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ABSTRACT

With the purpose to filling in the gap of the previous research, which paid little attention to the language anxiety of young children, this study has examined the dynamics of language anxiety with a main focus on young Korean elementary ESOL students in an American school setting. First of all, this study found that the ESOL class was less anxiety provoking than mainstream classes. Second, the reasons for this difference seemed to be: 1) the lower level of English proficiency required in the ESOL class and 2) homogeneity of the ESOL class as non-native English speakers, 3) the self-evident but important corollary that ESOL class is taught by a teacher who had formal ESOL education training. Third, facing English language anxiety, the participants of this study displayed a range of coping strategies, and every participant used some or all of them in greater or lesser degrees in both ESOL and mainstream classes. The defense mechanisms most commonly shown by the participants were flight behaviors, especially avoidance. Fourth, the defense mechanisms employed in the ESOL class and mainstream classes had been different not only in the extent of but also in the diversity of coping strategies. Defense mechanisms other than avoidance, associated with mainstream classes were boredom, rationalization, fantasy, competition, anticipation, and displacement. In contrast, defense mechanisms, related to the ESOL class were limited to reaction formation, competition and fantasy. Lastly, the teachers in the research site appeared to well recognize the presence of language anxiety, and accordingly employed a number of mitigating strategies for the ESOL students, including being a facilitator and frequently praising their works. Among the teachers, the ESOL teacher made the most complete use of mitigating strategies. Along with those used by mainstream teachers, she had also employed additional mitigating strategies, such as giving instruction clearly by using a model. However, this study found one case different from the
general characterization of the teachers in the research site. It seemed that this teacher held some misconception regarding language anxiety, because she had neither professional training nor previous experience in working with language minority students.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In the field of second language learning, much research has been conducted to establish the existence of language anxiety, and to identify its distinct characteristics as well as to examine the effects of anxiety on language learning and performance. In fact, language anxiety has been one of the most closely studied subjects in the field of second language learning (Pappamihiel, 1999). Thanks to this research, we now have come to possess more a comprehensive and detailed understanding about language anxiety. In the current literature of language learning, for instance, the existence of language anxiety is no longer seriously challenged. So many studies have shown language anxiety to be a concrete reality that it is now commonly accepted as a norm rather than the exception in the language learning experience, although language anxiety can vary in strength from person to person or from one context to another.

Additionally, thanks to the research done so far, we now have come into a general agreement that language anxiety is a situation-specific anxiety, that is, a special and distinctive phenomenon caused by the unique contexts of language learning, and thus distinguishable from other forms of anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). In spite of an initial confusion in the early studies, as will be addressed in detail later, we have now come to know that the overall effects of anxiety on language learning are negative (Blankstein, Toner & Flett, 1989; Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Hembree, 1988). Not to mention that we have now better instruments of identifying language anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986), consequently, the focus of research is no longer simply on whether anxiety affects language learning positively or
negatively, but on more intricate questions that require more sophisticated and in-depth analyses to answer: for instance, in what specific contexts does language anxiety develop, and how? Who is more prone to language anxiety and why?

As such, the achievements of the research conducted on language anxiety over the last several decades have been quite remarkable. They have provided a strong scholarly foundation, from which the subsequent researchers greatly benefit in furthering our understanding of language anxiety. The present study is one that aims to do such a job. While appreciating the achievements of previous research, this study will try to advance our understanding of language anxiety by filling one of the gaps that the previous research appeared to have omitted: language anxiety of young children especially elementary school ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) children. As compared to other age groups, unfortunately, the previous research has paid relatively little attention to the language anxiety that young children may experience in learning a second language. Thus as MacIntyre and Gardner claim, “the literature on the role of anxiety among children is fairly sparse” (1991a, p. 94). For example, Young (1994) provides a list of thirty-three studies on language anxiety dating from the year of 1945 to 1994, but among them only one study (Swain & Burnaby, 1976) addresses the language anxiety of young children. Even after 1994, the situation showed little change as very few studies of language anxiety with a main focus on young children, such as Ariza (2000), could be found.

One might assume this gap in the previous research as an indication that young children may not experience language anxiety as adults do. Such an assumption can be readily contested by the above mentioned Swain and Burnaby (1976) study. They discovered that anxiousness has a high negative correlation with target language scores, illustrating not only the existence of language anxiety among young children, but also the detrimental effects of anxiety on their language learning and performance. Further, a number of relevant studies, which have examined the prevalence of anxiety disorder among children, show that children are not impervious to anxiety arousal.

For example, Hills (1972) claims that test anxiety appears at about second grade and then
increases grade by grade. Hembree (1988), who integrates the results of 562 studies by meta-analysis to show the nature, effects, and treatment of academic test anxiety, also reports that test anxiety and performance are significantly correlated at grade 3 and above. Foxman (2004) highlighted common fears in children, in which test and school performance anxiety showed predominantly in children between the ages of 9-12. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1999) estimates that about 13% of American children and adolescents ages 9 to 17 experience some kind of anxiety disorder. Even this figure is often considered as an underestimation, since children may not be able to describe anxious feelings, even though they are intensely anxious. That is why the anxiety disorder of children is viewed as a silent problem (Chavira, Stein, Bailey & Stein, 2004). Moreover, one relevant study (Twenge, 2000) compares the change in the level of general anxiety among children from the year of 1952 to 1993, and reports an alarming situation: “normal children of the 1980s were scoring higher than 1950s child psychiatric patients on self-reported anxiety” (p. 1016). In light of the discussion so far, it can be at least stated that children are not immune to anxiety at large, and thus not to language anxiety either.

This lack of attention on the language anxiety of young children can be problematic on two counts. First, we simply cannot know about the language anxiety of young children without trying to seriously and regularly look into it. Second, it is not possible to come up with the viable strategies and programs for young children to cope with language anxiety that usually is detrimental to language learning. With negative effects typically associated with language anxiety, it could have more serious consequences for young children. As Pekrun (1992) points out, people with more anxiety-provoking experience in the past are more likely to become anxious about similar situations later. In a comparable line, MacIntyre (1999) notes that if students experience anxiety about language learning at the early stages, they come to associate

---

1 I also suspect that the paucity of research on the language anxiety of young children might be due to the fact that they originally came from foreign language studies in the United States, where young children do not usually take foreign language classes. Because the majority of foreign language students are older than young children, in other words, the research on language anxiety tends to focus on those age groups, while young children do not receive due attention. Related to this matter, MacIntyre and Gardner (1991a) posit “foreign language anxiety is more relevant to language learning among adults” (p. 94-95).
anxiety arousal with language learning. When this happens, the student expects to be anxious in language learning contexts later. Accordingly, children can have major problems later in learning language if these difficulties are not dealt with earlier. As McCroskey (1984) points out, moreover, the typical behavior patterns of people with high levels of anxiety are avoidance of and withdrawal from anxiety-eliciting situations. In view of this, young children with high levels of language anxiety will be similarly prone to such behaviors later, avoiding and withdrawing from language learning opportunities. If language learning is critical to educational and professional advancements, its effects will be far more than abstract academic constructs.

This can be especially so for Korean children with regard to English, since proficiency in English has been one of the crucial factors that determine their life-chances in Korea (Truitt, 1995). Entering university and getting jobs are very much connected to how well they command English. As a result of globalization, moreover, the proficiency in English becomes more than an issue of personal concern.

**Purpose of Study**

This study will examine the dynamics of language anxiety with a main focus on young Korean elementary ESOL students in an American school setting, in order to fill the gap of the previous research, as pointed out previously. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to find out how young children cope with their second language anxiety, to discover any difference in their handling language anxiety between in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes, and to identify the roles of teachers in reducing the language anxiety of these children. To accomplish this purpose, this research will employ a qualitative case study approach in which a close observation of relevant students in the natural setting is possible. As will be explained later, a qualitative case study approach allows for rich and vivid observation of the attitudes and behaviors of the participants and the specific contexts in which language anxiety is experienced as well as how students attempt to deal with this language anxiety.
Research Questions

1. Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?
2. What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?
3. How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes?
4. What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies?
5. What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students?

Significance of the Study

As this study will focus on the language anxiety of young children, it appears to be the third research after Swain and Burnaby (1976)’s and Ariza’s (2000) studies that specifically deal with the language anxiety of young children. Therefore, this study would be among the few that fill the gap in the literature of language anxiety. In addition, since Ariza’s (2000) study is more like a narrative report about her experiences of applying community language learning approach in Puerto Rican K-12 school setting, its connection with other relevant literature and theoretical implications seem to remain limited. In comparison to Swain and Burnaby’s (1976) study that is a quantitative research, the present research employs a qualitative case study approach with a theoretical framework that explicitly addresses how people respond to language anxiety provoking situations. In fact, as will be detailed, this study is the first research attempt to apply a useful specification of defense mechanisms against language anxiety developed by Ehrman (1996). Therefore, this study could carry a wider theoretical scope and methodological rigor than Swain and Burnaby’s (1976) and Ariza’s (2000) study. In summary, it can be said that this study is a fresh research effort to render a vivid and in-depth description of children’s language anxiety within its specific contexts, and to provide ample descriptive data regarding language anxiety and
Definition of Terms

1. Foreign language: A language learned in one’s own culture with few immediate opportunities to use the language within the environment of that culture, for example, English learned in Korea.

2. Second language: A language learned within a culture where the language is spoken natively, for example, English learned in America.

3. ESL (English as a Second Language): Learning ESL means learning English within a culture where English is spoken natively, for example, in America, the UK, or Australia, etc.

4. EFL (English as a Foreign Language): Learning EFL means learning English in one’s own culture with few immediate opportunities to use English within the environment of that culture, for example, a Korean learning English in Korean.

5. ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages): When ESOL is used in reference to students involved in this study, it indicates English language learners who are learning English in a specifically structured classroom to teach English as a second language in an American school setting.

6. TESOL (Teaching English to speakers of other languages): It refers to both of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) and a second language (ESL).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

General Definitions of Anxiety

The term “anxiety” is probably most commonly used in contemporary psychology to denote an emotional state characterized by feelings of tension, apprehension, or dread. Freud (1963) defines anxiety as 1) “a specific unpleasurable quality, 2) efferent or discharge phenomena, and 3) the perception of these” (p. 70). In his view, anxiety is distinguished from other unpleasant affective states, such as anger or grief, by its unique combination of experiential (e.g., feelings of apprehension or tension) and physiological (e.g., heart palpitation or increased blood pressure) qualities. Although Freud did look into anxiety’s essential components, and his view is no less pertinent today, he displayed little theoretical interest in the experiential and physiological qualities of anxiety (Spielberger, 1972). More recent studies have brought a theoretical focus upon delineating the general properties of anxiety states and identifying the specific conditions that evoke them.

The conception of anxiety, varying from perspective to perspective coupled with a vast amount of differing definitions of anxiety, makes it difficult to come up with a theoretically and methodologically agreed upon definition of anxiety. This confusion results in the lack of a consensus on its causes, measurement, and treatment (Sarason, 1986). In a plethora of definitions in the literature, some definitions deserve our attention. First, Cattell (1960) views anxiety as the result of all unfulfilled needs and the degree of uncertainty that these needs will remain unfulfilled. Meanwhile, May (1977) brings the role of personality in its definition with a
view of anxiety as “the apprehension cued off by a threat to some value that the individual holds essential to his existence as a personality” (p. 205).

On the other hand, Lazarus (1966) offers a cognitive perspective of anxiety, specifically relevant to the subject of this study, by characterizing it as being misappraisal of a threatening situation that results in an individual not being able to see any effective action to alleviate the threat. Following Lazarus’s (1966) definition, Lesse (1970) portrays anxiety as “a phenomenon experienced as a foreboding dread or threat to the human organism whether the threat is generated by internal real or imagined dangers, the sources of which may be conscious or unconscious, or whether the threat is secondary to actual environmental threats” (p. 13). In a similar manner, Spielberger (1972) offers a similar definition of anxiety as:

an unpleasant emotional state or condition which is characterized by subjective feelings of tension, apprehension and worry, and by activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system that accompanies these feelings (p. 19)

Hamilton (1975) elaborated on anxiety, viewing it as “internally generated cycles of connotative signals elicited by external stimuli, which a central interpreting or appraisal process codes as requiring avoidance, and as indicating physical danger, injury to self-esteem, rejection, and loss of affection in valued social settings” (p. 50). Leary (1982) directly includes a physiological aspect of anxiety by characterizing it as “a cognitive-affective response characterized by physiological arousal (indicative of sympathetic nervous system activation) and apprehension regarding a potentially negative outcome that the individual perceives as impending” (p. 99).

The preceding illustrative definitions show that the concept of anxiety has multiple aspects (Sarason, 1986). Although definitions appear fairly complex, three basic interrelated aspects of anxiety can be drawn from them. As pointed out by Vasa and Pine (2004), the three basic interrelated aspects are physiological, behavioral, and cognitive. The physiological aspects of anxiety refer to the bodily symptoms of heightened physiological arousal such as increased
blood pressure and muscle tension, whereas the behavioral aspects entail nervous actions and avoidance behaviors, such as missing class and postponing homework, exhibited by the anxious individuals (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). The cognitive aspects involve the subjective appraisal process that produces distinctive physiological and behavioral outcomes (Spielberger, 1972; Pappamihiel, 1999). Among these three aspects of anxiety, it is cognitive aspects of anxiety that recent studies have paid most attention, and widely applied to language learning. As MacIntyre (1995) states, a focus on the cognitive dimension offers a clear explanation for the negative effects of anxiety on language learning. Accordingly, the cognitive perspective is most relevant to this study and thus worthy of having a more detailed review here.

Simply stated, the cognitive perspective posits that anxiety is basically “a type of self-preoccupation characterized by self-awareness, self-doubt, and self-depreciation” (Sarason, 1975, p. 27). In light of its subjective characteristics, anxiety is distinguished from fear that usually derives from a real, objective danger in the external environment. In other words, whereas fear is largely an emotional response to objective or known conditions, anxiety is a subjective reaction to unknown stimulus conditions, and its emotional intensity is disproportionately greater than the magnitude of the objective danger (Truitt, 1995). As such, cognitive anxiety can be characterized as a state of apprehension that is only indirectly associated with an object (Hilgard, 1967). Regardless of their objective abilities or the magnitude of the objective danger, anxiety can be generated when individuals appraise a situation negatively. Conversely, when people appraise their situation positively or evaluate their ability highly, they do not feel any anxiety or are less anxious, even if objective situations indicate otherwise. In summary, from a cognitive perspective, anxiety is viewed as fundamentally situational in nature, and whether or not anxiety is generated depends on an individual’s appraisals of a certain situation as being threatening or not, as well as his/her appraisals of one’s own capacity in dealing with those events (Pekrun, 1992).
Theoretical Framework

Just as there is diversity in the definitions of anxiety, researchers differ in their explanations of the causes of anxiety. For instance, inherited biological factors are viewed as the source of anxiety in individuals (Buss, 1988).² In contrast, some view that anxiety eliciting factors are not hereditary, but the learned traits that are acquired after birth (Ost, 1991). On the other hand, anxiety can be understood mainly as the product of external conditions, such as threatening or uncertain situations (Hamilton, 1975). To others, anxiety is largely a manifestation of unfulfilled needs or an upshot generated by the awareness of dire reality (Cattell, 1960). These lines of accounts are self-explanatory and contain some grains of truth, but are too simplified to capture a multiplicity of potential sources and causative processes which lead to anxiety. The understanding of what situations are likely to evoke anxiety and who is prone to anxiety is very important in the study of anxiety, because it helps us design reduction strategies that are effective and appropriate for those in need. In the literature of anxiety, fortunately, two useful theoretical models have been developed to explicate those dynamics: Pekrun’s (1992) Expectancy-Value Theory of Anxiety (EVTA) and Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-efficacy. These theoretical models are closely associated with the cognitive perspective in that they share the view that “feelings of anxiety rest on two components: appraisals of event as threatening or non-threatening and appraisals of one’s own self-efficacy in dealing with those events” (Pappamihiel, 1999, p. 12). With these two theoretical models as a starting point and additional insights from other scholars, we can move to unravel the sources and causative processes of anxiety.

The EVTA model (Pekrun, 1992) is based upon the assumption of the general expectancy theory that organisms anticipate events and that their behavior is thus guided by

---

² This biological perspective is derived from certain observations. For instance, baby rats freeze when a cat appears. Water phobic children are afraid of water without any traumatic initial experience. Identical twins are frequently similar in terms of enuresis, menstrual complaints, and nervous habits, even if they have been reared completely apart. In light of these observations, the biological perspective sees it highly plausible that anxiety-evoking factors are built into humans at birth (Horwitz & Young, 1991).
anticipatory goal states. Based upon this assumption along with application of several key concepts, Pekrun (1992) puts forward that anxiety is elicited when no effective control of future negative threatening events is expected. More specifically, Pekrun’s EVTA model presents five cognitive components and then combines them together resulting in either anxiety or the satisfactory dismissal of the threat. They are 1) situation-outcome expectancies, 2) action-control expectancies, 3) action-outcome expectancies, 4) intrinsic valences, and 5) extrinsic valences. Situation-outcome expectancies represent what an individual perceives as being the end result of a situation, positive or negative. Action-control expectancies reflect individuals’ own perceptions of their ability to initiate an appropriately effective control over a threatening situation, which is similar to Bandura's (1991) concept of self-efficacy. Action-outcome expectancies deal with the effectiveness of those responses. Meanwhile, intrinsic valences represent the subjective values related to the events themselves, whereas extrinsic valences reflect the subjective values of the threatening events that stem from the appraisals of their consequences (Palmgreen, 1984; Pappamihiel, 1999). In Pekrun’s (1992) EVTA model, anxiety is presented as a function of these five components. If one’s overall appraisal of these five components indicates that a negative event is expected and cannot be successfully controlled, anxiety is generated. In other words, the feeling of anxiety is naturally generated, if individuals foresee potentially threatening events which they perceive they cannot effectively control.

Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-efficacy puts forward a similar line of account, but with a new construct: self-efficacy. He defines self-efficacy as individuals’ perceptions of their capabilities to organize and execute a given course of action to solve a problem or control potential threats. He posits anxiety as the outcome resulting from the mismatch between “perceived coping capabilities and potentially hurtful aspects of the environment (p. 89).” If people have little sense of self-efficacy, they engage in apprehensive thinking and experience high levels of anxiety arousal. According to Bandura (1991), in short, the ways in which individuals experience anxiety are primarily dependent on their appraisal of self-efficacy
(Pappamihiel, 2002). Bandura (1991) characterizes self-efficacy as a multidimensional construct that varies in strength, generality, and level (or difficulty). Depending on who they are, therefore, a sense of self-efficacy differs in strength, generality and level. Some people have a stronger sense of self-efficacy than others; some have efficacy beliefs that encompass a wider range of events than others; and some are efficacious on the more difficult tasks than others (Pajares, 2001).

As seen above, the construct of threat and appraisal of self-efficacy are made subjectively and on the individual basis, and thus the propensity to anxiety varies from person to person (Pappamihiel, 2002). In the face of a mildly threatening event, for instance, some people may exaggerate its danger, or they underestimate their control over its danger, resulting in a feeling of anxiety. For some people, conversely, an objectively threatening situation is appraised as ‘concerning but manageable,’ and thus does not result in anxiety arousal. Who, then, is more likely to perceive a situation as threatening and thus be more vulnerable to anxiety? Several scholars address this issue.

To begin with, whether a particular situation is threatening or not is, at least in part, determined by past experience with similar situation. Based on this supposition, Pekrun (1992) argues that people who had experienced many threatening situations in the past, are more likely to perceive future situations as potentially threatening. Due to this overestimation of potential danger, some people are more likely to be prone to anxiety than those who had no or few traumatic experiences in the past. For example, a person who experienced a very painful dental treatment is likely to be more fearful of going to the dentist than a person with no such experience. The propensity to anxiety is also acquired during the individual history of socialization.

Spielberger (1983) also addresses the differences in a person’s propensity to anxiety by making the distinction between trait anxiety and state anxiety. Trait anxiety denotes a steady predisposition to become anxious in any situation. People with high levels of trait anxiety have a
tendency to view the world generally as threatening, and thereby are very likely to become apprehensive in a wide range of situations. On the other hand, state anxiety refers to apprehension at a particular moment in time, for example, prior to test taking, trying to speak in a foreign language, or speaking in public. In general, state anxiety does not hamper a person’s ability to reasonably appraise situations as being threatening or not. In addition, state anxiety is conceptualized as being situationally induced, and therefore mostly fades away when its eliciting situation is removed. For this reason, those with state anxiety are less likely to be prone to anxiety than those with trait anxiety which is generally of long duration and not easily modified. To the dichotomy of trait anxiety and state anxiety, MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) have added a third differentiation, situation-specific anxiety. This new construct is very similar to trait anxiety except that it is applied to a single context or situation (MacIntyre, 1999). Since situation-specific anxiety is especially relevant to language anxiety, it will be detailed later, when language anxiety is addressed.

Effects of Anxiety

A vast amount of research has been conducted to clarify the relationship between anxiety and learning (input and processing) or performance (output). In fact, their relationship has been one of the most closely examined subjects in all psychology and education (Horwitz, 2001). It is intuitive to many that anxiety has harmful effects on learning, for it involves tension, apprehension, nervousness and worry, all of which are largely regarded as negative emotional states that interfere with learning and performance. Yet, some research has shown that this is not necessarily true. The ambivalent impacts of anxiety on performance were noted earlier by Broadhurst (1957) and Hebb (1955). They posit that the relationship between anxiety and performance is an inverted-U relationship as the Yerkes-Dodson’s (1908) principle. As anxiety increases, performance would increase as well, but if anxiety becomes too great, performance would deteriorate. Put another way, as stress begins to build up to the extent within which an individual feels confident in being able to control the situation, performance could be better.
However, once a stressor becomes so great that the individual begins to doubt the ability to cope, performance would start to decline (Humara, 2002). A number of studies in educational psychology have also shown that some degree of anxiety can promote learning, while too much anxiety can hinder academic performance (Campbell & Ortiz, 1991).

Drawing upon the Yerkes-Dodson’s (1908) principle that describes curvilinear relationship between anxiety and performance as a function of task difficulty, Alpert and Haber (1960) explain the differing effects of anxiety on achievement. They suggest that anxiety was bidimensional: anxiety can be either facilitating or debilitating. The former is referred to facilitating anxiety, which affects learning and performance positively, and the latter is debilitating anxiety, which hampers learning and performance (Alpert & Haber, 1960). They found a positive correlation between facilitating anxiety and grade-point average, and a negative correlation between debilitating anxiety and grade-point average. According to them, both kinds of anxieties or neither can be experienced by the learners. In addition, Scovel (1978) addresses how these two types of anxiety influence learning: 1) facilitating anxiety motivates the learner to “fight” the new learning task; gears the learner emotionally for approach behavior, and 2) debilitating anxiety motivates the learner to “flee” the new learning task, and stimulates the individual emotionally to adopt avoidance behavior (p. 139).

