan el idioma que estudio
33. Me pongo nervioso cuando el profesor pregunta cosas que no me he podido preparar

REFERENCES

- Arnold, J. (ed.). 1999. *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnold, J. and Brown, D. 1999. "A map of the terrain". *Affect in Language Learning*. Ed. Arnold, J. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aida, Yukie. 1994. "Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's Construct of Foreign Language Anxiety: The Case of Students of Japanese". *The Modern Language Journal* 78: 155-168.
- Alcántara, F. 1992. "La Ansiedad en la Adquisición de la L2: Su Expresión por Medio de la Escala F.L.C.A.S." *Bilingüismo y Adquisición de Lenguas. Actas del IX Congreso Nacional de A.E.S.L.A.* Ed. Etxeberria, F. and Arzamendi, J. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial Universidad del País Vasco.

- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. and Schallert, D.L. 1999. "Language Anxiety: Differentiating Writing and Speaking Components". *Language Learning* 49 (3): 417-446.
- Eysenck, M.W. & Gutiérrez Calvo, M. 1992. "Anxiety and Performance: The Processing Efficiency Theory". *Cognition and Emotion* 6(6): 409-434.
- Gardner, R. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitude and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gutiérrez-Calvo M. 1996. "Ansiedad y Deterioro Cognitivo: Incidencia en el Rendimiento Académico". *Ansiedad y Estrés* 2(2-3): 173-194.
- Hernández, M., Horrillo, P. & Pico, E. 1992. "Variables Afectivas de la Adquisición de la segunda Lengua". *Bilingüismo y Adquisición de Lenguas. Actas del IX Congreso Nacional de A.E.S.L.A.* Ed. Etxeberria, F. and Arzamendi, J. Bilbao: Servicio Editorial Universidad del País Vasco.
- Horwitz, E. 1983. "F.L.C.A.S." Unpublished Manuscript. Austin: University of Texas.
- Horwitz, E. K, Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. A. 1991. "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety". *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classrooms Implications*. Ed. Horwitz, Elaine K. & Young, Dolly J. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Research*. London: Longman.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R.C. 1989. "Anxiety and Second Language Learning: Toward a Theoretical Clarification". *Language Learning* 39: 251-275.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R.C. 1991. "Methods and Results in the Study of Anxiety and Language Learning: A Review of the Literature". *Language Learning* 41(1): 85-117.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner, R.C. 1994 . "The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language". *Language Learning* 44(2): 283-305.
- Monteagudo García, M.C. 1995. *Incidencia de la ansiedad en los exámenes de inglés*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Universidad de Alicante.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Bailey, P. and Daley, C.E. 1999. "Factors associated with foreign language anxiety". *Applied Psycholinguistics* 20: 217-239.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Bailey, P. and Daley, C.E. 2000. "The Validation of Three Scales Measuring Anxiety at Different Stages of the Foreign Language Learning Process: The Input Anxiety Scales, the Processing Anxiety Scale, and the Output Anxiety Scale". *Language Learning* 50(1): 87-117.
- Oxford, R. 1999. "Anxiety and the language learner: new insights". *Affect in Language Learning*. Ed. Arnold, J. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Oxford, R. & Ehrman, M. 1993. "Second Language Research on Individual Differences". *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13: 188-205.
- Pérez Paredes, P.F. 2000. *Actividades comunicativas y su relación con la generación de ansiedad en estudiantes de inglés como lengua extranjera*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, Servicio de Publicaciones,

- Saito, Y., Garza, T.J. & Horwitz, E.K. 1999. "Foreign language reading anxiety". *The Modern Language Journal* 83(2): 202-218.
- Sánchez-Herrero, S. & Sánchez, M.P. 1992. "The Predictive Validation of an Instrument Designed to Measure Student Anxiety in Learning a Foreign Language". *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 52: 961-966.
- Scovel, Thomas. 1978. "The Effect of Affect on Foreign Language Learning: A Review of the Anxiety Research". *Language Learning* 28: 129-142.
- Skehan, P. 1989. *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. London: Arnold.
- Young, J. 1991. "Creating a Low-Anxiety Classroom Environment: What Does Language Anxiety Research Suggest?". *The Modern Language Journal* 75(4): 426-440.