The ambivalent impact of anxiety on performance has also been noted by Pekrun (1992) who points out the mediating effect of motivation. According to Pekrun (1992), there are four possible outcomes of negative task emotions such as anxiety. The first might be an increase in “tightening of information-processing” (p. 372) which slows down creativity. The second outcome might be a high level of task-irrelevant thinking and self-concerns. The third outcome is a possible reduction in positive intrinsic motivation and an increase in negative intrinsic motivation. All these three outcomes of anxiety render negative effects on performance. However, it is the fourth outcome that is positively related to performance: anxiety about failure and negative outcomes may produce a strong motivation to avoid such failure or outcomes with
a consequent increase in task effort (McInerney, McInerney & Marsh, 1997). Without any anxiety, people would lack the motivation to work hard. Therefore, a moderate amount of anxiety actually helps academic performance by creating motivation. It is also suggested by Pekrun (1992) that time on task is an important mediating variable in how anxiety affects performance. If there are minimal time constraints (as in long-term preparation for tasks), according to him, anxiety effects on performance may be positive, in that “cognitive processing impairment can be compensated for by extra hours of work” (Pekrun, 1992, p. 372). Meanwhile, Humphreys and Revelle (1984) suggest that anxiety affects performance differently, depending on the difficulty level of task performed and the quality of feedback. They posit that anxiety facilitates performance if the tasks are relatively simple and there is a large amount of positive feedback. In contrast, anxiety renders detrimental effects on performance if tasks are complex and negative feedback is provided.

As previously illustrated, research points out the possibility of beneficial effects of anxiety on learning and achievement. However, it is important to note that its negative effects have been more apparently seen in the literature of psychology and education. For example, high levels of anxiety have been shown to be negatively correlated with 1) IQ, 2) aptitude, 3) academic achievement in a wide range of subjects (such as reading, English, math, natural sciences, foreign language, psychology, and mechanical knowledge), 4) problem solving, 5) memory, and 6) grades. Moreover, these effects were found in students ranging from third grade through graduate school (Blankstein, Toner & Flett, 1989; Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Hembree, 1988; Swain and Burnaby, 1976). Following this, anxiety is typically identified as the primary factor associated with these performance decrements. Evidences of negative relations between anxiety and achievement have led to much research aimed at formulating the processes that maybe involved in such a negative relation.

Broadly speaking, these processes have been specified differently in two theoretical models: the cognitive interference model and the additive model. The first posits that highly
anxious people perform poorly in large part because of interference and distraction by task-
irrelevant information (Sarason, 1988; Wine, 1980). Drawing on Eysenck’s Working Memory
Capacity Theory (1979), the cognitive interference model posits that human beings are limited
in their attention and processing capacity, and thus they have a limited capacity of cognitive
resources to allocate to performing a task. Yet, highly anxious people may waste part of their
cognitive energy thinking about things that are completely irrelevant to the task at hand, such as
worries and concerns about self-evaluative aspects of failure, which partially occupy working
memory capacity. People with a high level of anxiety perform poorly, because anxiety takes up
processing capacity, thereby diminishing the amount of cognitive resources that can be
dedicated to performing the task itself. Since less anxious people do not waste the cognitive
resources on the task-irrelevant thoughts, in contrast, they can maintain a greater amount of
cognitive resources to devote to fulfilling task demands, while preventing competing thoughts
from entering conscious awareness and interfering with performance, thereby leading to a better
outcome (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1992).

Generally speaking, the cognitive interference model is most applicable to complex
tasks rather than to easy tasks, because in easy tasks the remaining memory capacity may be
sufficient to fulfill task requirements (Dutke & Stober, 2001). The same is true for the
automatized tasks that people do without conscious thought. When people are very familiar or
highly experienced with the tasks, the cognitive resources required by the tasks can be kept low.
In this case, the detrimental effects of anxiety on performance would either be none or minimal.
Meanwhile, the demand for cognitive resources differs, depending on the stage of learning, and
in general it is at the early stage where its demand is the highest. At the later stages of learning,
tasks become automatized so that it is no longer necessary to devote a large part of cognitive
resources to carrying out the task. This suggestion is consistent with Hembree’s (1988) meta-
analysis of 562 studies that report that the relationship between anxiety and performance is
significant at grade three and above. Hembree (1988) states that high levels of anxiety peak
between grades four and six, then remain fairly constant through high school, and are lower in college.

The second theoretical explanation, the additive model, is an agreement with the cognitive interference model on the negative effects of anxiety on performance, but with one important qualification: highly anxious individuals will perform poorly only in situations that activate the state anxiety factor (Zohar, 1998). More specifically, the impact of anxiety on performance is an additive function of two factors: the individual’s trait anxiety and situation-specific variables. In the additive model, anxiety does not always cause poor performance, but only when it is activated by certain situational factors. Accordingly, whether or not anxious individuals would experience a performance decline depends on situation-specific variables, such as low self-confidence for the specific task or an awareness of being underprepared for the class (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1992; Zohar, 1998). The additive model obtains support from results showing that highly anxious students who perform poorly on essay and short-answer questions, do better on multiple-choice questions, which generally involve less anxiety-activating test format (Benjamin, McKeachie, Lin & Holinger, 1981). In line with similar reasoning of the additive model, Tobias (1986) suggests that whether or not anxiety will lead to a lower performance also depends in part on the level of an individual’s skills. Whereas anxiety diminishes the cognitive resources that individuals can devote to performing the tasks, their skills reduce the cognitive resources required by the tasks. Consequently, their good skills can compensate for the loss incurred by their anxiety. In other words, although anxiety diminishes the proportion of the cognitive resources available to perform the tasks, good skills reduce the proportion of the cognitive resources necessary for successful tasks. Thus, the performance of two people even with an identical level of high anxiety will not necessarily result in the same outcome if they differ in their skills. In his view, optimal performance can be expected of those individuals with good skills and low level of anxiety because they have the greatest proportion of their cognitive resources available to cope with task demands.
In addition, Tobias (1986) suggests that anxiety can affect performance at three separate stages: encoding (input), organizing (processing) and retrieving (output) the information. The individuals with good skills and low level of anxiety are usually good at all three stages, but others are so only at one, two or none. For instance, some are good at encoding and processing but not at retrieving. This case is especially relevant to the anxiety that occurs during the test or test anxiety: a highly anxious student just ‘freezes up’ at test time, even though he acquires knowledge of the relevant material (Culler & Holahan, 1980, p. 18). Naveh-Benjamin, McKeachie and Lin (1987) come up with two types of test-anxious students: the students with poor preparation have problems in encoding, organizing and retrieving the information, and the students with good preparation have a major problem only in retrieving the information during the test. The latter also performs fairly well in non-threatening situations, presumably because they have a sufficient knowledge of the subject matter. This finding supports Tobias’s (1977; 1986) idea that anxiety can affect performance at three separate stages, and the suggestion of the additive model that the impact of anxiety on performance is an additive function of the individual’s trait anxiety and situation-specific variables.

In summary, it can be said that learning and performance, in general, are negatively affected by anxiety, which creates the cognitive distraction of task-irrelevant thinking. Yet, anxiety’s effects are prevalent primarily in specific conditions where the state anxiety factors are activated. Accordingly, the impacts of anxiety on performance are situational in nature, varying in their degree and sometimes even in their direction, as well as at differing cognitive stages. Finally, its negative effects on performance can be compensated in part by the greater capability and skills of performers, for they help reduce the task demands, and therefore, optimal performance can be expected of those individuals with good skills and low anxiety. With these understandings at hand, now, we are ready to explore the main subject of this study – language anxiety.
Language Anxiety

Among various types of anxiety, language anxiety has been one of the closely investigated areas in the research of anxiety (Pappamihiel, 1999). Studies of language anxiety range from trying to show existence of language anxiety to endeavoring to find how anxiety affects language learning and performance as well as how to measure it with the largest possible validity and reliability. Broadly speaking, the studies on language anxiety can be divided into two categories: 1) early studies and 2) studies came after the mid-1980s (Young, 1994). The basis of this division is the time when the concept of language anxiety arose and when studies expanded into investigations of other issues than earlier studies. Major issues in the early studies were to establish the existence of anxiety in the foreign/second language learning and investigate its effect on the language performance. On the other hand, many of the language anxiety studies conducted since the mid-1980s have not only continued to examine the effects of anxiety on language learning and performance, but also expanded into investigations of related issues including: 1) theoretical models and frameworks of language anxiety in relation to other anxieties, 2) sources and characteristics of language anxiety through both quantitative and qualitative analyses, and 3) anxiety-reducing and coping strategies (Young, 1994). After briefly looking into early studies, the conceptualization, sources, and effects of language anxiety based on literature reviews conducted after the mid-1980s will be discussed. This period is one in which “significant insights into the phenomenon,” language anxiety, were made (Young, 1994, p. 13).

Early Studies on Language Anxiety

The focus of the early studies was on ascertaining the existence of anxiety in the foreign/second language and scrutinizing its effect on the language performance. The first study, concerned with the relationship between anxiety and language learning, appears in Dunkel’s (1947) examination of the personality effect on language achievement. He attributes considerable emotionality, inner conflict, and anxiety as marked factors to a group of high
school students who learned Latin as a foreign language and fell short of expectation in a placement test. Even though this study’s focus is not only on anxiety itself, its value lies in the fact that it highlights anxiety as a factor causing unsuccessful results in language learning. This means that existence of anxiety became one of the issues in language learning.

Since Dunkel’s (1947) study, a number of scholars have further examined the relationship between anxiety and language learning, and their findings turned out to be contradictory, according to Scovel (1978), who extensively reviewed the early studies. At times there were studies which showed that anxiety negatively affects language achievement. For instance, Swain and Burnaby (1976) analyzed the relationship between anxiety and reading scores of children in a bilingual education system and found that anxiousness has a high negative correlation with the target language scores. At the same time, however, studies reached different conclusions from no relationship between anxiety and the performance to even a positive relationship existing between anxiety and language performance. Put differently, contrary to intuition shared by many, these studies showed that in language learning, the more anxious students actually performed well, or at least not worse than less anxious student.

In Backman’s (1976) study, she discovered that the highest and lowest anxiety measure scores were made by two of her poorest performing students. She concluded this as evidence suggesting that no relationship exists between anxiety and performance. Even within the same study, the findings were conflicting. Perhaps Chastain (1975) would best exemplify this case. While the correlations between anxiety and language learning were tested for three languages (French, German and Spanish), the directions of the correlations were not consistent, reporting positive, negative and near zero correlations between anxiety and language learning in three languages. Specifically, Chastain (1975) showed a negative correlation between anxiety and university students’ final course grades in an audio-lingual French class, but no correlation in regular French or German classes. On the other hand, he found a positive correlation between anxiety and the scores of German and Spanish students in traditional classes. Furthermore, he
discovered a positive correlation between foreign language anxiety and Spanish learners’ grades, while no relationship between grades in all other courses and anxiety was reported. Likewise, Tucker, Hamayan and Genesce (1976) also found that anxiety was negatively correlated to reading performance, but not to oral language performance. Meanwhile, Kleinmann (1977) showed that Spanish and Arabic university students with higher scores on anxiety measures had a greater propensity to employ difficult English structure, and anxiety was not negatively related to their language learning. Rather his finding indicated that anxiety improved learners’ oral performance.

Why, then, did such conflicting results occur in the early studies? First, Scovel (1978) provides an answer that is later proven right (Horwitz, 2001). According to Scovel, since the various studies employed different anxiety measures such as test-anxiety, facilitating-debilitating anxiety and so on, it was not unusual that they found different types of relationships between anxiety and language achievement. Horwitz (1986) also explained the reason of discrepant findings was that “existing measures of anxiety did not test an individual’s response to the specific stimulus of language learning” (p. 559). Similarly, Young (1994) attributed the conflicting results to the fact that many of the early studies had different goals, objectives, definitions, and conceptual schemata, thereby making comparison difficult. In essence, it happened because the anxiety being examined in early studies was “not what we would now consider to be language anxiety, nor did it sufficiently explain how it was related to language learning” (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 27). Young (1994) points out that among the sixteen studies she reviewed, only three used a specific language anxiety scale, thereby the study results were scattered and inconclusive. For example, the study by Chastain (1975), mentioned previously, utilized scales of test anxiety and trait anxiety. More recent research, however, has shown that these types of anxiety are not consistently related to language learning (MacIntyre, 1999).

In light of these contradictory results, Scovel (1978) emphasized that language researchers should be specific about the type of anxiety they are measuring, and recommended
that anxiety studies take note of variety in the types of anxiety that had been identified. Since Scovel’s (1978) recommendation, fortunately, more precise definitions and instruments have been developed to identify and measure language anxiety and its specific aspects. Among them are Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) who took the study of language anxiety a step further. Not only the first to introduce a ‘situation-specific’ anxiety construct which they called ‘Foreign Language Anxiety’ (Young, 1991), but also they designed the most widely used instrument, the 33-item Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), to measure this anxiety. The FLCAS was designed to be a standard instrument for measuring anxiety as a specific reaction to language learning (Truitt, 1995). Since the construction of FLCAS, the relationship between language anxiety and language achievement has been shown to be relatively uniform. Specifically, moderate negative correlation between the FLCAS and measures of language achievement has been consistently found. As researchers have increasingly relied on qualitative methods, moreover, they have also provided consistent results regarding the negative effects of language anxiety. Unlike quantitative analyses of earlier periods, qualitative examinations have consistently reported that “students feel that anxiety does matter” (Phillips, 1991, p. 2). According to Young (1994), while the consistent results in quantitative methods of analyses have contributed to understanding the effects of language anxiety, qualitative methods can provide the insights on some important aspects of language anxiety that may often be undetected in a quantitative approach.

On measurement, Horwitz (2001) later goes as far as to state, “with the development of distinct situation-specific measure of foreign language anxiety, the issue of appropriate anxiety measurement seems to be resolved” (p. 115). Although this statement may contain some exaggeration, it would not be easy to deny that Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope’s (1986) study marked a new era in the research of language anxiety that distinguished itself from the early studies. According to more recent research findings, on the other hand, it is fair to say that the prevailing findings indicate that the language anxiety negatively affects language learning and
performance across target languages and language contexts or nationalities and ages of learners (MacIntyre, 1999; Horwitz, 2001; Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Chen & Chang, 2004). The following section will discuss the conceptualization, sources and effects of language anxiety largely based on the literature review of research conducted after the study of Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope in 1986.

**Conceptualization of Language Anxiety**

Early studies (e.g., Chastain, 1975; Swain & Burnaby, 1977) regarded language anxiety as a simple transfer of other types of anxiety, previously mentioned, such as trait anxiety and debilitating anxiety, to language learning (Donley, 1999). More recently, however, scholars have generally viewed language anxiety as a special and distinctive phenomenon caused by the unique stresses imposed on students in language classes. From this perspective, it is quite possible that students experiencing no anxiety may become anxious in a language learning context. This recent definition is what MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) have called ‘situation-specific anxiety,’ which they added to the dichotomy of trait anxiety and state anxiety. The researchers have used the term, situation-specific anxiety, to differentiate people who are generally anxious in a variety of situations from those who are anxious only in specific situations. As such, situation-specific anxiety is conceptualized as the probability of becoming anxious in a particular type of situation, and thus it is necessary to distinguish one anxiety from another, according to a particular and specific situation that arouses it. For example, when people become anxious during a test, it is labeled as test anxiety. When people experience anxiety while solving mathematic problems, it is called as math anxiety. When people become anxious while speaking a second language, it is termed language anxiety. In this manner, language anxiety is considered as a specific anxiety associated with the unique situation of the language-learning context, such as learning a second language in a classroom (Pappamihiel, 1999).
From this theoretical perspective, the language learning context differs from other contexts that elicit other types of anxiety. Gardner (1985) succinctly explains the distinctiveness of the language learning situation that creates an anxiety specific to language learning classrooms that is not present in other academic subject areas. He states:

When studying history, for example, the student is presented with material from the perspective of his or her own community. Anyone who has had the opportunity to discuss some ‘historical fact’ with a member of another ethnic community will easily recognize that facts have different perspectives. When confronted with modern language, however, students face material from another cultural community. Moreover, students are not asked simply to learn about the language; they are required to learn the language, to take it in, as it were, and to make it part of their behavioral repertoire. (Gardner, 1985, p. 6)

In this light, more specifically, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) define foreign language anxiety as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feeling, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (p. 128). Many researchers of language anxiety have shared their definition. As was pointed out previously, in fact, they were the first scholars who started to use the term ‘foreign language anxiety.’ After the term ‘foreign language anxiety’ was coined, Foss and Reitzel (1988) presented anxiety in second language learning as second language anxiety, and then gradually foreign language anxiety and second language anxiety became integrated to be known as ‘language anxiety.’ Now it is accepted to say that language anxiety is an umbrella term of second/foreign language anxiety, as it can be seen in MacIntyre and Gardener’s work (1991). More recently, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) portray language anxiety as “the apprehension experienced when a situation requires the use of a second language with which the individual is not fully proficient,” this apprehension being characterized by “derogatory self-related cognitions..., feelings of apprehension, and physiological responses such as increased heart rate”
MacIntyre and Gardner (1994a) also sum up language anxiety as the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, in particular second language performance. Following this tendency in recent literatures, language anxiety will be used as an umbrella term to indicate foreign language or second language anxiety in this research, though the distinction between them will be made when necessary.

All previous definitions indicate the need to distinguish language anxiety from other forms of anxiety. There have been some studies to examine the relation between language anxiety and other types of anxiety. With a factor analysis, for instance, MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) investigated the relation among 23 scales of different types of anxiety: trait anxiety, audience anxiety, communication apprehension, interpersonal anxiety, novelty anxiety, math anxiety, and two measures of French test anxiety, French use anxiety and French classroom anxiety, with the last three measures representing language anxiety. They found that there was no correlation among anxiety factors, and thus concluded that it is possible to see that language anxiety is distinctive from other forms of anxiety.

Consistent with this finding, many scholars suggested that it was necessary to develop measures that specifically captured the distinctive aspects of language anxiety. There are a variety of such measures: the above-mentioned Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986), the French Class Anxiety Scale (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Smythe, 1975), the English Use Anxiety Scale (Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1977), the English Test Anxiety Scale (Clement, Gardner & Smythe, 1980), the French Use Anxiety Scale (Gardner, Smythe & Clement, 1979), and the Spanish Use Anxiety Scale (Muchnick & Wolfe, 1982). Among these instruments, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and the French Class Anxiety Scale have been most frequently adopted in later research (Kim, 2002). The FLCAS was devised based on students’ self-reports, clinical experience and a review of related instruments. This scale is designed to measure the range and degree of foreign language anxiety. It contains 33 items that Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) consider to be indicative of...
three components of language anxiety: communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the foreign language classroom. Here, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) would be the most pertinent in this study, not only because it is the instrument specifically designed to measure language anxiety directly associated with language learning, but also because the underlying principles of FLCAS are consistent with other current theories and concepts surrounding anxiety (Pappamihiel, 1999).

**Components of Language Anxiety**

In the past several decades, especially after the mid-1980s, a vast number of studies have attempted to construct theoretical models specifically pertinent to language anxieties through both quantitative and qualitative analyses, with a focus on identifying the components and causes of language anxiety as well as on developing anxiety-reducing and coping strategies (Young, 1994). Thanks to these studies, there is a better understanding of what language anxiety consists of and its causes. With regard to the components of language anxiety, generally speaking, there are four groups: anxiety at different stages, performance anxieties, anxiety of different language functions, and anxieties of contrasting effects. These groups can be further divided into several specific components.

**Anxieties at different stages**

While language anxiety was largely viewed as a unidirectional construct in early studies, recent research began to consider it as multidimensional. This perspective is well represented by McIntyre and Gardner (1994a; 1994b). Drawing upon Tobias’s (1977; 1986) model of the effects of anxiety on learning, McIntyre and Gardner (1994a; 1994b) posit that language anxiety occurs at three stages of the language acquisition process: input, processing and output. For them, accordingly, there are three kinds of components of language anxiety that arise at each of
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3 The French Class Anxiety Scale was developed as a part of the Attitudes and Motivation Test Battery. This scale intends to measure the degree to which students report feeling embarrassed or anxious in language class (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). This scale has been found to have strong reliability, and studies employing this instrument have reported consistent significant correlations between students’ scores on the French Class Anxiety Scale and course grades (Saito & Samimi, 1996).
three stages: input anxiety, processing anxiety and output anxiety. Input anxiety represents the fear or apprehension that students experience when they are presented with new words or sentences in the foreign language. The level of input anxiety depends on the student’s ability to receive, concentrate on, and encode external stimuli (McIntyre & Gardner, 1994a). Input anxiety may reduce the effectiveness of input by limiting the anxious student’s ability to attend to material presented by the instructor. The efficacy of input may also be diminished, for it reduces the student’s ability to represent input internally (Tobias, 1977). As mentioned previously, the highly anxious student typically attends to task-irrelevant information and material, decreasing their capacity to receive input (Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 1996). McIntyre and Gardner (1994a) suggest that examples of behaviors shown by the students with high levels of input anxiety would be asking their instructor to repeat sentences more often than do their low-anxious counterparts, or repeating material in the foreign language several times to compensate for missing or inadequate input.

Process anxiety refers to the apprehension students experience when cognitive operations are performed upon the external stimuli, that is, when they are attempting to organize and to store new information (Onwuegbuzie, Bailey & Daley, 2000). The amount of processing anxiety encountered varies, depending on the complexity of the information, the extent on which memory is relied, and the level of organization of the presented material (Bailey, Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 2000). Anxiety at this stage can obstruct learning by interfering with the processes that transform the input information and generate a solution to the problem (Tobias, 1977). In addition, since processing anxiety may reduce the efficiency with which memory processes are utilized to store and arrange the information, students with high levels of processing anxiety may be less able to understand messages or to learn new vocabulary items in the foreign language than their low-anxious counterparts (McIntyre & Gardner, 1994b).

Meanwhile, output anxiety denotes the worry or apprehension students experience when they are asked to demonstrate their ability to use previously learned material. According to
Tobias (1977), output anxiety involves interference with the retrieval of previous learning. He also notes that this interference appears after processing has been completed, but before it has been reproduced effectively as output. According to McIntyre and Gardner (1994a), the students with high levels of anxiety at this stage might suffer ineffective retrieval of vocabulary, inappropriate use of grammar rules, or an inability to speak or to write in the foreign language at all. They note that the three stages of anxiety are somewhat interdependent, meaning that each stage depends on the successful completion of the previous one. This interdependency can be seen in that not only are highly anxious students likely more to be prone to interference at all three stages, but such interference is most probably cumulative (Tobias, 1977; 1986). Put differently, input anxiety that diminishes the proportion of effective input may render a greater burden on processing to compensate for the proportion of input that previously was not successfully registered. Moreover, the anxiety that also may ensue at this processing stage may be deteriorated by the diminished efficiency of the ongoing processing, which in turn may intensify the anxiety level at the output stage, culminating in further deficits (Tobias, 1977; 1986). This distinction of language anxiety into three stages renders some meaningful benefits in investigating the effect of anxiety on language learning. McIntyre and Gardner (1994b) state:

Although these three stages of learning overlap, it is instructive to distinguish among them. The distinctions are especially useful in locating the source of performance problems that may be traced back to one of the earlier stages of learning. For example, a student may fail a test in a language course because anxiety interfered with the learning of vocabulary items and the student thus lacks sufficient knowledge to pass the test. However, a fully competent student may also fail the same test because anxiety arousal during testing interfered with the retrieval of vocabulary items that had been mastered. Placed in a more relaxed performance context, the performance of these two students would probably be very different. (p. 3)
**Performance Anxieties**

In their seminal article, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) categorize language anxiety into three performance components: 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety, and 3) fear of negative evaluation. This categorization serves as the basis of the FLCAS, and they posit that this categorization of performance anxieties is possible because language anxiety is mainly concerned with performance evaluation within an academic and social context. First, communication apprehension generally refers to a form of anxiety experienced in interpersonal communicative settings, such as shyness characterized by fear or anxiety about communicating with other people. The manifestation of communication apprehension includes “difficulty in speaking in dyads or group (oral communication anxiety) or in public (‘stage fright’), or in listening to or learning a spoken message (receiver anxiety)” (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986, p. 127). The typical behavior patterns of people with a high level of communication apprehension are communication avoidance and communication withdrawal. Compared to people with a lower level of communication apprehension, they are more reluctant to get involved in conversations with others or to seek social interactions (McCroskey, 1984).

As such, communication apprehension is obviously relevant to language learning context, because language learning processes inherently involve communication. This communication apprehension may be more evident in the foreign language learning context, because in addition to all the typical concerns about oral communication, the students in foreign language class are required to communicate through a medium in which only limited facility is possessed. In foreign language class, it is often the case that even though the students may have mature thoughts and ideas, they have an immature foreign language vocabulary with which to express them. This inability to express oneself or to comprehend another person leads to frustration and apprehension (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986).

The second component of language anxiety is test anxiety which refers to a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure. As defined by Guida and Ludow (1989),
more specifically, test anxiety is the “subjective feelings of tension, apprehension, and uncertainty and by activation or arousal of the autonomic nervous system, which continues throughout the evaluative situation” (p. 179). Students who are test-anxious have the tendency to perceive the consequences of inadequate performance in an evaluative situation with apprehension. They frequently place unrealistic demands on themselves and feel that anything less than a perfect performance is a failure. Test anxiety may be caused by a deficit in the students’ learning or study skills. On the other hand, it may take place when students, who have performed poorly in the past, indulge in task-irrelevant thoughts, such as worrying about the consequence of perceived failure during evaluative situations, thereby reducing their attention to perform the task at hand. Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) suggest that test anxiety is considerable among foreign language students since in foreign language class frequent tests and quizzes are quite common, and making errors is also a common phenomenon for even the brightest and most prepared students.

The third component is fear of negative evaluation, defined as “apprehension about others’ evaluations, distress over their negative evaluations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986, p.128). Although fear of negative evaluation appears similar to test anxiety, it is considered to be broader in scope, because it is not limited to test-taking situations in that it may occur in any social, evaluative situation such as interviewing for a job or speaking in foreign language class. Unlike most academic subject matters, foreign language requires continual evaluation by the only fluent speaker in the class, the teacher. Meanwhile, students may also be acutely sensitive to evaluation of their peers, irrespective of whether it is real or imagined. In these unique situations of the foreign language learning context, consequently, students are likely prone to fear that they are not able to receive good marks from evaluations done by others. In addition, since foreign
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4 This fear of negative evaluation can be further aggravated, when teacher acts more like a drill sergeant than that of a facilitator in correcting their errors (Brandl, as cited in Ohata, 2004). Although many students accept that some error correction is necessary (Koch & Terrell, 1991; Horwitz, 1988), the manner of error correction is often cited as potentially
language learning necessarily involves speaking in front of others, the psychological dilemma between necessity to speak and fear of losing their self-esteem in front of others is highly likely to be a common phenomenon in the foreign language classroom setting.

As previously seen, even though each of the three components of language anxiety was addressed separately, language anxiety is not viewed as simply a mixture of these three components (Pappamihiel, 1999). Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) emphasize that although these three performance anxieties are an important part of foreign language anxiety, they should not be viewed simply as the combination of these fears transferred to foreign language learning. Rather, they conceive language anxiety as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the language learning process” (p. 128). As such, the phenomenon of language anxiety ought to be approached from a more broad perspective that captures the complex nature of its diverse experiences (Ohata, 2004).

**Anxieties of Different Language Contexts**

Another categorization of components of language anxiety can be made by different language contexts or skill areas in language learning: speaking, listening, writing and reading. This categorization is based on the view that as language anxiety is situational specific, each language contexts may be associated with a distinct form of anxiety, unique to their differing inherent characteristics. Thus, it is possible to distinguish and classify them as speaking anxiety, listening anxiety, writing anxiety, and reading anxiety. However, the research on language anxiety has predominantly focused on oral aspects of language anxiety (speaking and listening), thereby relatively overlooking other components of language anxiety (reading and writing).

On the surface, reading and writing would appear to be the language contexts least prone to anxiety effects. For instance, since reading is for the most parts done privately with many opportunities for reflection and reconsideration, little communication apprehension and provoking anxiety in students.
fear of negative evaluation from others are involved, and thus it may be assumed that reading hardly elicits anxiety. Moreover, individual reading may be viewed to have little anxiety provoking factors, since it is “also an individual act in that the success of the reading does not depend on a dynamic construction of meaning by two or more speakers, whereas a speaker interacting with an uncooperative or incompetent conversational partner is going to have difficulty even if he or she is a very competent and sensitive conversational partner” (Saito, Garza & Horwitz, 1999, p. 202). In case of writing, it may be also considered to be the least anxiety-eliciting of the language contexts. When we write something, we control the language and the content of the message. Moreover, writing usually permits us to have more time to think about the message than speaking and listening, more time to find appropriate words and syntactic structures to communicate the message, and more time to revise the content and the language after the first attempt is written down (Leki, 1999).

However, these assumptions have been increasingly challenged, and now it is fair to say that at least the existence of language anxiety unique to writing and reading is firmly established by the research focusing upon non-oral language contexts. For examples, Hilleson (1996), in his diary study, observes various types of anxiety related to different skill areas and discovers that his participants have anxiety related to not only speaking and listening but also reading and writing. Cheng, Horwitz and Schallert (1999) also investigate the relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and foreign writing anxiety, and their results show that foreign language writing anxiety is a more specific type of anxiety closely related to the language function of writing. With regard to reading, Saito, Garza and Horwitz (1999) explore the relationship between general foreign language anxiety and foreign language reading anxiety among learners of French, Japanese, and Russian. They find that foreign language reading anxiety is related but distinguishable from general foreign language anxiety. In this light, it can be said that language anxiety can be comprised of four distinct components associated with different language contexts.
From this point, this study will focus specifically on speaking anxiety. In view of a relative scarcity of research dealing with the other components of language anxiety, such studies would be desirable to make more contributions to language anxiety study. However, the focus of this study on speaking anxiety can be equally contributory. First, this study will investigate the language anxiety of Korean elementary ESOL students. For Koreans, the speaking of English is the most intensive and extensive experience of anxiety (Kim, 1998; Truitt, 1995). In his research on affective experiences of Korean college students in foreign language learning, for instance, Kim (1998) found that Korean students experience considerable anxiety in the conversation class rather than in the reading class. There are a number of reasons for this vulnerability of Koreans in learning English. In addition to all the usual apprehensions about speaking in the foreign language, Koreans are especially prone to make mistakes in pronunciation when they speak in English due to considerable phonological and syntactic differences between the two languages. Therefore, it is not difficult to find Koreans who can hardly make themselves understood, even though they are fairly proficient in writing, reading and listening. Moreover, speaking anxiety is high among Koreans, for Koreans are “mortally afraid of losing face in front of people whom they know” (Kim, 1977, p. 16). Since the teachers and their peers are known persons, speaking anxiety occurs at a higher level than other language contexts that are done more on an individual basis. Therefore, it can be said that this study would be equally beneficial in view of the fact that it deals with speaking anxiety, a very source of the ‘most’ extensive language anxiety found among Koreans.

Anxieties of Contrasting Effects

As mentioned previously, anxiety has been found to render contrasting effects on language learning and performance. In light of this, language anxiety can be regarded as having two contrasting components: facilitating anxiety that affects language learning and performance positively, and debilitating anxiety that hampers language learning and performance (Scovel, 1978). As Eysenck (1979) points out, the effort expenditure that one invests in performing a task,
is not always constant, but rather it may vary from situation to situation. Performance is, at least in part, determined by the level of effort expenditure invested, in addition to one’s skill level, aptitude, etc. Thus, it is possible that highly anxious people invest more effort expenditure to compensate for the negative effects of anxiety, thereby canceling out the negative effects of anxiety with the positive effects of increased efforts or even the latter surpassing the former, resulting in a better performance. In this respect, as seen in Figure 1, it can be said that the relationship between anxiety and performance has an inverted U characteristics: as anxiety increases, performance would increase as well; but, if anxiety became too great, performance would deteriorate.

In this light, people with a relatively low level of language anxiety can compensate for its negative effects on performance by increasing their effort expenditure so that they may actually have a better performance. For instance, the language learners, who experience communication apprehension, test anxiety, or fear of negative evaluation can compensate for their negative effects with increased efforts in preparation before the class or test. This increased

![Figure 1: Inverted “U” relation between anxiety and performance](image)
effort expenditure may enhance the performance (Chastain, 1975; Tucker, Hamayan & Genesee, 1976). In other words, they may work harder to avoid the embarrassment and shame, about which they are anxious, which can result in a better performance. However, if they are intensely anxious, its negative effects would not be fully compensated for by extra efforts. When the level of anxiety is higher, moreover, the impairment caused by anxiety will worsen. For instance, the people with an extremely high level of language anxiety might simply give up attending classes or withdraw themselves from other communicative interactions. As discussed above, Chastain (1975), Tucker, Hamayan and Genesee (1976), Kleinmann (1977) empirically show that language anxiety has two contrasting components. In short, the research indicates that a modest anxiety could generate a positive result, whereas too much anxiety could produce negative results.

Sources of Language Anxiety and Reducing Strategies

Sources of Language Anxiety

As seen previously, the effects of language anxiety on language learning and performance have been closely examined in the literature of language anxiety. The effects of language anxiety must be one of the following: positive, negative or no effects at all. The findings of research on this subject have been somewhat contradictory, especially in early studies, as discussed previously. Nevertheless, the prevailing findings are that the language anxiety negatively affects language learning and performance across target languages and language contexts or of all nationalities and ages of learners (Cassady & Johnson, 2002; Chen & Chang, 2004; Horwitz, 2001; MacIntyre, 1999). At times, facilitating anxiety has been observed, and thus its positive effects. On the other hand, facilitating and debilitating anxiety, if they function simultaneously, might cancel out positive and negative effects so that no effects of any one direction can be monitored. However, as discussed previously, the literature of language anxiety has shown that these are relatively rare events as compared to the occasions when negative effects are found.
In fact, researchers have repeatedly warned of the negative effects of language anxiety on learning. For instance, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) highlight that language anxiety could cause students to postpone language study indefinitely or to change majors. Over a decade ago, Campbell and Ortiz (1991) reported that the level of anxiety in language classrooms was alarming, and Horwitz and Young (1991) estimated that half of the students enrolled in language courses were suffering from a debilitating level of language anxiety. More recently, Reid (1999) also points out that “even in optimum conditions, students can experience destructive forms of anxiety” (p. 297). As Phillips (1991) stresses, language anxiety should not be treated merely as an abstract construct studied by theorists or by researchers under laboratory or anxiety-induced conditions. Rather, language anxiety is a reality that the language student experiences on a daily basis. Facing this situation, a number of studies have been conducted to identify the sources of language anxiety and propose the strategies to ameliorate its negative effects, with an expectation that an understanding of its sources and investigation into how to lessen language anxiety will improve learner performance and increase learning satisfaction by easing tensions and reducing task-irrelevant distractions. This section will review these studies.

The sources of language anxiety can be discovered at two levels. We can look into all-encompassing explanations or theories to make out a broad picture of how language anxiety is produced. On the other hand, situation-specific sources can be identified by examining the studies done on more practical levels. I will address the sources of language anxiety, moving from all-encompassing explanations to more situation-specific explanations.

First, applying Pekrun’s (1992) Expectancy-Value Theory of Anxiety (EVTA) and Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-efficacy reviewed earlier, language anxiety can be seen as a feeling generated when individuals anticipate potentially a challenging situation of foreign language learning in which they perceive themselves as ineffective mediators. Guiora (1983) comments on how challenging foreign language learning context is:
Learning a new language is “not only a cognitive shift in terms of vocabulary, grammar and syntax but something much more formidable: the necessity to recategorize information according to the available and obligatory linguistic forms, a task that inevitably must lead to a demand to assimilate alternative and new ways to describe and thus conceptualize and ultimately experience events in and around us.” (p. 8)

In this challenging situation of foreign language learning in which learners are not usually ineffective mediators, even a mature and intelligent person would not fare well. With regard to this, Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) explain:

Adults typically perceive themselves as reasonably intelligent, socially-adept individuals, sensitive to different socio-cultural mores. These assumptions are rarely challenged when communicating in a native language as it is not usually difficult to understand others or to make oneself understood. However, the situation when learning a foreign language stands in marked contrast. As an individual’s communication attempts will be evaluated according to uncertain or even unknown linguistic and socio-cultural standards, second language communication entails risk-taking and is necessarily problematic. Because complex and nonspontaneous mental operations are required in order to communicate at all, any performance in the L2 is likely to challenge an individual’s self-concept as a competent communicator and lead to reticence, self-consciousness, fear, or even panic. (p. 128)

In other words, the foreign language learning context is inherently threatening, and defense mechanisms are necessary to deal with this threatening situation. They lack in what Bandura (1991) calls self-efficacy or what Pekrun (1992) labels action-control expectancy to overcome this unsettling situation, because in the foreign language learning context, they are usually required to communicate via a medium in which only limited facility is possessed. Moreover, individuals in this unsettling situation are potentially in a constant state of tension, and if the problem is not solved at an early stage, the anxiety experienced by language learners
is compounded by the unresolved tension. Then the ‘anxiety itself,’ generated at an early stage
by the initial encounter with a foreign language learning context, becomes another new cause of
the compounded anxiety at a later stage. In this line of reasoning, Pekrun (1992) posits that
people, who have experienced many threatening situations in the past, are more likely to
perceive present or future situations as potentially threatening. Due to their experience of a
threatening situation, they are more likely prone to anxiety than those who had no or little
negative experiences in the past. Drawing on Pekrun’s (1992) insight, MacIntyre (1999)
describes the way in which language anxiety is developed:

At the early stages of language learning, a student will encounter many difficulties in
learning, comprehension, grammar, and other areas. If that student becomes anxious
about these experiences, if he/she feels uncomfortable making mistakes, then state
anxiety occurs. After experiencing repeated occurrences of state anxiety, the student
comes to associate anxiety arousal with the second language. When this happens, the
student expects to be anxious in second language contexts; this is genesis of language
anxiety. (p. 30-31)

Pekrun’s (1992) Expectancy-Value Theory of Anxiety (EVTA) and Bandura’s (1991)
theory of self-efficacy can be also applied to identifying the reasons behind the changes in
anxiety levels under different situations. For instance, Pappamihiel (2002) shows that the ELL
(English Language Learner) students become more anxious or begin to experience high levels of
anxiety, as they move from the ESOL classroom to the mainstream classroom. She posits why
this occurs, drawing on the theories of Pekrun (1992) and Bandura (1991):

In other words, where ELL students may have not been anxious in the ESL classroom
because they have above average achievement, they may very well suffer from high
levels of English language anxiety in the mainstream classroom because of diminished
feelings of self-efficacy when confronted with higher demands in listening and speaking
skills and social relationships… (p. 346)
Upon entering the mainstream classroom, ELL students often make negative situation-outcome appraisals (the expected outcome of a potentially threatening situation) when confronted with situations in which their usual ESL classroom coping strategies are no longer valid or adequate. When they cannot see any successful course of action (action-outcome expectancies), high levels of anxiety involving the use of English result. (p. 347)

Meanwhile, Clarke (1976) also explains the origin of language anxiety by applying an all-encompassing theory. Drawing on Bateson’s theory of schizophrenia, Clarke (1976) argues that like the schizophrenics, the second language learners suffer from a sense of helplessness or anxiety in the face of confusing and conflicting environment. He characterizes second language learning as a clash of consciousness, in which a double bind exists. This is the situation where an individual will be punished if he does one thing, or another thing, or nothing at all. Bateson (as cited in Clarke, 1976) explains the double bind with an example of a Zen master who is holding a stick over the pupil’s head and says fiercely, “If you say this stick is real, I will strike you with it. If you say the stick is not real I will strike you with it. If you do not say anything, I will strike you with it” (p. 379). This situation happens because, as Bailey (1983) claims, language learners have to use language that is still premature, and thus find themselves in a double bind or no-win situation.

In this light, language anxiety is elucidated in terms of tension that stems from the language learning contexts, in which learners are required to use immature foreign/second language, and the consequent need to devote excess energy to performing even the basic tasks: to be understood or understand others. These tasks are usually accomplished with little or no conscious effort when communicating in a native language. However, in foreign language learning contexts, they become potentially problematic, prone to a communication breakdown. Clarke (1976) adds that this experience would be especially evident for students coming to the United States from less modernized cultures, since their anxiety can be aggravated by the
identity crisis thrust upon them with “apocalyptic suddenness” (p. 388). This point is also shared by Schumann’s (1976) Social Distance Hypothesis. The Social Distance Hypothesis assumes that people may feel anxious when they encounter different cultural values and customs. In this view, the greater the social distance between the two groups, the more difficult it is for the members of the second language learning group to acquire the target language.\footnote{This means that if the two cultures are not congruent, it is a difficult situation for language learners to learn the target language. This can be, for example, the case of Korean students learning English. Even though Korean ESL students surely have both integrative and instrumental motivation as classified by Gardner and Lambert (1959), they could suffer from language and cultural shock more than students who came from the countries whose culture is similar to that of the US. This means that learning English as a second language may be bad and not at all a “successful” language learning situation for Korean students, thus producing anxiety.}

In the literature of language anxiety, its potential sources have also been identified at the situation-specific level. Relying on qualitative methods of analyses, a number of studies have examined the potential sources of language anxiety. Their qualitative analyses have offered the valuable insights on situational specific sources of language anxiety that are often unnoticed in quantitative analyses. Through interview with students, open-ended questionnaires, journals, or their own personal experiences, many researchers have examined a variety of the situation specific factors that may provoke language anxiety. Based on the detailed reviews of these researches, Price (1991), Young (1991, 1999), Donley (1999) and MacIntyre (1999) have offered a list of the potential sources of language anxiety. Since they are very much situation specific, the list of potential sources at this level is fairly long, and they are intertwined with one another. Accordingly, it is not easy to discuss all nor to make a clear-cut distinction of one from another. In light of this, I will summarize focusing on the sources frequently pointed out as important in the literature.

First, the unrealistic beliefs of learners as well as instructors about language learning can cause the students to experience language anxiety in the classroom. According to Horwitz (1987), students’ beliefs about language learning are more accurately characterized with the term “myth,” influenced by previous experiences and cultural background. In the case of reading, Lee (1999) elaborates on language learners’ misconceptions of the reading process;
successful reading equals answering comprehension questions, 2) reading is a private act, 3) reading is a linear process, and 4) comprehension is an absolute one. These kinds of misconceptions lead to anxiety. In addition, Young (1991) expresses that unrealistic beliefs about language learning can provoke anxiety. For example, students tend to underestimate the time it takes to learn foreign language, but in contrast, they tend to overestimate the importance of pronunciation.

Another example of students’ unrealistic beliefs about learning would be that silence may be better in the foreign language until it can be said correctly, or that it may not be okay to guess an unknown foreign language word (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986), or that students falsely believe that they simply do not have the aptitude essential to learn a new language, even though they actually do (Price, 1991). These kinds of students’ misconceptions and unrealistic beliefs are prone to produce anxiety. Based on this observation, Horwitz (1988) suggests that dispelling students’ unrealistic beliefs about language learning could be one of the important tasks that would help students cope with language anxiety.

Meanwhile, instructors’ unrealistic beliefs about language learning also evoke learners’ anxiety under certain situations. For example, some instructors believe their role is to correct students constantly (Young, 1999). Young (1991) also suggests that instructors’ beliefs about language learning can affect their teaching styles, creating a climate more or less conducive to anxiety. According to Brandl (as cited in Young, 1991), the majority of instructors believed that “a little bit of intimidation” is “a necessary and supportive motivator for promoting students’ performance” (p. 50). Unlike their students, moreover, most instructors viewed their role in language class to be “less a counselor and friend” and opposed “a too friendly and inauthorative student-teacher relationship” (p. 49). Rather, such intimidation can provoke students’ anxiety. Price (1991) also shows that instructors’ roles are important in determining the amount of anxiety students may experience in the classroom. She reports that students’ anxiety is alleviated when “the teacher encouraged mistakes and periodically discussed the importance of
making mistakes in order to learn” (p. 106). On the contrary, some teachers aggravated students’
anxiety, such as when instructors “criticized students’ accents,” or “walked around the room
with big yard stick and flung it under anyone who was listening, yelling, ‘Pay attention!’” (Price,

Another important source eliciting students’ anxiety is competitiveness. Competitiveness is the desire to excel in comparison to others, or it could be competition with an idealized self-image (Bailey, 1983; Young, 1991). The object of the competition could be the others, normally the classmates of the learner, or the learner himself. Through studies of ten diaries, Bailey (1983) found that anxiety in adult second language learners was related to such competitive characteristics as 1) overt self-comparison with peer learners, 2) emotive responses to the comparison, 3) a desire to out-do other language learners, 4) emphasis on or concern with tests and grades, 5) a desire to gain the teacher’s approval, 6) anxiety during the language lesson, 7) withdrawal from the language learning experience.

Testing is also presented as a source of anxiety. This goes beyond test anxiety itself, and is more pertinent to how a test is given or managed by instructors. Young (1991) details the situations that may cause test anxiety: 1) if students are assessed by different material than they learned in the classroom, 2) if the test format is one with which they have no experience, and 3) if the test situation is novel, ambiguous or highly evaluative. Guida and Ludow (1989) add that this kind of anxiety is more evident among students from the countries where tests play an important role as a selection instrument in higher education or advancement in jobs.

The incongruence between learners’ learning style and teachers’ teaching style can also generate students’ language anxiety (Bailey, Daley, & Onwuegbuzie, 1999). For example, since the approach of how teachers perform in the Korean classroom is very different from that in America, Korean ESOL students would be asked to do activities that they would not be expected to do in a Korean classroom. This kind of difference can lead Korean students to have
anxiety, whereas American students might enjoy the class. Similarly, Oxford (1999) suggests that students may become anxious, because their instructor prefers a loosely structured class atmosphere, while they dislike ambiguity.

The level of difference that the target language has in relation to native language is also viewed as a source of anxiety. Saito, Garza and Horwitz (1999) conducted research on reading anxiety of American students in three different foreign language classrooms, Spanish, Russian and Japanese. They found that the level of reading anxiety varied by target language and, suggested that reading anxiety is related to the specific writing system. Their findings show that reading Japanese provoked higher anxiety levels than reading Russian or French. This difference was due to the unfamiliar and non-Roman writing system as well as to the foreign cultural content. This implies that ESL or EFL students, whose native language is greatly different from the target language, would have more anxiety and thus more difficulties in learning.

In addition to the sources previously discussed, the research has presented a variety of other potential sources that can generate language anxiety. These include low self-esteem, fears of being incorrect in front of the peers, the lack of language learning group membership, frequent quizzes and tests, being called on, peer derision, and criticism, etc. As seen so far, language learning itself is very challenging so that it has inherent parts that make people anxious. Yet, there are also many situation specific sources that cause anxiety. Therefore, it can be said that whereas the former indicates the difficulty of reducing language anxiety, the latter shows the possibility that language anxiety can be manageable.

Reducing Strategies of Language Anxiety

In view of the general tendency of language anxiety to hamper learning and the understanding of its sources discussed, several scholars (Ariza, 2002; Burden, 2004; Donley, 6)

---

6 One thing to note here with regard to teaching style is that most teachers, no matter whether they are Korean or American, tend to teach the way they learned unless they had specific teaching style education or deliberately changed their teaching style (Oxford, 1999). This is why teachers have to be trained to become professionals who can disconnect themselves from how they were taught when they were students.
1999; Foss & Reitzel, 1988; Leki, 1999; Price, 1991; Young, 1990; 1991; 1999) have suggested a variety of the strategies and programs that can contribute to reducing the negative effects of language anxiety. Following are suggestions that researchers have made about reducing language anxiety.

**Create a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere.**

As Dornyei (2001) notes, language classrooms are “inherently face-threatening environments,” because students are expected to communicate using a “severely restricted language code” (p. 91). Therefore, creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere is clearly an important prerequisite to language learning success. Young (1990) also stresses that anxiety decreases when instructors “create a warm social environment” (p. 550), and she recommends teachers to make more use of communicative approaches (Young, 1991). Whereas the role of a teacher in the Audio-lingual Method is more like a drill sergeant, the teacher’s role in communicative approaches is to be more of a facilitator. Accordingly, a communicative approach that fosters a learner-centered learning environment will be helpful in reducing students’ anxiety. In addition, the result of Young’s (1990) survey of language learning university and high school students shows that the teachers who have “a good sense of humor” and were “friendly,” “relaxed” and “patient,” who “make students feel comfortable,” and who “encourage students to speak” are helpful in reducing language classroom anxiety (p. 549). Similarly, the result of Price’s (1991) interviews with highly anxious university students also shows that students “feel more comfortable if the instructors were more like a friend helping them to learn and less like an authority figure making them perform” (p. 107).

On the other hand, a sense of community among students is also contributory to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere. In her survey of university and high school students, Young (1990) finds that an atmosphere of cordiality, communality, and friendship among the students themselves appears to alleviate their anxiety. Samimi and Rardin (1994) also note that group solidarity among students helps lessen their emotional barriers, such as anxiety.
**Have students recognize their irrational beliefs or fears.**

Foss and Reitzel (1988) posit that if students can recognize irrational beliefs or fears, they will be able to interpret anxiety-provoking situations in more realistic ways and eventually will approach rather than avoid anxiety-evoking situations. For this, they recommend that the teachers ask students to verbalize any fear and then to write them on the board. In this way, students can see they are not alone in their anxiety. In addition, journal writing and use of an anxiety graph are recommended. Meanwhile, Horwitz (1988) points out that since the students’ unrealistic beliefs are often made with limited knowledge and/or experience, the most effective way to deal with students’ unrealistic beliefs about language learning is for teachers to confront and correct students with new information. She also suggests that teachers “discuss with their students reasonable commitments for successful language learning and the value of some language ability if it is less than fluent” (p. 286). To develop more realistic expectations, Price (1991) adds that it is important to let students know that “they weren’t supposed to be fluent or have a perfect accent after two semesters” (p. 107).

**Change classroom procedure.**

Classroom procedures, such as unfamiliar testing format, are one of the factors that provoke anxiety. It is important, therefore, to make classroom procedure less prone to anxiety. For this, Young (1999) suggests that the teachers have to make sure that the test accurately reflects the in-class instruction, and that the teacher has tested what has been taught within the context of how it was taught. Another useful classroom procedure to lessen language anxiety is to have students work in groups or do pair work. For instance, have students discuss answers with their peers before replying. Since the classroom is like a “public arena” (Long & Porter, 1985, p. 211), anxiety is often generated when a teacher makes it a practice to call individuals randomly in front of their peers. This can be a particularly anxiety-provoking situation, if the lesson will not proceed until the teacher receives a satisfactory response. In contrast, collaborative tasks, in which all parties provide certain information, not only create positive
interdependence between students alleviating competitive stress (Burden, 2004), but also reduce the anxiety caused by the fear of negative evaluation from others, because they do not single out individual students out (Donley, 1999).

In a similar line of reasoning, Ariza (2002) suggests an anxiety-alleviating strategy, drawing upon Curran’s (1976) Community Language Learning Approach (CLL). The CLL approach is unique in that the teacher assumes the role of counselor by creating a supportive environment for the student’s personal comfort. The counselor shows an understanding of the learner’s anxiety as well as empathy for the supposed emotional threat of a new language situation (Samimy & Rardin, 1994). As a result of using this approach, Ariza (2002) reports that her students “can conquer their fears of making a mistake, gain greater self-confidence, and bond with the teacher in a non-threatening classroom, thus promoting language acquisition” (p. 9).

Additionally, there are a variety of very specific suggestions. For instance, Donley’s (1997) suggestions to anxious students: 1) discuss your feelings with other students, 2) tell your instructor how you feel, 3) do something fun and relaxing, 4) eat healthful food and get enough rest and exercise, 5) make sure you’re prepared for class, 6) attend every class, 7) keep your foreign language class in perspective, 8) seek out opportunities to practice the foreign language, 9) remember that errors are a part of language learning, 10) develop your own standards and rewards for success. To teachers, Scarcella and Oxford (1992) suggest a number of ways to reduce anxiety in the classroom: 1) being aware of the possibility of learning anxiety, 2) being respectful towards students, such as learning their names quickly and correctly, 3) encouraging students to engage in positive self-talk (“I can do a good job on this test!”), 4) rewarding students for quality work performance and giving them greater choice in selecting activities, 5) having students alternately tense and relax major muscle groups or to engage students in quiet, visual meditation, 6) encouraging extracurricular student support groups, where students can share learning strategies and prepare for class projects or exams together, 7) allowing students
the opportunity to redo tests and assignments, rewrite papers, etc., 8) designating someone from the student's culture - a facilitator or a student who has been in the country a longer period of time - to serve as a friend and confidant for sharing concerns.

**Conclusion**

As reviewed previously, a great number of studies have been conducted to establish the existence of, and to identify the distinct characteristics of language anxiety as well as to examine the effects of anxiety on language learning and performance. Thanks to these researches, now we have come to possess a more comprehensive and detailed understanding about language anxiety. They have provided a strong scholarly foundation, from which the subsequent researchers greatly benefit in furthering our understanding of language anxiety. The present study is one that aims to do such a job. While appreciating the achievements of previous researches, this study will try to advance present understanding of language anxiety by filling one of the gaps that the previous researches appear to have left: language anxiety of young children (elementary school ESOL children).

With a main focus on young children, Korean elementary ESOL students in an American school setting, specifically, my study will try to find how young children cope with their second language anxiety, to discover any difference in their handling language anxiety between in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes, and to identify the roles of teachers in reducing the language anxiety of young children. To accomplish this purpose, this research will employ a qualitative case study approach, with which a close observation of relevant students in the natural setting is possible. A qualitative case study approach allows for a rich and vivid observation of the attitudes and behaviors of the participants, and the specific contexts in which they experience language anxiety, and try to deal with it. Therefore, this study can be the a fresh research effort to render a vivid and in-depth description of children’s language anxiety within its specific contexts, and to provide ample descriptive data bearing a cause-effect relationship between language anxiety and second language learning contexts, thereby explaining how it is developed.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As stated earlier, the research questions of this study are: 1) Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience? 2) What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience? 3) How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes? 4) What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies? 5) What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students? To discover the answers for these questions, this study employed qualitative method. More specifically, the methodology of this study is a qualitative case study, using observation and in-depth interviews of the participants. In the pages to follow, first of all, the site and participants of this research will be explained, and then the characteristics of qualitative research and case study will be addressed respectively, along with the rationale of selecting qualitative case study as the method of this research. Finally, the method of data collection and data analysis, employed in this study, will be elucidated with a discussion on the issues of validity and reliability of the data.

Site

The site of this research is an elementary school, kindergarten through fifth grades, in a medium-sized metropolitan area in Florida. There are 24 public elementary schools in this area, and the site of this research is one of the two schools that offers ESOL classes. The school is located in a predominantly white middle class area. Students at the research site appeared to be academically competitive. In the FCAT (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test) of 2004-05 school year, for instance, 89% of students at the research site scored 3 and above among five possible achievement
levels, ranging from Level 1 (lowest) to Level 5 (highest), in reading and math whereas the state wide averages were 53% and 59% respectively. Not only did the research site earn the top FCAT score in the school district and ranked above 20th in the State of Florida out of 1,650 elementary schools in 2005. Therefore, it appeared that teachers at the research site were very proud of their students as well as themselves for the academic accomplishments.

Class at the research site begins at 7:50 a.m. and ends at 2:10 p.m. Class subjects are language arts, math, social studies, science and special areas such as music, art and P. E. (Physical Education). These class subjects are same for every grade, and students learn these subjects every school day, but the three subjects of special areas rotate day by day. As for language arts, math, social studies and science, students are taught in their mainstream classrooms whereas for special areas they move to playground or other classrooms such as music room. Concerning five mainstream classrooms and the ESOL classroom, which were observed for this research, typically there are about 20 students in each mainstream class, and in the ESOL class the number of students differ depending on grade ranging from 5 to 12 students. Both classrooms are laid out in a circular pattern. Teacher’s workstation is located at the corner, but teachers usually move around the classroom to check students’ works. Student desks are arranged in groups with 5-6 students sitting together so that they can work together easily. This classroom layout is called the group type, which is typical of student-centered learning (Johnson & Johnson 1991). Unlike the row type, the group classroom layout provides an effective environment for collaborative learning, since students in groups are situated in close proximity to the other members of the group so they can share knowledge and materials without having to disrupt the other groups in the class (Johnson & Johnson 1991). Moreover, the classroom layout at the research site seems to render a diminishing effect on language anxiety since it could facilitate group work and thus promote a higher level of student-to-student interactions during class as well as their sense of camaraderie (Young, 1990; Samimy & Rardin, 1994).
The ESOL Class and Mainstream Classes in the Site School

The ESOL (English as Second or Other Language) is a program of English language, cultural instruction and academic support for students whose native language is not English. Generally speaking, the goals of the ESOL program are threefold: including enabling students 1) to learn all of their school subjects in English, 2) to succeed socially and academically in school, and 3) to meet state academic content standards (Florida Department of Education, 2005). To decide if the ESOL program is necessary, an English language proficiency test is given to students whose native language is other than English. The tests are nationally standardized and appropriate for a student’s age, grade, and approximate level of English. Therefore, the research site of this study is not different from other areas in the selection of ESOL students. When the children enter school, their parent or caregiver fills out a form that contains three questions in a Home Language Survey section. If it is answered that native language of child is not English, Florida state law requires the child to be tested for English proficiency within twenty days.

First, the child is given a listening/speaking test. If she or he is designated as non-English speaking or limited English speaking, she or he then qualifies for the ESOL program. If the child is tested as fluent English speaking, then she or he does not qualify for the ESOL program. But if the child is in 4th or 5th grade and graded as fluent English speaking, then it is required to give her or him a reading/writing test. At this point, if the child is determined to be a non-English reader/writer or limited English reader/writer, then she or he qualifies for the ESOL program. On the other hand, if the child is determined to be a competent English reader/writer, then she or he does not qualify for the ESOL program. Like the above, selecting ESOL students is a little complex, and can be summarized in figure 2. It is important to note here that the ESOL program is required for those children whose native language is not English and tested as necessary for it.
Yes on Home Language Survey

Listening/speaking test

Grade 1, 2 and 3

- LEP Speaker
- FEP Speaker

- ESOL
- No ESOL

Grade 4 and 5

- LEP Speaker
- FEP Speaker

- Reading/writing test

- FEP speaker and LEP Reader/Writer
- LEP Speaker and LEP Reader/Writer
- FEP Speaker and FEP Reading/Writing

- ESOL
- No ESOL

FEP: Fluent English Proficient

LEP: Limited English Proficient

Figure 2: Selection Process of ESOL students

In the ESOL program, students learn a variety of skills. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing in English, American culture, vocabulary and skills to master the same core subjects (math, science, social studies, and language arts) as other students in their mainstream classroom. The
ESOL program at the research site of this study (elementary school) is a pull-out program, meaning that the ESOL students are moved from their regular homeroom to a separate classroom, which at this school, is a portable designated as the ESOL classroom. Each ESOL student at the research site of this study stays in the ESOL class every day for one hour, while some ESOL programs at different schools keep the ESOL students shorter or longer than one hour, depending on the language proficiency or grade level of each student.

At the end of every semester, the ESOL students are given a standardized test to determine their progress. The ESOL team decides when students are ready to be exited from the ESOL program. The ESOL team generally consists of the parent/caregiver, the ESOL teacher, mainstream classroom teachers, and the guidance counselor. In some schools, an administrator, such as the principal or the vice principal has to be additionally involved in the team. An ESOL student is exited from the ESOL program, only when she or he has demonstrated that she/he is ready to be mainstreamed into the regular classroom full-time. At the research site of this study, most ESOL students stay in the ESOL program on average for two years. But since students progress at a different pace, some students exit out of the program in less than one year, and some students may take longer than two years. After exiting the ESOL program, she or he will be monitored for minimum of 2 years. If the student performs unsatisfactorily in mainstream classes, the ESOL team could decide to return her or him to the ESOL program.

Mainstream classes are English-medium classes that follow regular curriculums where all students are expected to have a level of English proficiency to successfully communicate with each other. To fit in mainstream classes, the ESOL students need to develop a degree of English proficiency necessary to compete on an equal footing with native speakers. Yet the ESOL students are usually placed in mainstream classes long before they achieve such a level of English proficiency. Therefore, the ESOL students often have a more difficult task than English proficient students in that they simultaneously face not only cognitive tasks but also linguistic challenges. This double burden of the ESOL students is aggravated especially if their teachers are not sensitive to this aspect (Carrasquillo
At the research site of this study, there are twenty ESOL students, including five Korean students, the participants of this study, all of whom are placed in mainstream classes. As will be revealed later, the sensitivity level of mainstream teachers can be one of the important factors in determining the language anxiety of ESOL students.

**Pilot Study**

This research actually began 2 years ago, when I conducted two qualitative studies with observation and interviews, and notably on the topic closely related to this research: “A story of a Korean girl in an American elementary school” (2003) and “How do Korean ESOL students cope with their language anxiety in the English as a second or other language (ESOL) classroom?” (2004). The first study chiefly intended to come across the school life of Korean ESOL students. For two months, I observed a Korean ESOL student in the ESOL class as well as mainstream classes. She was in the 3rd grade of elementary school, the same site of this research. Along with the observation, I also interviewed informally and formally her, her mother, and her ESOL and mainstream teacher. Among the findings of this study, what drew my attention the most is that she was slower to learn English than had been expected, mainly because she lacked confidence and was full of anxiety. There was another Korean girl who even threw up whenever she arrived at school for the first whole month due to English language anxiety. My participant was just a normal kid, neither too shy nor overactive. Her parents were very supportive of her both in academic and in other matters. She had a number of Korean friends to keep her busy, and she even made two American friends in her mainstream classes. She was enthusiastic and active in the PE class. But she just remained silent in the ESOL class as well as in mainstream classes, where English was the main medium of communication. One thing clear in my findings was that she was anxious about learning English, and this language anxiety was one of key difficulties in her learning English. After this study, I became interested in language anxiety.

Since I came to understand the role of anxiety in learning, in the second study I specifically
focused on language anxiety, and addressed a topic similar to but narrower than this research. For two months I observed and interviewed three Korean ESOL students to find out how they coped with their language anxiety in the ESOL classroom. The major coping strategies that I found in this case were avoidance, helping each other in the class, speaking in their native language. These two previous studies formed the basis of this research not only by highlighting the importance of language anxiety, especially for Korean children, and but also by providing the guidance to improve the research plan regarding the contents of data and the procedure to be followed in this research. On the other hand, some findings in my previous studies will be refined in this research. For example, the operational definition of the concept of language anxiety has been notably improved in this research, as will be explained later, by applying Ehrman’s (1996) categorization and specifications.

Research Approach

Characteristics of Qualitative Research

It is difficult to find an unambiguous definition of qualitative research. The definitions have been quite diverse. Broadly speaking, as Strauss and Corbin (1990) note, qualitative research includes “any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (p. 17). Meanwhile, Glesne and Peshkin’s (1992) state: “Qualitative inquiry is an umbrella term for various philosophical orientations to interpretive research. For example, qualitative researchers might call their work ethnography, case study, phenomenology, educational criticism, or several other terms” (p. 9).

Despite this ambiguity, it can be said that qualitative research has been used largely to identify the presence or absence of something and to determine the nature of distinguishing features in contrast to quantitative research, which is mainly concerned with measurement (Watson-Gegeo, 1995). Simply put, as Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) point out, quantitative research deals primarily with numbers, whereas qualitative research involves words. More specifically, qualitative research contains several characteristics that differentiate it from quantitative research. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) present five distinctive characteristics of
qualitative research. (p. 431-433).

1) Qualitative research employs the natural setting as the source of data. The researchers attempt to observe, describe and interpret settings as they are, while maintaining what Patton calls an “empathic neutrality” (1990, p. 55). The qualitative researchers go directly to the particular setting of interest in which they observe and collect their data, as Bogdan and Biklen (1998) point out, because they feel that human behaviors can be best understood in the actual settings in which they occur.

2) Qualitative data is collected in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. Therefore, the data collected can include field notes, interview transcripts, official records, personal comments, and anything else that reflects the actual behaviors of subjects. In addition, to maintain the richness of the collected data, qualitative researchers usually do not attempt to reduce their data to numerical symbols.

3) Qualitative researchers are interested in process as well as product. Thus, their research typically contains highly detailed rich descriptions of how things occur: for instance, how people interact with each other, how people’s beliefs and attitudes are translated into certain actions, how language anxiety affects learning. With these kinds of questions, qualitative researchers are concerned with the influence of context and the dynamic process of human behaviors.

4) Qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively. They do not usually search out data to support or reject the hypotheses formulated beforehand, as quantitative researchers normally do. In other words, “qualitative researchers are not putting together a puzzle whose picture they already know. They are constructing a picture that takes shape, as they collect and examine the parts” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 432). In qualitative research, therefore, theory usually emerges from the bottom up through interconnecting many disparate pieces of collected evidences (Hwang, 2003).

5) Qualitative researchers’ major concern is how people make sense out of their lives.
They want to know the assumptions, motives, goals, and values that the participants in a study have or share. The emphasis in qualitative research is put on entering into the conceptual world of the participants in a study. Stated differently, qualitative researchers are expected to do their best to capture the thinking of their participants from the participants’ perspectives as accurately as possible. Qualitative researchers challenge the concept of an objective reality. For them, rather, reality is constructed differently by different groups of people, and consequently different interpretations of a given experience are possible.

In the field of language anxiety, it should be pointed out that a majority of research studies have employed quantitative methods using quantified scales such as Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope’s (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale or the French Class Anxiety Scale (Gardner & Smythe, 1975; Gardner, 1985). While this quantitative research have produced significant contributions to understanding correlational effects between language anxiety and performance, qualitative methods of analysis can also offer insights into language learners’ anxiety that may often be undetected in quantitative approaches (Pappamihiel, 1999; Young, 1994). Fortunately, the benefits of qualitative methods have been increasingly acknowledged, and recent research studies have started to take advantage of qualitative research that analyzes the students’ perspectives of language anxiety in learning (e.g., Ehrman, 1996; Ariza, 2002,). Since investigations involving young children are still new, the selection of a qualitative method design in this study would be more contributory to the literature of language anxiety than simply replicating what has been the leading method in the literature.

**Characteristics of a Case Study**

There are a variety of approaches to qualitative research. Case studies are one form of qualitative research, and thus case studies are often discussed within the context of qualitative research and naturalistic inquiry. Many scholars have tried to offer an unambiguous definition of a case study itself. As Lincoln and Guba (as cited in Bassy, 1999, p. 22) note, there seems to be little agreement about what a case study is, even though the literature is replete with references
to case studies and with examples of case study reports. If the representative definitions are chosen, among them, Johnson (1992) characterizes a case study as the collection and presentation of detailed information about a particular participant, a setting or a particular event as it exists in its naturally occurring environment. On the other hand, Yin (as cited in Bassy, 1999, p. 26) explains case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” Case studies are frequently connected interchangeably to ethnography, field study, and participant observation. These forms of qualitative research all share the underlying philosophical assumptions of qualitative research in that they take place in a natural setting (such as a classroom, factory, neighborhood, or private home), and seek for a more holistic interpretation of the event or situation under study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

The strengths of case study are, as Merriam (1998) explains, that it offers “a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon” (p. 40). Case studies are typically done in real-life situations, resulting in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon, a process that offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers’ experiences. Accordingly, case studies are the preferred method when the researcher seeks as comprehensive an understanding of an event or situation as possible. In a case study, this kind of comprehensive understanding is possible through an in-depth examination of the case being studied, the contexts under which it is situated, the characteristics of the participants involved in it, and the nature of the community to which they belong. As such, a case study can provide rich information, render a careful and holistic account, and allow researchers “to describe the case in its context” (Johnson, 1992, p. 76). As Merriam (1998) points out, however, there are general limitations of qualitative case

---

7 Yet, it is important to note that case studies can be qualitative and quantitative as well. The research design would be decided depending on the research questions or what the researcher wants to find out. For example, if a researcher needs information about the phenomenon rather than statistical probabilities in the tightly controlled conditions, an experimental design is the proper one. However, if depth description of the phenomenon in the context is needed, then qualitative design should be used.
studies: 1) the product may be too lengthy and too detailed, 2) case studies can oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state, and 3) the investigator is left to rely only on his own instinct and abilities. At this point, yet, it is necessary to emphasize that a method to use in a particular research is not chosen by weighing the inherent advantages and disadvantages of qualitative or quantitative approach, but by selecting the one method that will be the most effective according to the research questions to be examined and the purposes driving the particular research (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

**Rationale of Case Study Approach for This Study**

In view of research questions and purposes presented previously, a qualitative case study approach was chosen for this study. Because language anxiety includes psychological, social, and affective aspects of the second language learning process, a close observation of relevant students in the natural setting is necessary. Asking related people in-depth questions can provide understanding of which factors actually lead the students to feeling of anxiety, and can help uncover how students cope with anxiety, and in which environments or circumstances they feel less anxiety. Because language anxiety varies in degree as well as in nature, depending on differing contexts that bind personal, interpersonal and cultural factors together, the interpretation of gathered data cannot be accurate without knowing the background of the learners’ situation. Therefore, this study will employ a qualitative case study approach that allows for a rich and vivid observation of the attitudes and behaviors of the participants, and the specific contexts in which they experience language anxiety and attempt to deal with it. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) explain the appropriateness of a qualitative case study approach in studying very similar questions that the present study will examine:

> Sometimes much can be learned from studying just one individual, one classroom, one school, or one school district. For example, there are some students who learn a second language rather easily. In hopes of gaining insight into why this is the case, one such
student could be observed on a regular basis to see if there are any noticeable patterns or regularities in the student’s behavior. The student, as well as his or her teachers, counselors, parents, and friends, might also be interviewed in depth. A similar series of observations (and interviews) might be conducted with a student who finds learning another language very difficult. As much information as possible (study style, attitudes toward the language, approach to the subject, behavior in class, and so on) would be collected. The hope here is that through the study of a somewhat unique individual, insights can be gained that will suggest ways to help other language students in the future. (p. 439)

Like the quoted situation, the particularity of the present study is each single scene in which the students express their feelings verbally or nonverbally in the class as well as during interviews. It is a case study approach that will allow the researcher to carefully observe how students react and cope with their anxiety in the particular setting of the ESOL classroom and the mainstream classroom, and to give the subjects an opportunity to express and explain their feelings through in-depth interviews. Considering these points, it would not be difficult to see that a case study approach is the proper research method to the present study. In light of Yin’s (2003) typology of case study, moreover, it can be said that the present study is a descriptive case study focusing on a single case, for its major part is the in-depth description of what is happening in the ESOL and mainstream classes with a central attention given to language anxiety of the participants.  

**Participants**

The participants were five Korean ESOL students in the site school. They were all

---

8 Yin (2003) divides case studies into six types, based on a 2 X 3 matrix. First, there are single case and multiple case studies. The former focuses on a single case only, while the latter has two or more cases with the same study. Irrespective of whether single or multiple, the case study can be also categorized into three types: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory. The goal of an exploratory case study is to define the questions and hypotheses of subsequent study or to determine the feasibility of the desired research procedures. The descriptive case study aims to offer a complete description of a phenomenon within its context. The purpose of an explanatory case study is to provide data bearing a cause-effect relationship, thereby explaining how events occurred.
Korean ESOL students available in the site school. Like other ESOL students, they were pulled out from the mainstream classroom to spend one hour per day in the ESOL class with the ESOL teacher who could not speak any Korean. Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants. They had come from Korea and had been in the United States for four months to eleven months. The socioeconomic status of their family is middle class in Korea, and their fathers are highly educated, either being visiting scholars or graduate students in an American university. It appeared to the researcher that the families of the participants were very supportive for education. Since elementary students in Korea usually start to learn English at school from the third grade, the participants above the third grade had experience learning English at school when they were in Korea. In addition, they also learned English in cram school such as private language institute before coming to the US. Here, it is important to note that all identities of participants in this study are made confidential by the use of pseudonyms.

Teachers involved in this study were the ESOL teacher as well as mainstream teachers of the participating students. The in-depth interviews with them provided helpful insights in addressing the research questions of this study. Their involvement in this research was especially critical in discovering the answers for research question 5: What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students? As can be seen in Table 2, each teacher had one participant in her class except for the ESOL teacher who had all participants in her ESOL class. It is noticeable that all but one had formal training in ESOL education as well as experience with ESOL students. Generally speaking, ESOL teacher and the mainstream teachers alike in the school of the research site seemed to understand the ESOL students’ difficulty related to language anxiety, and to have tried to provide the ESOL students with special academic and emotional support in a variety of ways. As will be detailed later, nevertheless, there was one case that differed from this general characterization. Like the participants, all identities of teachers shown in Table 2 are pseudonyms used for their confidentiality.
Table 1: Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hannah</th>
<th>Eugene</th>
<th>Jay</th>
<th>Anna</th>
<th>Sunny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td>6Y 9M</td>
<td>7Y 0M</td>
<td>8Y 11M</td>
<td>10Y 2M</td>
<td>11Y 5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in the US*</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>11M</td>
<td>11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling in Korea</td>
<td>1st grade: attended one semester</td>
<td>1st grade: attended one semester</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of learning English in Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 in cram school and one semester at school</td>
<td>6 in cram school and one semester at school</td>
<td>7 in cram school and one semester at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Meticulous</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family situation</td>
<td>-Middle class -Father: visiting scholar -Supportive for education</td>
<td>-Middle class -Father: graduate student -Supportive for education</td>
<td>-Middle class -Father: graduate student -Supportive for education</td>
<td>-Middle class -Father: visiting scholar -Supportive for education</td>
<td>-Middle class -Father: visiting scholar -Supportive for education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y and M indicates years and months respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mrs. Smith</th>
<th>Mrs. Baker</th>
<th>Mrs. Parker</th>
<th>Mrs. Debb</th>
<th>Mrs. Frank</th>
<th>Mrs. Anders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant in the class</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Sunny</td>
<td>All: ESOL teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>First year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL training</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60 hours in summer</td>
<td>120 hours in summer</td>
<td>20 hours in summer</td>
<td>60 hours in summer</td>
<td>ESOL classes at college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience with ESOL students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>More than 2</td>
<td>1 semester during internship at the site of this study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward ESOL students</td>
<td>Little understanding ESOL students’ being anxious</td>
<td>Understanding them from having difficulties in learning French</td>
<td>Understanding their frustration and asking to other students being helpful to ESOL students</td>
<td>Understanding them from having difficulties in learning Spanish</td>
<td>Admiring her ESOL students and their families being supportive</td>
<td>Very understanding and supportive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

Data Collection Instruments

To determine participants’ level of English proficiency and language anxiety, two kinds of tests were administered to them during the first week of observation: the PPVT (Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test) and the ELAS (English Language Anxiety Scale).

English proficiency level of the participants: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

The first data collection instrument is. During the first week of observation, the participants were given the PPVT to identify their level of English language proficiency. The PPVT is an individually administered and norm-referenced test usually conducted as a test of listening comprehension for the spoken word in standard English (Dunn & Dunn, 1997). The PPVT is available in several forms, and administered to the participants of this study was its third edition that contains 4 training items followed by 204 test items arranged in order of increasing difficulty. Each item has four simple, black-and-white illustrations arranged in a multiple-choice format. The task of the participants is to select the picture they consider to best illustrate the meaning of a stimulus word presented orally by the researcher. The test is designed for persons 2.5 through 40 years of age and standardized nationally on a sample of 5,028 persons. Raw scores are usually converted to age-referenced and percentile rank. The PPVT has been frequently used as a scholastic aptitude test, since vocabulary is a strong predictor of school success. It has been also found that the PPVT is reliable and valid in providing accurate measure of English language proficiency (Piotrowski & Keller, 1989; Wright, Huston, Reitz & Piemyat, 1994).

Table 3 displays the results of the PPVT administered to the participants of this study, indicating the participants’ level of English proficiency in relation to native English speaking peers. First, raw scores range from 27 to 104, showing an upward tendency along with chronological age. This result is not surprising since obviously the older ones, who already have learned English in Korea, can be expected to perform better than the younger, and thus have a
higher score. To allow for comparisons of scores to be made across age, therefore, raw scores need to be converted to standard scores\(^9\), and based on these standard scores, national percentile ranks, and age-equivalent are calculated for further comparisons.

Table 3: The result of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hannah</th>
<th>Eugene</th>
<th>Jay</th>
<th>Anna</th>
<th>Sunny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in the US*</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>11M</td>
<td>11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Age*</td>
<td>6Y 9M</td>
<td>7Y 0M</td>
<td>8Y 11M</td>
<td>10Y 2M</td>
<td>11Y 5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Score</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile Rank</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Equivalent*</td>
<td>2Y 1M</td>
<td>2Y 0M</td>
<td>3Y 10M</td>
<td>6Y 0M</td>
<td>7Y 10M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y and M indicates years and months respectively.

As can be seen in Table 3, all of the participant students show a very low performance level across the measures. Their standard scores are between 49 and 77. This range indicates low levels of English proficiency, considering that the mean of standard score is 100 and standard deviation 15. Except for one participant, all of them are 2 standard deviations away from the mean. This also can be seen in national percentile ranks as well as age-equivalent scores. On the basis of these results, it can be said that they had not yet achieved the degree of English proficiency necessary to compete on an equal footing with native speakers in mainstream classes. For this reason, if a lower level of English proficiency is one of the significant factors

---

\(^9\) Standard scores are developed based on the distribution of scores obtained by some defined sample of individuals (called the norm sample). In the norm sample, standard scores are assigned so that the mean of the standard scores is 100 with the standard deviation of 15 for all age groupings. This standardization was done by 2 month age groups.
provoking language anxiety, there will be a difference in the level of language anxiety between the ESOL class and the mainstream classes.

In view of these results, the participants of this study may be considered an atypical group representing the lower end of general ESOL students in their level of English proficiency. However, it appears that this is not the case. Existing research (Klesmer: 1994) provides notable evidence suggesting that the participants of this study are not greatly different from other ESOL students in terms of English proficiency. In other words, the English proficiency gap between the ESOL students in general and the native English speaking students is as wide as seen in the result of the PPVT administered to the participants of this study.

Klesmer (1994) presents data from a study of 12 year-old ESOL students in metropolitan Toronto. In the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, 12-year-old ESOL students who had lived in Canada for 6-11 months, have on average scored age-equivalent of approximately 4 years and 6 months old native speakers of English. This result indicates that their national percentile rank is below the 1st percentile of native speakers of the same age group. In the case of those ESOL students who had studied in an English-speaking school environment for 12 to 17 months, their scores are still below the 1st percentile of native English speaking peers, and their average age-equivalent is about that of a five year old native English speakers. In addition, Klesmer’s (1994) finding suggests that only those ESOL students who had had 60 to 71 months of English (five to six years) reached native speaker age norms on these measures of English.

A similar result can also be found among studies on adult ESOL students. For example, Porter, Comings, and Cuban (2005) sampled 242 adult ESOL students (on average aged 37.3 years) from five of the ESOL programs in the New York public library system and administered them the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. The result showed that the average score is the age-level equivalent of 10.4 years, translated into approximately the 5th grade of native speakers. In light of the English proficiency levels of other ESOL students shown previously, it appears that the participants of this study are not an atypical case of ESOL students in general.
**English language anxiety level of the participants: English Language Anxiety Scale**

The second data collection instrument is the Korean version of the English Language Anxiety Scale (Appendix B). The Korean Version of the ELAS is a Korean translation of Pappamihiel’s (2002) the English Language Anxiety Scale (Appendix A). Originally the ELAS is adapted from Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope’s (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). It is a 20-item questionnaire with individual items being rated on a 5 point Likert scale. Though there are many similarities between foreign language learners and ESOL learners, and the FLCAS and the ELAS are related, Pappamihiel (2002) amended and adapted the FLCAS for use with ESOL students. The adaptations included alterations, the addition of several items, and the addition of a Spanish translation of the instrument. First, the ELAS was translated into Korean by a bilingual individual of English and Korean. Second, the translated Korean ELAS was back translated into English by another bilingual individual. Then, they were compared to see whether the original translation was appropriate for this study, and based on this comparison, the final version was adopted. It should be noted that the final version was also made with careful choice of vocabulary understandable and appropriate for young participants of this study. These steps were taken not only to provide an accurate translation but also to provide and understandable translation for Korean children. Reading the Korean version of the ELAS would not pose any problems to Korean first graders, since it is almost certain that they have already gained literacy in Korean. In a survey of when Korean children begin to learn Korean characters (reading and writing), for instance, 52.2% begin at the age of 2, 32.9% at the age of 3, 9.9% at the age of 4, which means that 95% of Korean children start to learn Korean characters before advancing to first grade (Cho, 2003). As expected, the first grader participants of this study had no problem reading the ELAS.

With regard to specific contents of the ELAS, it is constructed on the basis of the Likert-scale, a method used to measure attitudes, which involves respondents indicating their degree of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements, where 1 indicates ‘strongly agree,’ and 5
indicates 'strongly disagree.' Twenty questionnaire items in the ELAS are evenly divided into two groups of 10 items, each question respectively concerned with ESOL class and mainstream classes. For example, an item in one group asks, “In ESOL classes, I start to panic when I have to speak in English without preparation?” a corresponding item in the other group asks, “In regular classes, I start to panic when I have to speak in English without preparation? This dichotomy of questionnaire items is designed to allow for addressing research question 1 of this study: “Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?”

In the ELAS, the participants were asked to express agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale of a series of questionnaire items designed to measure language anxiety. Each degree of agreement was given a numerical value from two to ten: 2 (strongly agree), 4 (agree), 6 (neutral), 8 (disagree) and 10 (strongly disagree). Then, a total numerical value of each student’s response was calculated from all the questionnaire items and then summed up to give a composite measure of language anxiety displayed by each student. Since there are two groups of 10 questionnaire items, each being respectively concerned with ESOL class and mainstream classes, therefore, the minimum score for the ESOL class and mainstream classes respectively is 20, indicating the most anxious, while the maximum score, 100, signifying the least anxious. Here, it should be kept in mind that the Korean version of the ELAS used in this study follows its original version in scaling numerical values of responses, and thus a lower score in composite measure of participants’ responses denotes a higher level of language anxiety.

Table 4 shows language anxiety levels displayed by the participants of this study. Language anxiety scores in the ESOL class range from 28 to 90 with the mean of 61.6, while in the mainstream classes they vary from 20 to 84 with the mean of 52.8. Though modest, as seen in Table 4, all participants of this study show one important pattern relevant to the first research question: to them, the ESOL class is less anxiety provoking than mainstream classes. Although a significance test was not applied to it due to the very limited number of cases, it can be said that there is a modest but
Table 4: The result of the English Language Anxiety Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hannah</th>
<th>Eugene</th>
<th>Jay</th>
<th>Anna</th>
<th>Sunny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Age*</td>
<td>6Y 9M</td>
<td>7Y 0M</td>
<td>8Y 11M</td>
<td>10Y 2M</td>
<td>11Y 5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in the US*</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>4M</td>
<td>11M</td>
<td>11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL Scores**</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Scores**</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y and M indicates years and months respectively.

**Higher score denotes higher level of language anxiety.

consistent difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of language anxiety, and in Eugene’s case, the difference is relatively large. As will be detailed later, this difference is manifested regardless of their individual level of language anxiety, suggesting the possibility that even students with a low level of language anxiety in the ESOL class could become anxious when they move from the ESOL class to mainstream classes.

With regard to the language anxiety of participants in this study as compared to those of other ESOL students in general, it is hard to come up with a clear picture, since there has been no previous study to apply the ELAS to elementary ESOL students. The closest one would be the study conducted on Mexican-born middle school ESOL students (Pappamihiel, 2002). She administers the ELAS to 178 Mexican-born middle school ESOL students, and the result is similar to that of this study, showing that mainstream classes are more anxiety provoking than the ESOL class.

**Procedures**

Broadly speaking, there are three techniques for collecting qualitative data: observation, interview, and document review (Best & Kahan, 2005). In this study, observation and interview were employed. First, the participants were observed in their ESOL and mainstream classrooms for a period of five weeks. Informal interviews were conducted as frequently as possible in order to acquire additional information useful in checking the accuracy of the impressions.
obtained during the observation period. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted at
the beginning of observation with a fewer questions and at the end of the observation period
with more detailed questions. Along with these student participants, their teachers were also
interviewed in the same manner. Field notes were written during and immediately after each
observation, as suggested by Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995). The field notes were also made
on informal interviews, since they were not tape-recorded. The interviews were conducted in
native languages, Korean in the case of the student participants and English for the teachers. All
semi-structured interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed.

Observation

The purpose of observation is to collect the qualitative data that are helpful in answering the
research questions of this study - detailed notations of behaviors, events and contexts related to
language anxiety. As explained before in the discussion of the merits of qualitative research,
observation has several advantages in such a task (Patton, 1980): 1) make a better understanding of
the context (the particular setting of the ESOL classroom and the mainstream classroom), within
which students react and cope with their language anxiety; 2) allow for inductive approach,
thereby making it less dependent on prior conceptualization; 3) offer an opportunity to gain
information on sensitive topics, such as interpersonal competition among certain students, that
they may not be willing to talk about in an interview; 4) provide the resources otherwise
unattainable - observer’s impression, feeling, reflection and introspection. These can be part of
meaningful data to allow for understanding and interpreting the events and behaviors with a
holistic perspective.

Basically, there are two kinds of observational strategies open to this study: participant and
non-participant observation (Patton, 1980). The participant observation involves when the researcher
takes part in the situation being studied, rather than simply acting as a neutral and unobtrusive
observer (Lancy, 2001). In participant observation, the researcher is fully engaged in experiencing the
situation under study, and may be required to work with the members of the group or community
under study for an extended period of time. On the other hand, the non-participant observation occurs when the researcher does not take part in the situation being studied, but may well be present in the environment (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). In non-participant observation, the researcher attempts to observe people without interacting with them and often without their knowledge that they are being observed.

Yet, it should be noted that the distinction between participant and non-participant observation is not as clear-cut as it may seem, for there is a great deal of variation along the continuum between these two extremes: at one extreme is the participant observer who becomes fully absorbed in the group under study, and at the other is the non-participant who remains completely detached from it (Patton, 1980; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In view of this, the choice of observational strategy in this study would not be simply either one or the other, but somewhere in the continuum between these two extreme poles. However, this study adopted an observational strategy much closer to non-participant observation than participant observation. In other words, while assuming to take the role of participant observer, when necessary, such as being directly asked questions by students, the researcher of this study still tried to put the major focus on recording behaviors at a distance, that is, a researcher sitting in a classroom, making observations of students and their teachers.

There are two main reasons for the choice of such an observational strategy in this study. First, as Patton (1980) points out, the extent to which a researcher can be a participant observer depends on the nature of the program under investigation. In the case of human service and education programs that serve children, for an obvious reason, it is difficult for the researcher to become a student and therefore experience the program as a child. Likewise, the nature of the program (elementary school classes) and affective experience (children’s language anxiety) under investigation in this study inherently limits the scope of participant observation that can be conducted by an adult, such as the researcher of this study. Secondly, it is highly possible that participant role would simply take too much attention as compared to the observer role (Yin, 1984). As a result, the researcher may not be able to work as a careful observer; not missing an opportunity to capture the behaviors and events that
otherwise would usually escape his or her conscious awareness. In this light, this study employed an observational strategy much closer to non-participant observation than participant observation.

Specifically, the observation of this study was made in natural settings in the school of the participants with the researcher shadowing the participants from Monday to Friday during school hours over a five-week period. Each day, on average, the five-hour observation was conducted including the ESOL class that lasted for one hour for each grade. The rest of observation was on the mainstream classes of participants. The researcher shadowed each participant for three days and for two days, observation was focused only on the ESOL class. These consisted of 17 observation days with the duration of 86 hours - 25 hours for ESOL classes and 61 hours for mainstream classes. During the observation, the researcher recorded what was heard and seen as well as noted ideas, reflections, impressions and hunches that emerged. As such, the field notes contained two kinds of materials: descriptive and reflective. The former is an objective record of the details of what had occurred during the observation. The latter is more a personal account of events or what Bogdan and Biklen (1992) characterize as ‘a personal log’ (p. 107). Therefore, the descriptive parts of the field notes provided the data necessary to address the research questions, such as specific actions that participants had taken or not taken to cope with language anxiety. On the other hand, the reflective parts rendered a kind of think pieces that helped not only clarify patterns that might be present or connections between pieces of data, but also to keep on track and remain self-conscious of the development of this research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

**Scope of observation.**

Even through a very attentive observation, it is hardly possible to capture everything happening in the classroom. Therefore, it is necessary to focus on certain kinds of activities and events that provide the particular information and insights helpful for answering the research questions of this study. This strategy not only helps sensitize the observer to certain kinds of events, activities and behaviors relevant to the purpose of this study, but also makes the observation work manageable (Patton, 1987). Conforming to this strategy, the focus of the observation (i.e., what to
observe) in this study was made on the following elements, as suggested by Merriam (1998):

1) The physical setting: A close observation on physical environment (e.g., classroom layout) is indispensable in this study, since it can affect students’ feelings and behaviors. For instance, a particular classroom layout facilitating group work, can promote a higher level of student-to-student interactions during class and thus their sense of camaraderie, which has been found to render a diminishing effect on language anxiety (Young, 1990; Samimy & Rardin, 1994)).

2) The participants: This element of observation will identify who are in the classroom, that is, demographic characteristics of participants, including not only main participants but also their classmates and teachers. It is important to understand the demographic characteristics of all participants, for they may yield useful clues to appreciating the mechanism of language anxiety, which is otherwise difficult to grasp. For example, Pappamihiel (2002) finds that Mexico-born ESOL students are often at odds with Chicanos (born in the US and of Mexican descent) in mainstream classes, even though they are similar in language and culture. According to her, the Chicano students make fun of Mexico-born ESOL students (e.g., teasing their English), often leading to the conflicts and tensions between the two groups, and this strained relationship “appear to have contributed to the kinds of anxiety experienced by Mexican students in mainstream classrooms” (p. 345). Likewise, my participant could face the similar situation with US-born Korean descent classmates or Korea-born but fluent English speaking classmates in mainstream classes. And if so, whether the same mechanism works or not would be one of noteworthy issues to address in this study.

3) Activities and interaction: The observation was made on specific activities and behaviors of all participants relevant to language anxiety, such as the competitiveness, level and types of interactions, sequence of activities. For example, I tried to find out the pattern of teacher’s manner of error correction, and to see whether or not student’s making a mistake in English is followed by giggling or lending a hand.

4) Conversation: The content of conversations among students as well as with teachers was noted. Their conversations were directly quoted, paraphrased or summarized in the field notes, as
needed to answer the research questions. In addition, I also noted silence and nonverbal behaviors, such as avoidance and withdrawal that have important bearing of language anxiety.

5) Subtle factors: I looked for less obvious but relevant behaviors to language anxiety that contain symbolic and connotative meanings such as biting nails, making face, sweating, gazing, the way of raising hand, etc. More importantly, I was equally attentive to ‘what does not happen,’ in other words, “absence of occurrence” (Patton, 1987; p. 91). In observation, for example, I found that my participant is in a particular mainstream class where all classmates were Americans. This was what I observed. Then, the observation of what did not happen in this case was that there is no ESOL classmate. The latter observation was as important as the former to make here, because learning with peers, like an ESOL classmate, could make him relatively comfortable, which can lead to reducing his language anxiety (Young, 1990).

6) My own behaviors: Merriam (1998) points out that the thoughts, comments, roles of the observer are as important as those of participants, since like the latter, the former also affect what is being observed. Put differently, the observation is not merely a close look on the scene with perfect neutrality, but necessarily involves a cognitive process that cannot totally exclude subjectivity of the observer (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Therefore, what the observer is thinking about what is going on in observation is necessary to be noted, for it can be used later to have as wide a perspective as possible in deciphering the sequences and patterns of events and activities recorded in the fieldnotes.

**Interviews**

The second method in this study was interview, a method that elicits information and data by directly asking questions of participants. In this study, interview has mainly two goals: 1) to find out those things that the researcher cannot directly observe, and 2) to enter participants’ world by understanding what they think or how they feel about things relevant to the issues under investigation. The first goal is pursued, because we cannot observe everything (for an example, the behaviors and events that took place when the researcher was not present). On the other hand, the second goal is sought, because it adds an inner perspective to outward behaviors and events, thereby allowing the
researcher to gain a holistic understanding of participants’ feelings, thoughts and intentions behind the observed behaviors and events (Patton, 1987). In this way, the interview is expected to provide this study not only with ‘more’ data but also with the ‘better’ data that have deeper meaning and elaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Structured</th>
<th>Semi-structured</th>
<th>Unstructured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Standardized/Formal)</em></td>
<td><em>(Informal)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Interview Structure Continuum](image)

*wording of questions* predetermined
*order of questions* predetermined
*oral form of a survey*

*mix of more- and less-structured question*

*open-ended questions*
*flexible, exploratory*
*more like a conversation*


Figure 3: Interview Structure Continuum

Interviews most often used in qualitative research can be divided into three types: 1) informal (unstructured), 2) semi-structured, and 3) formal (highly structured or standardized) interview (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Merriam, 1998). These types of interview are distinguished by the amount of structure involved. Figure 3 shows the interview structure continuum, and as mentioned earlier, the kinds of interview employed in this study were informal and in-depth interview. As it is, the informal interviews of this study do not have any predetermined question topics or sequence of questions or any particular forms of questioning. Questions would come forward from the immediate context as the conversation unfolds, and would be asked in the natural course of conversation.
Although informal interview is prone to produce less systematic and comprehensive data, it allows the researcher to be responsive to individual differences of participants and to enhance the salience and relevance of questions (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003).

The second type of interview used in this study was a semi-structured interview, which is halfway between the ends of the continuum in Figure 3. The semi-structured interview has a fairly open framework, thereby allowing a great deal of flexibility in the kind of information that interviewees choose to give (Patton, 1990). In other words, unlike formal (standardized) interview, where detailed questions are prepared in advance, semi-structured interview has the questionnaire framework that starts with more general questions or topics. As such, semi-structured interview is formulated ahead of time only in the sense that some form of interview guide is prepared beforehand and provides a framework for the interview. Similarly, a large part of questions in semi-structured interview are not formulated and phrased in advance, but created during the interview, enabling both the interviewer and the interviewees the flexibility to probe for details or discuss issues. This facilitates gaining the information the interviewer needs without overly influencing the participants' responses. This flexibility during the interview is important in qualitative research because it allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand while bringing up information that the researcher might not anticipate, potentially shedding a whole new insight onto a problem (Merriam, 1998; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). In summary, semi-structured interview can be characterized as a relatively guided and relaxed discussion based around a predetermined topic.

For this study, the semi-structured interview was conducted at the beginning of observation with a fewer questions and at the end of the observation period with more detailed questions. Along with the participants, their teachers and caregivers were also interviewed after observations are done. To make the interview like a guided conversation, broad questions were asked so as not to constrain the conversation. As the semi-structured interview, moreover, the set of questions had been prepared in advance, but they were open enough to allow the interviewees to express their thoughts, feelings, or opinions freely throughout the interview. And questions were generally simple with a logical sequence.
to help the interview move naturally. For an example, first, a broad question was asked such as “How was speaking English in mainstream classes?” If the answer to the above question is “difficult,” then, new questions came forward as a result of the answer, such as “Why is that so?” or “How about speaking in the ESOL class?” Table 5 to 7 show a brief sketch of interview questions prepared for this study. The complete set of interview questions had not been formulated in advance, since many of relevant interview questions emerged during observation. They were formulated fully as observation showed issues, behaviors, events and so on that formed the basis of interview questions. The language used in interviews with participants and their caregivers was Korean, and interviews with the ESOL and mainstream teachers were conducted in English. Since the researcher conducted interviews with the participants in Korean, our native language, it was possible for the researcher to catch the linguistic nuances and cultural connotations behind their overt expressions. It appeared that our use of native language in interviews has compensated the difficulties often arouse by the interviewees being too young to express themselves clearly.

With regard to interview settings with the participants, first of all, the interview site was the students’ house, because their homes was expected to be the most familiar place to them and thus they would feel most comfortable there. The interview was conducted after classes or during weekends as convenient for the participants. The length of the interview was limited to 30 minutes, considering the research result (Graue & Walsh, 1998) that around a 20-minute is interview length appealing to children. As for teachers, they were interviewed in their own classrooms after school or during the teacher’s preparation period. The teachers interviewed were the ESOL teacher and the mainstream teachers of student participants. Since there were a number of occasions for informal interviews with students and teachers during observation, it was planned that this semi-structured interview would be held once for each teacher. However, when necessary and agreed on by the interviewees, another interview was conducted to gain additional information or to clarify the previous responses.
Table 5: Interview questions for participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety? | 1) In which class do you feel more comfortable?  
2) Do you often forget how to say in the ESOL class? How about mainstream classes?  
3) Do you feel it would be OK to say anything in the ESOL class? |
| 2. What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety? | 1) In which class can you understand better?  
2) Who is your best friend? Is she or he in the ESOL class or mainstream classes?  
3) When you have a difficulty at school, which teacher do you want to talk about?  
4) Why do you feel the ESOL class more comfortable than the mainstream classes? |
| 3. How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes? | 1) What do you do if you cannot make your friend(s) or teacher understand you in English?  
2) What do you do when you do not know how to say something in English?  
3) When you are nervous in class, how do you act? |
| 4. What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies? | Same as the above in the research question 3. Yet, differentiate where they use a particular defense mechanism.  
1) Do you study harder for the ESOL class?  
2) Do you want to have a Korean classmate in mainstream classes? |
| 5. What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students? | 1) Doing which activity makes you most comfortable in mainstream classes?  
2) Are you sure your teacher would not call on you if you don’t raise your hand?  
3) Do you want your ESOL teacher to allow you to speak Korean in the ESOL class? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety? | 1) Ask both the ESOL and mainstream class teachers, “How is Hannah in your class?” and compare their responses  
2) To the ESOL teacher: I heard Eugene saying, “I got four,” and his mainstream teacher told me that it was the first time for her to hear his using a sentence. Have you ever heard doing so in your class? |
| 2. What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety? | 1) How long have you had ESOL students in your class?  
2) When you learned a foreign language, did you feel language anxiety?  
3) Have you had formal training for the ESOL education? |
| 3. How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes? | 1) Is it like Sunny prepares for what she would talk with you before she came to the class?  
2) Is it true that Anna has always been with Jin at school?  
3) Did you notice Eugene trifling with the bandage on his thumb all day long? |
| 4. What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies? | Same as the above in the research question 3, and compare the responses of mainstream teachers with those of the ESOL teacher. |
| 5. What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students? | 1) Do you ask your ESOL student to speak out from the beginning?  
2) Have you ever seen highly anxious ESOL students? If so, what do you think made them so anxious?  
3) What did you do to reduce your student’s language anxiety? |
### Table 7: Interview questions for caregivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety?** | 1) Which class do you think she like more?  
2) Which subject does she like most?  
3) Has she tried not to go to school because of English? |
| **2. What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety?** | 1) Did he say why the ESOL class is more fun?  
2) Who is his best friend? Is he in the ESOL class or mainstream classes?  
3) When your child has a difficulty at school, which teacher do you want to talk about? |
| **3. How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes?** | 1) Has she tried not to go to school because of English?  
2) Does she study harder here than in Korea?  
3) What he talks about his friends? |
| **4. What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies?** | Same as the above in the research question 3. Identify where their children use a particular defense mechanism. |
| **5. What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students?** | 1) What kind of class activities does she like most?  
2) Has he said about his teachers? If so, what it is?  
3) What do you want teachers do to reduce your child’s language anxiety? |
Data Analysis

The central concept in the research questions of this study is language anxiety, and therefore, this concept should be clarified in terms of identifiable characteristics or behaviors in actual setting. There could be two ways to specify language anxiety. The first is to specify it by using three components of language anxiety presented by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986): 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety, and 3) fear of negative evaluation. In other words, we try to come up with operational definition of language anxiety in terms of observable characteristics of these three components. Presumably, this strategy has been most widely used specification (e.g., the FLCAS and the ELAS). However, it is important to note that in qualitative research like this study, this strategy would not result in a refined specification. In case of quantitative study using survey such as the FLCAS or the ELAS, this strategy works well. The surveyed are asked the questions related to three components of language anxiety: “I tremble when I know I am going to speak in English” (communication apprehension); “I am afraid that native speakers will laugh at me when I speak English” (fear of negative evaluation); “I am usually at ease during tests in my language class” (test anxiety). Then, their answers can not only show overall level of language anxiety in quantified scores, but also to a certain extent, differentiate whether they are more prone to which one of three components than the others by comparing the scores on relevant questionnaires.

In case of qualitative study, however, such a distinction among three components is very difficult to make, because except for certain situations, they are not mutually exclusive (Tsui, 1996), and thus it is hardly possible to make a distinction on which of three components of language anxiety being studies. For an example, suppose that we observe that a student is trembling, when he is required to speak orally in front of whole class, the performance of which is being evaluated. In this case, he is showing a sign of anxiety (trembling), for he is required to speak orally (communication apprehension) in front of whole class (fear of negative evaluation), which is one of testing (test anxiety). For this compounding, the qualitative study, especially like
this study employing non-participant observation, would be very difficult to differentiate and specify one from other components of language anxiety.

Considering the difficulty shown above, this study employed a different strategy, drawn upon Ehrman’s (1996) defense mechanism against experiencing language anxiety. Unlike Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope’s (1996) and others’ studies, where the data collection method is survey that renders quantified scores, Ehrman (1996) uses qualitative method using observation and informal interviews to collect her data, and on the basis of the qualitative data on how students react to language anxiety provoking situations, she provides a rich array of observable characteristics of language anxiety, and differentiate them into four areas:

1) Flight behaviors
2) Aggressive behaviors
3) Group manipulation behaviors
4) Compromise behaviors

Ehrman’s specification is very useful as far as qualitative study is concerned, for instance, in observation we can know (observe) the presence of anxiety in participants only when they overtly react to anxiety eliciting situations. Their reaction could be trembling, cutting classes or being silent when expected to talk, what Patton (1987) characterizes as “absence of occurrence” (p. 91). These participants’ seemingly anxious behaviors can be further crosschecked or triangulated by the following interviews where the researcher can frame the questions according to her or his research interests. For this study, considering this point, the operational specification of language anxiety is made by drawing upon Ehrman’s (1996) categorization. Since all qualitative characteristics or behaviors of language anxiety cannot be listed here, as seen in Table 8, the main specifications of language anxiety are shown.

1) Flight behaviors: Flight behaviors related to language anxiety can be summarized as moving away or avoidance, such as lateness, absences, silence, unresponsiveness, boredom, physical removal of oneself from the class. Flight behaviors can be also displayed in inability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Behaviors</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Avoidance or withdrawal: Pulling away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reaction formation: Doing something for others in expectation to be given a similar treatment from them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fantasy: Mental escaping from reality such as daydreaming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Boredom: Hiding incompetence such as trying to avoid being called upon by intentionally showing indifference in activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rationalization: Attempting to justify maladaptive behaviors, such as lateness or nonparticipation, by substituting good reasons for real ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generalization: Stretching out his particular behaviors as if it is common to everybody, though not so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nomadism: Inability to stay in one place or frequent changes of class group and study materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Competition: Trying to demonstrate superiority in one particular area to avoid a negative evaluation of overall incompetence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Displacement: Redirecting anxious feelings in a form of anger toward a person whom he feels less strong than himself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cynicism or negativity: belittling ESOL or other mainstream classes, assignments or even teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interrogation: Keeping others under defensive by giving a barrage of questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acting out: Express anxious feeling straightforwardly and in an intense manner, such as crying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Manipulation Behaviors</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Forming subgroups: Seeking out supporter(s) and forming an emotional subgroup for mutual helps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scapegoating: Keeping one person in negative spotlight so that others can feel competent (as compared to him or her)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compromise Behaviors</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Anticipation: Seeking out for help from teachers and/or classmates or simply studying harder and preparing for class longer often more than needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Altruism: Trying to help others, but unlike reaction formation, not expect to receive similar help in return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Ehrman’s defense mechanism (1996, pp. 152-154)
to stay in one place or frequent changes of class group and study materials (nomadism). In addition, we can witness flight behaviors when a participant says in one way or another, meaning that he does not need the ESOL class, because he thinks he is good in English (escape from reality - flight by fantasy). Or “I do not need to do well in English, because I am good at math” (flight by rationalization).

2) Aggressive behaviors: Some examples belonging to aggressive behaviors, are showing resentment toward learning a certain skill (e.g., I hate reading English), annoying weaker classmates (redirection of anxious feeling toward a person whom he feels less strong than himself - displacement), belittling ESOL or other mainstream classes, assignments or even teachers (cynicism), and attempting to show up superiority in one particular area to avoid a negative evaluation of overall incompetence (competition).

3) Group manipulation behaviors: Unlike other categories, group manipulation behaviors are a kind of collective manifestation of language anxiety. These reactions are displayed in that ESOL students seek out supporters in class and form an emotional subgroup alliance in which they protect and support each other (exclusive closeness). For instance, Korean ESOL students could form an informal and exclusive nationality-based subgroup, and they help each other in ESOL classes, but their helping hands are not open to other ESOL students. Another kind of group manipulation behaviors is scapegoating. By spotlighting one weak person negatively and constantly, others try to have a feeling of competence.

4) Compromise behaviors: Compromise behaviors are usually shown by relatively mature students, and thus considered as constructive responses to language anxiety. The examples are studying harder (facilitating anxiety), seeking out for help from teachers or classmates (not simply give in, but trying to cope with anxiety), and trying to help others (for he is in difficulty, he more readily understands others and willing to help them - altruism). Yet unlike reaction formation, altruistic behaviors are done to others with no clear expectation to receive similar helps in return.
As has been seen above, Ehrman’s (1996) categorization not only provides a useful way to specify the activities and behaviors associated with language anxiety, but also distinctively renders very helpful insights to the research questions 3 and 4 of this study: 3) How do Korean ESOL students cope with language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes? and 4) what are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in students’ coping strategies? As easily noticed, Ehrman’s (1996) categorization of defense mechanism against experiencing language anxiety is identical to what we commonly call, coping strategies with language anxiety. Therefore, it can be expected that the observation with these specifications will provide a helpful guidance to answering the research questions 3 and 4.

Before ending discussion on the observation, there are two points to make. One is that as mentioned above, this study employed both observation and interviews. Through interviews, therefore, the researcher was able to collect the information on three components of language anxiety presented by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986). These data gathered from interviews were compared and crosschecked with the data collected in the observation. Another point is about example and nonexample of language anxiety. Here, an example has the essential attributes of language anxiety. In the concept of language anxiety in the literature and in this study (not in generic term), for instance, ‘learning’ language is an essential attribute. Since learning language is an essential feature of the ESOL class, being anxious in the ESOL class is an example of the concept of language anxiety. On the contrary, a nonexample lacks the essential attributes of the concept of language anxiety, even though it may share some irrelevant attributes with the concept of language anxiety. Suppose an ESOL student becomes anxious, when he suddenly realizes that he will be scolded by his strict mother when he comes back home, because he did not make bed before he came to school. This is an example of anxiety, but not an example of language anxiety, in other words, nonexample of language anxiety. Put differently, it is anxiety (a same attribute), but it is not related to learning language (absence of the essential attribute). Interview would be helpful to distinguish an example of language anxiety from its nonexample.
Establishing Trustworthiness of the Research

As Patton (2001) states, important issues surrounding the value and uses of qualitative research are validity, reliability and transferability. It is especially important to address these issues, considering a common criticism on qualitative research that qualitative results are anecdotal. In this study, the following efforts were made to establish trustworthiness of the research: validity, reliability and transferability.

Validity refers to the appropriateness of the inferences the researcher makes based on the data collected (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). It is concerned with the question of how research findings match reality (Merriam, 1998). To enhance the validity and reliability of this study, triangulation was made, which is a standard strategy for such as task in qualitative research. Triangulation is a process of verification that increases validity by incorporating the different methods, multiple sources and data (Sevigny, 1978). Denzin (1978) suggests three specific methods of triangulation: 1) using multiples methods, 2) employing many data sources, and 3) using different investigators. As has been seen above, first this study has attempted to accomplish triangulation by using quantitative assessment, a Korean version of the English Language Anxiety Scale (ELAS). In order to triangulate the data, this study has also incorporated five-week long observations, informal and semi-structured interviews with students, teachers and caregivers. As for transferability, this study has tried to follow Merriam’s (1998) suggestions as much as possible: 1) trying to provide a thick description to allow the readers to be able to determine how closely their situations correspond to research situation (such as providing much information on participants unless their privacy is violated), and thus whether findings can be transferred, 2) trying to describe how common the subjects, events and contexts of research situations are as compared to others in the similar cases and therefore the readers can make comparisons with their own situations (with regard to English proficiency level, for instance, providing a detailed comparison between the participants of this study and ESOL students in general), and 3) employing several sites (ESOL and mainstream classes) and theoretical frameworks (Ehrman’s specification) that
provide a rich array of defense mechanisms against language anxiety so that it could enhance
diversity so as to allow the result to be applied to other situations.

Regarding ethics, this study made utmost efforts to fully follow the official guidelines of
ethics in research of human subjects by Florida State University, and so was to obtain informed
consents from every single participant in this project. Special attention was given to children, making
it sure that their parents could reach the researcher whenever they wished. Finally, all identities in the
research were protected by the use of pseudonyms. All records collected during this study are made
confidential.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the qualitative data derived from observations and interviews, the findings with regard to the research questions of this study will be discussed, following the order of the research questions as posed. The discussion will elaborate the major findings of this study and draw lessons from the data collected. Additionally, the researcher will look at relevant theories and previous research on language anxiety in order to better explain the findings of this study.

Research Question 1:
Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?

As shown above, the result of the ELAS administered to the participants of this study demonstrates a modest but consistent pattern that they felt more anxious in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class, with this being a marked difference regardless of their individual level of language anxiety. Likewise, both the observations and interviews of this study confirm the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety experienced by the participants with the former being less anxiety-provoking than the latter. In one interview, one of the participants, Eugene, commented that the ESOL class was “far more enjoyable and comfortable” than the mainstream classes. During observation, Eugene displayed a marked difference in his behaviors. One day he constantly trifled with a bandage on his thumb during entire period of mainstream classes (boredom). However, he completely stopped doing that when he moved to the ESOL class where he remained attentive for the entire class time. On another occasion in his mainstream class, Eugene stated, “I got four,” and the teacher was surprised to hear it, since it was the first time she had heard him use a complete sentence in class. In a subsequent interview, he acknowledged that in mainstream classes he had never spoken a word, except for “bathroom” until this time. Yet, the researcher
observed his making a complete sentence, “I got seven” a week earlier in the ESOL class and further the ESOL teacher informed the researcher that he had already done so two weeks earlier in the ESOL class.

Hannah also talked about the ESOL class. As will be noticed, Hannah’s statement can be regarded as an evidence confirming the claim expressed by Steinburg and Horwitz (1986) that language learners are more likely to try to speak more in detail under a comfortable and supportive environment than under a stressful and non-supportive environment. In a formal interview, Hannah talked about her being comfortable in the ESOL class.

RESEARCHER: (…..) If you have to say something, in which class do you feel more comfortable?
HANNAH: The ESOL class.
RESEARCHER: Do you feel it would be OK to say anything in the ESOL class?
HANNAH: Yes.
RESEARCHER: Why would it be? Is it because the teacher asks to talk more or your classmates do not speak English well?
HANNAH: I feel so comfortable in the ESOL class that I can speak better.
RESEARCHER: Really?
HANNAH: Yes.
RESEARCHER: Because you feel comfortable?
HANNAH: Yes.

The difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of anxiety can be further noticed in the following situations. As Eugene’s teacher told me and he himself admitted later, he cried twice in the mainstream class out of the frustration of not being able to keep up with assignments given in mainstream classes. The other participant, Hannah, experienced this kind of frustration in more a severe way: she wet her pants in the mainstream class because she could not tell
her teacher in English that she needed to go to the bathroom. By contrast, she stated that “at school I feel the best in the ESOL class,” and “I feel like speaking better in the ESOL class.” During observation, the researcher also witnessed notable differences in their behaviors between the ESOL class and mainstream classes. Hannah was very active in the ESOL class, while she remained silent all the time in the mainstream classes. For instance, in the ESOL class, she spoke for a classmate, “He needs bathroom,” which she did not even speak for herself in the mainstream classes. Indeed, she spoke for her classmates so often that the ESOL teacher discouraged her doing so by telling her, “He has to say it by himself.”

This tendency was also seen among the participants with low language anxiety, Jay, Anna and Sunny, though at first it is less apparent than in Eugene and Hannah. In interviews, these participants did not directly express that mainstream classes were much more anxiety provoking than the ESOL class. During observations, nevertheless, the researcher clearly noticed indications that their anxiety level was higher in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class. By and large, they appeared much more relaxed and active in the ESOL class than in mainstream classes. In mainstream classes, on the contrary, they often looked bored and were unresponsive to the class activities. For example, Jay who was at all times very active in the ESOL class, frequently showed the sign of boredom and even withdrew himself from class activities, such as resting his chin on his hand when teacher and classmates enthusiastically talked about the story they had just read, and pretending to be preoccupied with other things when teacher started to ask students questions. Similarly, Sunny, who so excelled in class participation and language use in the ESOL class that the researcher wondered why she was still in the ESOL program, exhibited the manifestation of higher anxiety in mainstream classes. In her social studies class, for instance, when she was asked to recite to the class what she had talked about with the teacher one day before, she froze up and murmured only a few words even after being gently and repeatedly asked to share. This could be regarded as a kind of stage anxiety, but it would not appear so considering that she had always exhibited eager participation in the ESOL class.

In the case of Anna, she demonstrated her enthusiasm in the ESOL class by frequently raising
her hand with wiggling fingers to volunteer to answers to the teacher’s questions. In mainstream classes, however, she simply remained reticent with the exception of math class where she was talented, and where a higher level of English proficiency is not necessary as in other mainstream classes. While she was active in the ESOL class, in mainstream classes, the researcher could often observe the apparent sign of her disappointment on her not being able to be responsive, such as frowning, and even scowling at a classmate sitting next to her who raised his hand. As seen above, although these three participants did not directly express a higher level of anxiety in mainstream classes to the extent that Hannah and Eugene did, the researcher was able to witness the presence of higher level of anxiety in mainstream classes during observation.

Here it should be emphasized that the above discussion does not mean that the participants of this study experienced no anxiety in the ESOL class. Rather it shows that they felt a lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class than in mainstream classes. In fact, they also did display anxiety in the ESOL class, though it was less apparent than in the mainstream classes. The following episode illustrated this point. In the ESOL class when Eugene was called to write a word, pig, on the whiteboard that was pronounced by the teacher [p] - [i] - [g], at first he hesitated. The teacher pronounced it slowly and clearly three times, after which, he correctly wrote pig. What was curious to the researcher was that he wrote in very small letters, almost unrecognizable to the class. Therefore, the researcher asked him after the class on the way to a mainstream class why he wrote it in such a way. This response is as follows:

RESEARCHER: Eugene, why did you write pig in very tiny letters? I wonder whether your classmate can see it.

EUGENE: ……

RESEARCHER: You always write letters that small?

EUGENE: (Pause) No, I intentionally wrote it small.

RESEARCHER: Why?
EUGENE: I might be wrong.

RESEARCHER: That was right.

EUGENE: I know, but I was not sure then. I was anxious because I might be wrong.

RESEARCHER: You did a good job.

EUGENE: I wish the teacher don’t ask me English. I wish she can speak Korean.

RESEARCHER: Are you having difficulties in the ESOL class?

EUGENE: No. But English is difficult.

The existence of language anxiety in the ESOL class can also be shown by Hannah’s comments. In a formal interview at her home, she expressed her language anxiety both in the ESOL class and mainstream classes.

RESEARCHER: Do you forget how to say things you know in the ESOL class?

HANNAH: Yes, I do.

RESEARCHER: How about in mainstream classes?

HANNAH: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Do you tremble when you know you are going to have to speak in English in the ESOL class?

HANNAH: Yes, I am very very afraid.

RESEARCHER: How about other classes?

HANNAH: I am afraid.

RESEARCHER: Very much?

HANNAH: (Nod….. Sigh deeply as if she is terrified).

In light of these comments, it can be concluded that the ESOL class is also anxiety provoking to the participants. Yet, it should be emphasized, as examined earlier, that their anxiety in the ESOL
class had been shown significantly less than in mainstream classes. To them, the ESOL class was like a shelter in the school. When they were asked about their opinions on the change of class schedule, they unanimously answered that the ESOL class had to be longer. In an informal interview with the ESOL teacher after her class, she also told the researcher, “….. they feel relaxed in this class. That is what this ESOL class is for.”

Research Question 2:
What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?

To explain why the participants feel less anxiety in the ESOL class than in mainstream classes, a number of the reasons can be drawn from both the interviews and observations, and generally speaking they can be grouped into three interrelated categories: 1) the lower level of English proficiency required in the ESOL class and 2) homogeneity of the ESOL class as non-native English speakers, which fosters intimate interpersonal relationships among classmates and makes it possible for the teacher strategies specifically tailored to the needs of the ESOL students, and 3) the self-evident but very important corollary that ESOL class is taught by a teacher who had formal ESOL education training and thus likely has a positive attitude toward or a deeper understanding of non-native English language learners.

First, all participants appeared more relaxed in the ESOL class. They could not only better understand what was being told, but also made themselves better understood in the ESOL class. This point can be seen by the participants’ statements. For instance, Hannah said that the ESOL class was more comfortable “because I can speak English in the ESOL class.” Hannah also admitted that in mainstream classes there are so many grammatical rules in English that she felt she could not learn them all. However, she did not feel that way at all in the ESOL class because it is not as demanding as mainstream classes. The following is an excerpt from a formal interview with Hannah before observation began.

RESEARCHER: There are so many rules in English, right?
HANNAH: Yes

RESEARCHER: Do you feel like you can’t learn them all in mainstream classes?
HANNAH: No, I can’t.

RESEARCHER: Do you feel the same way in the ESOL class, too?
HANNAH: No, we learn them a little bit there.

RESEARCHER: Really? You don’t feel that way at all in the ESOL class?
HANNAH: No, in the ESOL class, we just do coloring, reading and something like that.

RESEARCHER: Oh.

HANNAH: (Excited) There are Korean books too (in the ESOL class).

RESEARCHER: So you don’t feel it at all in the ESOL class while you do in mainstream classes.

HANNAH: (affirmatively) Yes.

In a formal interview, similarly, Eugene stated that the ESOL class was “far more enjoyable and comfortable for it is easier than mainstream classes, and I can play games and study well.” Like Eugene, Jay also commented that the ESOL class was less stressful because it was not difficult like mainstream classes. In addition, he said, “In the ESOL class I am less worried about not being able to understand or to answer teacher’s questions than in mainstream classes.”

It is not surprising that mainstream classes pose greater challenges to the ESOL students, especially the participants of this study who have been in the United States less than one year. Therefore, it is too early to expect that the participants have reached an adequate level of what Cummins (2001) distinguishes as Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS), not to mention Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) which is necessary to compete on an equal footing with native English speaking peers. Their linguistic difficulty in mainstream classes could be inferred from the result of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test examined previously. Additionally, it can be perceived from the following episodes.
One day in the mainstream class the teacher asked students which holiday they liked the most, Thanksgiving, Easter, Christmas, and so on. Students raised their hands to respond as the teacher individually called each holiday. Yet, Eugene showed what Patton (1987) characterizes “absence of occurrence” (p. 91). Although he was expected to raise his hand like his classmates, he did not. It appeared to the researcher that he did not know what to do because he could not understand what was being asked or expected. In Korea, Christmas is one of the biggest holidays that children love the most. Much like in the US, in Korea Christmas is an official holiday and children are expected to receive presents on the Christmas day. More importantly, Koreans pronounce Christmas almost same as in English. Nevertheless, when Christmas was called, many students raised their hands, and Eugene simply kept looking around the classroom as if he was uncertain of what was happening. Only when his classmates told him to raise his hand, did he do so, apparently without really knowing why. Later in interview at his home, we talked about this episode.

RESEARCHER: How did you feel when you did not raise your hand because you had not understood what the teacher said while all of your classmates did so?

EUGENE: Once (in the mainstream class) my classmates insisted on me to raise my hand, telling me “Give it up! Give it up! (In English)”

RESEARCHER: What did they say? (Being surprised to hear his English).

EUGENE: They told me that just raise my hand.

RESEARCHER: Did they tell you to raise your hand simply because Christmas is a good day?

EUGENE: They forced me to raise my hand because I was only one who did not raise a hand, while telling me that Christmas is the best day.

RESEARCHER: Did they insist on you to raise a hand?

EUGENE: Yes, I have to raise my hand.

RESEARCHER: Do you have to raise your hand even though you do not know why?

EUGENE: (Laughing) yes.
This linguistic difficulty in mainstream classes is also illustrated in Hannah’s case. In a mainstream class, the teacher had students sit on the floor and then read several pages of a book, Charlotte’s Web, to the students. After reading, the teacher asked students to draw a picture about the story. Since the part of the story read was about a conversation between a pig and a chicken, students were expected to draw a scene of a pig and a chicken engaging in conversation. All of the students portrayed such a picture, but Hannah drew a picture of a girl, which was totally unrelated to the story. This could indicate that due to her limited English, she could not comprehend what had been read to her, and in all likelihood did not understand the drawing directions either.

The limited English proficiency, exemplified by Hannah, often renders negative impacts on academic performance even in subjects in which the ESOL student is naturally talented. For instance, one participant (Eugene) had good mathematical skills but was hampered by his limitation in English proficiency. In a formal interview after observation, he complained that he could not answer the question in math class because he did not know “big numbers in English.” He promptly added, “I am really distressed because of this.” He also said, “I cannot speak English, so I cannot study well (in mainstream classes). It’s unfair (‘Ugool Hayo’ in Korean) because I can speak Korean well.” Here, the researcher was able to catch an important connotation behind his comment, for we spoke in our first language, Korean, as usual for interviews with other participants and caregivers. In Korean, the meaning of Ugool Hayo has the connotation of an injustice being done to him, and thus implicit in it is anger toward the situation in which he has to use a linguistic medium very unfamiliar to him. As will be discussed, it is one kind of manifestation of language anxiety - redirection of anxious feelings toward the situation arousing the language anxiety.

At this point, it is important to note that the linguistic difficulty of the ESOL students, especially in mainstream classes, would not fade away shortly after they enter the ESOL program. Indeed, a number of the studies have identified the time periods typically required by non-native speakers to achieve Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills as two years and five years to catch up
to native speakers in Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Collier, 1987; Klesmer, 1994; Cummins 2001). Since achieving CALP takes much longer than BICS and a higher level of CALP is required in mainstream classes, the difference in the level of language anxiety between the ESOL class and mainstream classes confirmed by this study is quite comprehensible, and it is very likely that it would persist as long as a lower level of English proficiency is a significant source of language anxiety.

Additionally, the lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class can be attributed to the homogeneity of the class as non-native English speakers, which fosters intimate interpersonal relationships among classmates and facilitates the ESOL teacher using teaching strategies specifically tailored to the needs of ESOL students. As Pappamihiel (2002) points out, there are two kinds of interpersonal interactions related to language anxiety: 1) anxiety associated with teacher-student interaction and 2) anxiety rising from student-student interaction. The latter anxiety develops when a student lacks meaningful interaction with classmates, but it can be lessened when a sense of community with classmates is shared. This characteristic could be related to the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of anxiety. Above all, since in the ESOL class all students share identical positions as non-native English speakers and are in better positions to put themselves in the other’s shoes, it can be expected that student-student interaction in the ESOL class is less strained whereas in mainstream classes the ESOL students are more likely to experience social isolation as the linguistic minority.

Indeed the researcher could readily witness a sense of community among the students in the ESOL class. In a formal interview, Hannah highlighted this aspect by pointing out that she felt comfortable with her ESOL classmates “especially because all of the classmates can not speak English well and thus it would not be a great deal of embarrassment in the ESOL class to make mistakes in English.” When asked who their best friends were, they always included the classmates in the ESOL class, and the first one they said was typically someone from the ESOL class. Not only a sense of community, but comradeship among the ESOL classmates was also seen during observation.
In the ESOL class, when the first graders who had difficulty in reading, were asked to read short sentences in pairs, they were eager to help each other to get through the task with pointing word by word for their partner. This comradeship is likely to develop because the ESOL students share the common linguistic difficulty and understand each other well on this aspect. On the other hand, as will be discussed later, this comradeship can be considered as a defense mechanism they employed against language anxiety in the way of what Ehrman (1996: 154) calls benign “reaction formation,” which she defines as a constructive and personally gratifying service to classmates in a same situation or one might take care of classmates when they really wish to be taken care of.

Homogeneity of the ESOL class as non-native English speakers could also explain the lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class in that it allows the use of teaching strategies specifically tailored to the social and academic needs of the ESOL students. In school, the ESOL students experience a range of special problems unique to their needs and very different from those of native English speaking peers. In mainstream classes, meeting specific needs of the ESOL students is much easier said than done, because their curriculum and teaching practices are optimized and planned mainly for academic learning of native English speaking students. Furthermore, since the ESOL students are usually very few in number as compared to native English speaking students, teachers often believe that making curricular and instructional adaptations for the ESOL students is an inefficient use of their time and resources. In fact, this belief has served to justify their resistance to making such accommodations for the ESOL students (Youngs & Youngs, 2001).

By nature of the class homogeneity as English language learners, on the contrary, the ESOL class can be specifically tailored to meet the unique needs of the ESOL students. In the ESOL class, fluency in English is not taken for granted, and therefore the teacher is more likely to talk slowly and listen to students with patience. Moreover, in the ESOL class, homework, class assignments, and activities usually take that into account. Then it can be expected that all this taken together would make students more comfortable in the ESOL class. In observation, the researcher found such a tendency. As was pointed out before, the ESOL students appeared to be more active and relaxed in the
ESOL class than in mainstream classes. Previous interview data from the participants of this study has already suggested this. In particular, Jay’s comments explicitly indicated this point: He feels more comfortable in the ESOL class “because teacher talks to the class using easier words,” “because I feel she could understand whatever I say in English,” and “because the ESOL class is easier to me (than mainstream classes).”

Lastly, lower levels of anxiety in the ESOL class can be attributed to the often ignored but very important fact that it is taught by the teachers, who have positive attitudes towards their non-native English language learners. Obviously, teachers need a broad range of pedagogical expertise in working with the limited English proficient students, such as knowledge of second language acquisition, linguistics, and multicultural education, in order to effectively address the ESOL students’ special needs (Banks, 2001). Though these are necessary, more is required. Additionally, they might be required to have positive attitudes towards language-minority students because their attitude towards ESOL students is one of the important factors in determining the students’ educational outcomes (Valdes, 2001). Teachers’ negative attitude towards students can be subtle and thus harder to be detected by students. Indeed teachers’ negative bias against language minority students is seldom shown through blatant discrimination or other apparent actions, but rather it usually takes forms of covert and hidden practices and behaviors (Pang, 2001). Yet, it should be stressed that this negative attitude, though seemingly invisible as it is, generally becomes visible in the form of inferior educational services to language minority students, even by teachers with superior teaching skills (Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004).

In contrast, teachers’ positive attitudes towards ESOL students are more likely to result in better educational services, facilitating their progress in school and encouraging students to feel more relaxed in the class. In fact, it has been shown in studies (Tse, 2001; Valdes, 2001) that teachers’ positive attitude towards English language learners can better accommodate not only their academic needs (their progress in school), but also their social needs (their being comfortable in the class). As such, teachers’ positive attitudes could be regarded as a crucial factor in determining the quality of
educational services rendered to the ESOL students as well as their anxiety level in classrooms. In the school of the research site, it appeared that most teachers were open-minded or at least neutral about the ESOL students with none exhibiting any sign of negative attitudes towards ESOL students. However, it was the ESOL teacher who clearly demonstrated positive attitudes towards the ESOL students. This positive attitude may be regarded simply as a natural consequence of their being her own students. This would work in part in developing her positive attitudes towards the ESOL students. However, it seems to the researcher that her positive attitude has more to do with her professional training and her experience in linguistic and cultural diversity. She voluntarily chose to be an ESOL teacher, which can be taken as a sign of her own affinity towards language minority students. She had also gone through the necessary professional training, including an internship in the ESOL class. Therefore, it is likely that she gained a broad range of professional expertise in working with the limited English proficient students as well as internalizing norms and beliefs that foster a deeper understanding of them. Though she is relatively a younger teacher, in particular, she had extensive experience in linguistic and cultural diversity. In the formal interview, she informed the researcher that she was born in Germany. Since her father was in the military, she traveled around the world, “mostly around Europe though,” lived in England for two and a half years, and back into the United States and then she lived in “Texas which has a predominant Spanish population.” Taken together, it seemed that these factors made herself feel comfortable in working with the limited English proficient students.

In light of what has been shown previously, it can be said that the ESOL teacher had come to develop positive attitudes towards the ESOL students, since she as an ESOL teacher had educational training tailored to non-native speakers as well as her own personal diverse linguistic and cultural experiences. Indeed, this expectation has been consistently demonstrated to be convincing by numerous researches that have specifically examined the nature and determinants of teacher attitudes towards the ESOL students (Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1997; 1996; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004; Youngs & Youngs, 2001). For instance, Youngs and Youngs (2001) found in their survey of 143
teachers that positive attitudes towards the ESOL students are more likely to be formed among teachers who received formal ESOL training such as multicultural education and lived or taught outside of the US. Three other studies (Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1996; 1997; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004) concur with Youngs and Youngs’ (2001) findings.

As expected, teachers who hold positive attitudes towards the ESOL students are more likely to form a close interpersonal relationship with their students, which in part explains the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of language anxiety experienced by the ESOL students. In both interviews and observation, the researcher found that the ESOL teacher in the research site exhibited a keener awareness of social and academic needs unique to the ESOL students, and thus tried harder to accommodate these needs, thus further developing meaningful relationships with her students. The ESOL teacher was very attentive to differing dispositions and needs of the participants. As a result, the ESOL teacher was well acquainted with each of the individual participants. For instance, she recalled the Korean name of Eugene’s preschool brother, even though she met him only very briefly at a school festival.

Similarly, the participants of this study reciprocated by building a more personal relationship with the ESOL teacher. Anna and Sunny, who were the best English speakers among the participants, often came to the ESOL teacher to tell her about their personal matters such as “my father bought airline tickets yesterday,” “I will return home to Korea next month on January 31st.” However, such voluntary advances toward mainstream class teachers were not observed. Moreover, on the other occasion when Sunny had trouble with her friends, she went to the ESOL teacher rather than the mainstream class teacher, even though her concern regarded friends not in the ESOL class. This close relationship also contributed to a better accommodation of individual ESOL students’ academic needs, and this can be seen in the formal interview with the ESOL teacher.

RESEARCHER: But how you get the ideas from the curriculum?
ESOL TEACHER: Honestly, I just know what works with the kids. I mean, the curriculum is not that
good but I know that these kids, especially, they need kinesthetics, they need to
get up and move around. They need tangible stuff that they can touch, feel and
see, and I am at a point now where I can look at a curriculum and see okay. This is
a guideline but I add stuff to it as I go.

RESEARCHER: That’s what I thought.

ESOL TEACHER: And this seems to work the best for these kids because that book does not know
my kids. They don’t know my kids. They don’t know how old they are, what kind
of things they have experienced in their life and I know the kids. I try to make the
curriculum and make it relate to them where they are coming from, and the level
of proficiency they are at. Because that manual…. I followed the curriculum but
some of kids here got here a month ago, some of my kids got here a year ago. And
I am the only person who can do that.

As has been discussed so far, in summary, teacher’s positive attitudes contributed to
developing close relationships with the ESOL students, which in turn rendered lessening effects on
the language anxiety level in the ESOL class.

Research Question 3:

How do Korean ESOL students cope with English language anxiety
in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes?

Although the ESOL class is clearly a lower anxiety provoking situation than the mainstream
classes, as was previously shown, both are anxiety provoking, since each inherently requires the
ESOL students to use their limited English proficiency to communicate. Facing anxiety, the
participants of this study displayed a range of coping strategies, and every participant used some or
all of them in greater or lesser degrees. In the following pages, their coping strategies will be
discussed within the framework of the four defense mechanisms against experiencing language
anxiety as suggested by Ehrman (1996). The defense mechanisms are as follows.

1) Flight behaviors: withdrawal, generalization, or rationalization
2) Aggressive behaviors: showing resentment toward learning a certain skill, annoying weaker classmates, or belittling ESOL/other mainstream classes, assignments or teachers

3) Group manipulation behaviors: seeking out supporters in class or forming an emotional subgroup alliance

4) Compromise behaviors: studying harder, seeking out for help from teachers or trying to help others

As pointed out earlier, this categorization of four defense mechanisms against experiencing language anxiety are what is commonly called, ‘coping strategies’ with language anxiety. It needs to be also reminded that these four defense mechanisms are the operational specifications of language anxiety that this study has employed. This specification is necessary as far as qualitative research is concerned, for in qualitative studies we can know (observe) the presence of anxiety in participants only when they overtly react to anxiety eliciting situations. In other words, the defense mechanisms are the observable behaviors that the participants used to cope with language anxiety, and from which we have inferred the presence of language anxiety during observation. In interviews too, the defense mechanisms can be detected in forms of comments straightforwardly or indirectly expressed by the participants. They often provided direct expressions of their coping strategies such as “I want to go back to Korea,” which is one clear example of flight behaviors. As will be seen, nevertheless, the participants at times told the researcher things that initially sounded trivial, but under closer scrutiny and in relationship to their other remarks and behaviors observed, became very useful information in addressing the research questions. As such, then, it can be said that both observation and interviews were important sources of data, displaying a rich array of coping strategies. Table 9 in the following pages summarizes defense mechanism shown by each participant of this study. At this point, it should be emphasized that as mentioned before, since this study is the first research attempt to make a use of Ehrman’s (1996) specification of defense mechanisms, there are no similar
studies to which this study can make a comparison. Therefore, it is not possible to crosscheck how the participants respond to language anxiety in this study with the results of other studies.

In the below, an examination of their coping strategies will be presented, following Ehrman’s (1996) four categories of defense mechanisms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Behaviors</th>
<th>Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>GMB**</th>
<th>CB***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hannah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Avoidance: sometimes remained reticent (O)*</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-Reaction formation: helping each other by pointing word by word (O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-Competition: with Eugene over the numbers of words they each wrote (O, I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Avoidance: remained silent all the time (O);</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Fantasy: wishing to return to Korea (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Boredom: pulling down her skirt as if her skirt was too short (O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Generalization: claiming everyone become afraid of speaking in English (I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O and I indicate the data source (O: observation and I: interview).

**GMB (Group Manipulation Behaviors)

***CB (Compromise Behaviors)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flight Behaviors</th>
<th>Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>Group Manipulation Behaviors</th>
<th>Compromise Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E S O L</td>
<td>-Avoidance: not very often but sometimes remained reticent (O)*</td>
<td>-Competition: trying to submit assignments the fastest (O, I)</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay M A I M</td>
<td>-Avoidance: remained silent most of time; frequently unresponsive to the class activities (O); not explaining about a book for the AR Test (O, I)</td>
<td>-Competition: trying to submit assignments the fastest (O, I)</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O and I indicate the data source (O: observation and I: interview).
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Behaviors</th>
<th>Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>Group Manipulation Behaviors</th>
<th>Compromise Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E S O L</td>
<td>-Avoidance: very rarely but sometimes remained reticent (O)*</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna M</td>
<td>Avoidance: remained reticent except for math class (O); frequently unresponsive to the class activities (O)</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>Forming subgroups: building an informal nationality-based subgroup with a Korean girl (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny M</td>
<td>Avoidance: very rarely but sometimes remained reticent (O)</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
<td>No incidences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Boredom: sometimes looked bored (O)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*O and I indicate the data source (O: observation and I: interview).
**Flight Behaviors**

Flight behaviors used to cope with language anxiety compose a variety of behaviors, thought processes, and the manipulation of uncomfortable feelings such as avoidance, silence, unresponsiveness, boredom, generalization, rationalization, and reaction formation. As a number of previous studies (Kleinmann, 1977; McCroskey, 1984; Pappamihiel, 2002) have demonstrated, the typical behavior patterns of language learners to cope with language anxiety are avoidance of and withdrawal from anxiety-eliciting situations. Of the four defense mechanisms, the most common coping strategies exhibited by the participants of this study were the flight behaviors such as withdrawal, generalization, rationalization. In particular, the participants had definitely exhibited this kind of coping strategy in mainstream classes, while less frequently displayed in the ESOL class, where the anxiety level was lower than mainstream classes. As can be seen in Table 9, in addition, the participants with higher anxiety (Eugene and Hannah) tended to display coping strategies in a greater variety of ways and more frequently than those with relatively lower anxiety (Anna, Sunny and Jay). Furthermore, the older participants (Anna and Sunny) responded to anxiety-eliciting situations in more mature ways exhibiting compromise behaviors, such as studying harder or preparing more for classes.

First of all, the participants showed withdrawal, pulling away from anxiety-provoking situations. As described earlier, they remained silent most of time, being unresponsive to class activities and displayed boredom especially in mainstream classes. In mainstream classes, for instance, Jay showed the sign of boredom: resting his chin on his hands when the teacher and classmates enthusiastically talked about a story they had just read. This is one kind of defense mechanisms: he pretended to be uninterested in that particular class activity in order to hide his inability to participate in it due to limited English proficiency. Indeed, he made his boredom clearly visible to his teacher and classmates. In this way, he could protect his self-respect by showing that the reason for his nonparticipation was not because he was linguistically unable to participate in it, but because he was not interested and chose not to participate.
This defense mechanism was also observed among other participants by the researcher. One day in observation of the mainstream class, as described previously, Eugene constantly played with a bandage on his thumb. In the next observation he trifled with his hooded jacket, and in the following observation he trifled with his freshly cut hair. What was notable is that he exhibited this behavior only in mainstream classes and whenever there would be a chance for him to be called upon, such as the discussion time after reading. Hannah likewise displayed this defense mechanism. In the mainstream class, students were asked to sit on the floor, except for students wearing a skirt or dress. Hannah was wearing a short skirt and could have remained in her chair, but she chose to sit on the floor. When discussion time after a phonics lesson began, Hannah started pulling down her skirt as if she just realized that her skirt was too short. As the discussion went on, she continued doing so even though her skirt looked perfectly fine. She appeared to be very preoccupied with it, likely hoping to infer “Do not ask me to talk because I am too busy with my skirt.”

Jay illustrated another case of withdrawal, avoidance. In the ESOL class, he found an interesting book written in Korean and started to read it. The ESOL teacher told him that he could check it out and take the AR (Accelerated Reading) Test with it. He took the book to the mainstream class where he read it all about twenty minutes, then got a permission to go to the computer to take the AR test. Soon he discovered something was wrong and asked the teacher about it. The teacher told him that he could not take the AR Test with that book. He simply replied, “OK” and stopped trying. To the researcher, it was a case of absence of occurrence, because the researcher expected him to say something like “the ESOL teacher told me that I could take the AR Test with this book.” Yet, he did not. Therefore, the researcher asked him about it in a subsequent interview at his home:

RESEARCHER: ….. Why didn’t you tell Mrs. Parker (the mainstream teacher) that Mrs. Anders (the ESOL teacher) said you could take the AR Test with that book?
JAY: (Pause) I tried to take the AR Test because Mrs. Anders told that I could do it with that book.

RESEARCHER: But you couldn’t. Then why didn’t you say to Mrs. Parker what Mrs. Anders told you when she said you couldn’t.

JAY: (Pause) Well….. I don’t know.

RESEARCHER: Sometimes, do you stay silent when it is difficult to say (in English)?

JAY: Excuse me?

RESEARCHER: You just stay silent sometimes?

JAY: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Do you stay silent when it is difficult to say (in English)?

JAY: (Speaking in English) Never mind! (As if he did not want to admit it)

RESEARCHER: Oh, yeah! You do so, right? (Laughing)

JAY: (Nodding)

From this interview, it can be inferred that he withdrew himself from telling the mainstream teacher what the ESOL teacher told him because he was not comfortable about saying it in English. Moreover, many of his classmates were attentively looking at him during the situation, which probably gave an added reason for his withdrawal.

Another incidence of Jay’s withdrawal can be seen in the interview where Jay’s mother also participated.

RESEARCHER: ….. Do you use gestures when you can’t express yourself to your friends in English?

JAY: When I talk (in English) while playing with my friends, if it is fun, I can speak (English) very fluently and effortlessly.

RESEARCHER: Uh…..

JAY: I can speak (English) well in such a case.
RESEARCHER: OK. What do you do when you don’t know how to ask something?

JAY: It just comes to my mind.

RESEARCHER: It just comes to your mind?

JAY’S MOTHER: Jay, you sometimes asked me, “Mom, how do you say it (in English)?” Or you always asked me how to say something (in English) after you had played with your friends outside.

RESEARCHER: Everybody has different ways. Some people use body language while others just give up saying (in English).

JAY: Yea, I just give up.

RESEARCHER: Do you?

JAY: Yes, simply I give up.

RESEARCHER: Simply you give up.

JAY: Right.

RESEARCHER: Then, you asked your mom at home?

JAY: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Have you felt bad because you don’t know what to say in English even though you can do it well in Korean.

JAY: I have never felt bad, but I did give up sometimes.

JAY’S MOTHER: Hey! I know you have felt bad because of that.

JAY: When?

JAY’S MOTHER: Haven’t you felt bad because you don’t know how to say in English? When we came here, you didn’t even go outside because you couldn’t converse with other kids (in English).

JAY: Right (Reluctantly but clearly).

Flight behaviors could also take a form of rationalization (justification). Rationalization
includes an attempt to hide language anxiety by substituting some probable or good reasons for real ones (Ehrman, 1996). In a formal interview, this rationalization was displayed by Eugene.

RESEARCHER: What is the most difficult thing at school?
EUGENE: At school? Almost everything.
RESEARCHER: Almost everything? Everything is so difficult?
EUGENE: Yes, almost everything. But some things are OK.
RESEARCHER: Tell me which one is the most difficult?
EUGENE: Um….. Speaking English, writing (English) words that I don’t know.
RESEARCHER: So, English is the problem. Then everything will be OK if you can speak English well.
EUGENE: (Nodding)

Here, he clearly admitted that English is the most difficult thing at school (in mainstream classes). Once at school he told the researcher that sometimes he did not want to go to school because of English. In this interview, therefore, I expected him to express such feelings. However, he tried to substitute a probable reason for real one - English language anxiety.

RESEARCHER: So, every morning you don’t want to go to school?
EUGENE: Yes, (Because) it is too early. I don’t want to go to school this early.
RESEARCHER: Too early? Sometimes you don’t want to go to school because it is too early or English is hard?
EUGENE: (Speaking quietly) Both.

Here, we can see his attempt to substitute a probable reason, going to school too early, for a real one, English language anxiety. Obviously, it may be true that he really did not want to go to
school only because he had to get up early, considering that in Korea normally elementary school students arrive at school by 9 o’clock. Therefore, it could be a nonexample of language anxiety. That is, he did not want to go to school because he needed to get up too early, not because he was anxious about English language. Nonexample would be a possibility. In light of what he told the researcher earlier at school and in a formal interview, however, his not wanting to go to school sometimes had much to do with his English language anxiety, and thus it could be hardly a case of nonexample. If so, his giving the reason of too early could be regarded as one kind of flight behavior, rationalization. In another formal interview, Eugene again showed rationalization.

RESEARCHER: How do feel when you can’t raise your hand because you can’t understand what the teacher says (in mainstream classes)?
EUGENE: Sometimes my classmates help me do it, but sometimes not.
RESEARCHER: Do you feel OK?
EUGENE: OK, because I have good hand writing.

Later in the same interview, Eugene displayed rationalization again.

RESEARCHER: Have you experienced that everyone did what the teacher asked to do, except for you, such as open the book to some page?
EUGENE: There are kids who do it later than me.
RESEARCHER: Are there?
EUGENE: Yes, there are a lot of such kids.

Another case of flight behaviors is reaction formation. This strategy can be viewed as a kind of constructive strategy to cope with language anxiety in that it contains the behaviors of taking care of classmates. Yet, it should be noted that language learners had offered personally
gratifying service to classmates because they really wished to be taken care of in return of their helps extended to classmates. Among the cases of reaction formation displayed by the participants of this study are, as described earlier, when students in the ESOL class helped each other with a reading task by pointing word by word for their partners. In the mainstream class, Eugene also tried to help the girl sitting next to him on math, at which he was good, by showing his completed math worksheets even though she had not asked and more importantly, it appeared that she did not appreciate his help. This is a good example of reaction formation since Eugene tried to help her on math with the expectation that in return she would help him on worksheets of language arts with which he had difficulties. On this point, Eugene’s mother informed the researcher that he complained to her that even though he helped his classmate sitting next to him on math, she did not return his favor by helping him on English vocabulary, suggesting the presence of reaction formation. In the formal interview, his mother discussed this.

RESEARCHER: Does Eugene often talk about what happens at school?

EUGENE’S MOTHER: Yes, very often and in detail.

RESEARCHER: Good.

EUGENE’S MOTHER: He talked about the girl (sitting next to him in the mainstream class).

And he told me that he took a peek at her answers during the spelling test, because he did not know vocabulary.

RESEARCHER: Um-hmm.

EUGENE’S MOTHER: When I asked him whether she allowed him to peek on her work, he said, “Not really.”

RESEARCHER: Uh-huh.

EUGENE’S MOTHER: He told me, “So I did like this.” (Eugene’s mother raised her chin and made the gesture of peeking across).”

RESEARCHER: (Laughing)
EUGENE’S MOTHER: He said that she did wrong sometimes, though.

RESEARCHER: (Laughing)

EUGENE’S MOTHER: He also said (complained) to me that he showed her everything on math because she was bad at it, but she did not allow him to see her answers (on vocabulary during the spelling test).

RESEARCHER: Oh! (Laughing)

In a form of generalization, the participants of this study also displayed flight behaviors. They refer to the coping strategy that attempts to lessen language anxiety by generalizing its presence with statements such as “I am not the only one who feels anxious in this situation. Everybody should be feeling uncomfortable like me under this circumstance.” In interviews, Jay commented, “Every kid is afraid,” when asked, “Are you afraid of speaking English in front of people?” Hannah also stated in an interview, in reference to non-native speakers, “Even proficient English speakers become afraid and shy when they speak in English.” As seen, these comments illustrate attempts to mitigate language anxiety by reassuring themselves that everybody feels the same, therefore it is actually not a problem.

A final aspect of flight behaviors is fantasy, which is a defense mechanism against language anxiety by daydreaming an escape from anxiety provoking situations. It differs from avoidance and withdrawal in that fantasy is a thought process not resulting in actual avoidance or withdrawal but ends only in wishing. Fantasy is usually used against language anxiety eliciting situations, which could be mainstream classes, the ESOL class, schools in general, even the US at large, or anywhere where English is required for the participants to communicate. Thus, fantasy is aimed at escaping such situations. As a defense mechanism, fantasy is easy to do just because it requires no tangible resource, and thus increases the likelihood of the fantasy as a defense mechanism. Probably everybody would be involved in a kind of fantasy from time to time. This must be the case for the participants of this study. The participants could not
physically escape nor did they have resources to change situations from anxiety inducing into non anxiety such as ‘making mainstream classes be taught in Korean!’ Therefore it can be anticipated that fantasy as defense mechanism would be frequently used by the participants. Nevertheless, it should be noted that fantasy would be difficult to be detected by an observer. Although it is highly probable that its actual frequency would be great, only a relatively few examples of fantasy can be presented here.

In the formal interview with Eugene’s mother, first of all, she informed the researcher that Eugene had expressed his wish not to go to school, thereby escaping from language anxiety provoking environment. The example below should be read keeping in mind that Eugene told the researcher before that he did not want to go to school due to English.

RESEARCHER: … When I asked him (Eugene) with which you have the most difficulty at school, he answered, “English.” Then has he ever said that he does not want to go to school because of the difficult English?

EUGENE’S MOTHER: Yes, he said so once.

RESEARCHER: Once, he did?

EUGENE’S MOTHER: Yes, Hannah did not go to school once about two months after school started. I cannot remember whether she did not go to school because her family went on a trip or because she was sick. Anyways, at that time he (Eugene) said, “I wish I do not need to go to school like Hannah.”

In the passage quoted earlier, Eugene told the researcher that the ESOL class was also anxiety provoking, although it was much less anxiety eliciting than mainstream classes. In that conversation Eugene expressed that he wished his ESOL teacher could speak Korean. The following indicates his fantasy regarding his teacher’s language ability:
EUGENE: I know, but I was not sure then. I was anxious because I might be wrong.

RESEARCHER: You did a good job.

EUGENE: I wish the teacher don’t ask me English. I wish she can speak Korean.

RESEARCHER: Are you having difficulties in the ESOL class?

EUGENE: No. But English is difficult.

Another example of fantasy is illustrated by Hannah who was found to be the most anxious among the participants of this study. Her fantasy was not just an escape from one particular situation such as mainstream classes, the ESOL class, non-Korean speaking teachers or classmates. Her fantasy was going back home to Korea where she would not face English language anxiety provoking situations at all. In others words, she wished for the escape from English language anxiety provoking situations once and for all. While she expressed that she was also anxious in the ESOL class, even though it was much more enjoyable than mainstream classes, she still showed her desire to escape by her defense mechanism of fantasy.

RESEARCHER: Does it make you uncomfortable that you cannot express your feelings in English in the ESOL class?

HANNAH: Yes.

RESEARCHER: It is because you can’t express in English, though you do well in Korean?

HANNAH: Yes. That’s why I wish to go home back to Korea fast and fast (as soon as possible: she emphasized it twice).

**Aggressive Behaviors**

Sometimes the response to anxiety eliciting situations is expressed in aggressive behaviors. As examined earlier, examples of this reaction include showing anger with learning a certain skill, e.g., I hate reading English, expressing resentment toward weaker classmates.
(redirection of anxious feeling toward a person who is deemed less strong - displacement), demonstrating superiority to avoid a feeling of incompetence or shame (competition) and belittling ESOL or other mainstream classes, assignments or even teachers (cynicism). Among the participants of this study, no one exhibited severe instance of aggressive behaviors such as repeatedly bullying of weaker classmates that would promptly call for special attention.

Yet, aggressive defense mechanisms in milder forms, such as competition or cynicism, were observed among some of the participants. The first case was Jay, who displayed competition, that is, demonstrating superiority to avoid a feeling of incompetence. During observation, the researcher noticed that Jay had a tendency to hand in his assignments or test sheets the fastest in the class. At first, the researcher thought that he submitted them first simply because he finished first and thus was the fastest worker in the class. As time went by, it had appeared that his priority was more on being first to hand in his work than on the quality or accuracy of his work. Since the former was more visible to classmates than the latter, his priority would work more efficiently to the effect that his classmates would come to think he was superior in an important way. Indeed, it seemed that he was focusing on an area (who can submit it first), in which he could win, and more importantly where he could demonstrate his superiority (submitting first), visibly to every classmate.

However, there was an unintentional side effect: he kept forgetting to put his name on his paper. One day the researcher witnessed this happening twice in Jay’s mainstream math class. Then, it became clear to the researcher that forgetting to write his name was due to Jay’s preoccupation with being the first one in class to hand in his work. This was later discussed in a formal interview at his home, during which his mother was present.

RESEARCHER: The day when I observed your classes for the first time, you didn’t put your name down three times. (laughing: two times in the mainstream class, math, and one in the ESOL class) Do you remember that?
JAY: No, I don’t remember it.

JAY’S MOTHER: You should put your name down.

RESEARCHER: (Jay’s mainstream class teacher was handing out test sheets done in the previous day. The last test sheet, being about to be handed out, has no name on it, and turned out that it was Jay’s) The test sheet with no name on it was yours, and your teacher told you that you didn’t put your name down, when you submitted an assignment. Is it because you wanted to have it done so fast?

JAY’S MOTHER: Don’t do that!

JAY: That’s my special competence.

Here it can be seen that his special competence involved competing his work quickly (intended), and forgetting to write his name (unintended). To the researcher, it became evident that this special competence was one of the defense mechanisms that he intended to use in order to lessen his language anxiety. Yet this was the defense mechanism that he could use in the classes only where it was possible due to less proficiency in English being regarded. It should be remembered that in the mainstream classes, his common defense mechanism against language anxiety was avoidance or withdrawal. He usually remained quiet and unresponsive in those classes, and at home he had not even gone alone to the playground in his apartment complex, because as stated by his mother earlier, he was afraid of speaking English. Like most of the participants in this study, his use of avoidance had been more marked in the classes where a higher level of English proficiency was required, such as language arts, social studies, and science. In those classes, he could not employ competition as a defense mechanism (doing his work quickly), simply because of his limited English proficiency. By contrast, he employed competition as a defense mechanism in classes, such as math, art, and the ESOL class where it was possible because his limited English did not hamper his use of competition, completing his work quickly.
In the ESOL class, as expected, Jay tried to submit his work first and he generally accomplished just that. In his enthusiasm, he informed the class, “I am done!” However, he made a very simple mistake on capitalization, which was due to carelessness, no doubt, rather than his level of English ability. Thus, it became clear to the researcher that his mistakes were because he wanted to be the fastest in the class. It was very probable that he was trying to compensate for his inability to excel in the class due to limited English proficiency by demonstrating his self-conceived superiority of being the fastest worker in the class. Here in the ESOL class, again, he forgot to put his name on his work. A portion of a conversation between the ESOL teacher and Jay follows:

JAY: I am done! (shouting with excitement while handing in his work)
ESOL TEACHER: What do you need at the beginning of the sentence?
   Big p or small p?
JAY: Big p. (correcting the error on his paper)
ESOL TEACHER: Good.
JAY: (after confirming he was still the first to finish it) I am done! (shouting)
ESOL TEACHER: Good job. I want to see your name and date on your paper.

The interviews and observations reveal that the participants responded to anxiety provoking situations by use of defense mechanisms that differed from one situation to another. Avoidance was the most common in mainstream classes, but when conditions allowed, competition was employed instead of avoidance. Even this competition could take a different form as a defense mechanism against language anxiety eliciting situation. In the above, it was a competition between one student and the whole class, whereas in the below it was between two individual students shown by Hannah and Eugene.

Hannah and Eugene were both first graders and good friends. They often got together,
because they lived in the same apartment complex. Although they shared a similar command of very little English, Hannah was regarded as a better English speaker than Eugene. It appeared that Hannah saw herself as the better speaker and Eugene also shared her view. Therefore, initially it seemed no competitive relationship existed between the two in learning English. From Hannah’s perspective she was at least better than Eugene, and as for Eugene, he appeared to concede that she was better than he was in English. However, it was later discovered that indeed there was the competitive spirit lurking between them. Hannah could use her feeling of superiority over Eugene in English to lessen not only her English language anxiety but also her feeling of incompetence to equally compete with native English speaking peers. By this point, in other words, it was highly probably that at least unconsciously Hannah had already exercised competition - thinking that “at least I am better than Eugene in English” - as a defense mechanism against her language anxiety. On the contrary, Eugene could not employ such a coping strategy, because he himself admitted that her English was better. However, if there was a time that he was better than Hannah in English, he would maximize it as his defense mechanism against his own language anxiety.

One day in the ESOL class, Hannah and Eugene indicated their competitive relationship. All of the first graders were asked to come up to the white board and write as many words as they could with short vowel, e, such as bed, pet, or pen. Eugene wrote nine words, and Hannah wrote seven words. Having seen that Hannah wrote less than he did, he became very excited and shouted in Korean to her, “Mine is more than yours.” Hearing his words, Hannah shouted back in English, “No, don’t copy.” Eugene appeared excited and very happy about his accomplishment. Naturally, Hannah looked unwilling to budge and admit that Eugene wrote more words than she did. It seemed that she suspected that he wrote more words by dishonesty - copying what others wrote. Nevertheless, she could not hide that she was upset by his defense mechanism of being challenged by Eugene. Later she talked about this episode in an interview. In the following, we can see Hannah’s reluctance to reveal the incident to the researcher. Only
after the researcher pointed it out, did Hannah begin to talk and implicitly acknowledge that she was surprised at her defense mechanism being unexpectedly threatened. Then, she tried to recover her defense mechanism (her superiority over Eugene in English) by playing down Eugene’s writing more words.

RESEARCHER: Today, Eugene wrote words and became very excited.
HANNAH: Why did he become excited? (speaking indifferently as if she does not know it)
RESEARCHER: I don’t know why, but he was very excited. (speaking as if knowing nothing about the reason why he became excited). He braged to you about more words he wrote than you, didn’t he?
HANNAH: Uh-huh
RESEARCHER: How did you feel?
HANNAH: I just tried to tease him (implying that her saying, “No, don’t copy,” was just a tease)
RESEARCHER: You did?
HANNAH: Yes.
RESEARCHER: You just tried to tease him?
HANNAH: Yes.
RESEARCHER: Um… You usually do better.
HANNAH: (Because) I had been to a camp in New Jersey (before I came here).
RESEARCHER: Really?
HANNAH: Yes.
RESEARCHER: Oh, I didn’t know that. So, how did you feel when Eugene wrote more than you did?
HANNAH: …. Surprised.
RESEARCHER: Surprised?
HANNAH: Yes.

RESEARCHER: Did you think it like, “Oh! You could write more than I did (with an intention to play down)!

HANNAH: Yes. (speaking a little awkwardly)

RESEARCHER: You really did? (laughing)

HANNAH: Yes. (laughing sheepishly)

Another aspect of aggressive behavior is displacement, which could be similar to competition. For instance, both Hannah and Eugene attempted to compensate for a feeling of incompetence in English by demonstrating a self-conceived superiority in other areas. Yet they differ in an important aspect. Displacement is a more intense reaction to an anxiety provoking situation than competition, for it involves an overt expression of resentment toward an object or a person such as openly expressing anger with learning a certain skill or showing resentment toward a classmate whom is considered to be inferior in a certain way.

An example of displacement was displayed by Eugene, who was good at math. Eugene had an American classmate, Tom, in his mainstream classes. Tom lived in the same apartment complex as Eugene and often visited Eugene’s home, therefore, Eugene’s mother also knew Tom well. It was generally known that they got along well even though Eugene spoke limited English. In fact, Tom was Eugene’s only American friend. When they played together, they did not talk except for occasional exchange of short sentences such as ‘My turn” and “Mine,” for the obvious reason that Eugene was very limited in his English.

When foreign and American children play, it is a common expectation that the foreign child will speak English, rather than the American child speak the mother tongue of his or her foreign playmate. Likewise, when Eugene and Tom played, the communication medium was expected to be English, in which Eugene was very limited, and thus it was Eugene who experienced language anxiety. In this situation Eugene would use rationalization - “I am better
at math than him,” which was true, though not good at English- to mitigate his language anxiety. This rationalization as a thought process would remain invisible, but it would become visible when the necessary condition of rationalization - belief in his superiority over Tom in math - was threatened, as was seen in Hannah’s case of competition. Unlike Hannah, Eugene responded to such a threat in a form of displacement - showing intense resentment toward Tom. His displacement as a defense mechanism could be evidenced by the following conversation in an interview with his mother. The following was not an interview with Eugene, but with his mother. Eugene was playing while this interview was conducted. It was a middle of interview when we started to talk about the education in America. While doing so, she transiently told the researcher about his son’s American friend, Tom.

EUGENE’S MOTHER: …… One day Tom came here to play with Eugene. He was running around so actively that I asked him whether he liked P.E. Tom answered, “No, I like math.” When I told Eugene about that, Eugene said, “He is really bad at math (speaking as if Tom’s comment was unexpected and very surprising)!”

RESEARCHER: (laughing)

EUGENE’S MOTHER: I told Eugene that it was possible that Tom could like math, even though he was not good at math. The US is a better environment for Eugene to study because competition here is less fierce than in Korea.

RESEARCHER: Yes.

At this moment, apparently having overheard our conversation, Eugene abruptly stood up and angrily shouted at his mother.

EUGENE: (shouting in angry tone) Mom! I’ll tell you how bad Tom is at math. When he does
math in the computer lab, he cannot do anything, I mean at all. So I show the answers. See! How can Tom like math. He does not like math. So how he can say he likes math!!!

It appeared that his superiority of math over Tom was the prerequisite of his initial defense mechanism (competition) against language anxiety. When threatened by his mother’s comment, his initial defense mechanism took a more forceful form, displacement. In this way, the specific defense mechanism employed against anxiety at one time could be altered at another time as the nature of anxiety provoking situations was changed. His use of displacement was a kind of eruption that was almost certainly related to a sudden rise in his anxiety level. Notably, it was his own mother, whom he trusted most, who was producing a threat to the validity of his defense mechanism. Thus, it is likely that he quickly became angry, and his defense mechanism took a more intense form. In this sense, it can be said that language anxiety is not always simply about language learning. Very often it has much to do with interpersonal interaction and relation (Ehrman, 1996; Pappamihiel, 2002). Eugene may not have gone to such an extent in employing displacement as his defense mechanism if it was not his own mother threatening the validity of his initial defense mechanism, competition.

Among the elements of aggressive behaviors, there are two other expressions that characteristically differ from competition and displacement and thus are worthy of separate examination: interrogation and acting out. Interrogation is constantly cross-examining or asking a barrage of questions to keep others on the defensive. This aspect of aggressive behavior was not observed among the participants of this study. In view of their limited English proficiency, it could be hardly expected that they would be able to employ interrogation as a defense mechanism against language anxiety. In the case of acting out, which is an expression of anxious feelings in actions rather than words, such as pushing a classmate aside rather than saying, “Excuse me.” Obviously though, there were a variety of gestures and body language that
the participants displayed. However, none of them were acting out in a way that involved elements of aggression, and thus could not be viewed as employing a defense mechanism in the sense of aggressive behavior. Among the defense mechanisms displayed by the participants of this study, overall, displacement, examined shortly before, was the most intense reaction to an anxiety provoking situation. Indeed, it is fortunate to be able to report that no participant used inappropriate acting out to lessen their language anxiety.

**Group Manipulation Behaviors**

Group manipulation behaviors are a kind of collective manifestation of language anxiety such as forming an emotional subgroup alliance in which they protect and support each other. In this study, group manipulation behavior was displayed by Anna, one of the participants with lower anxiety. In fact, she had not shown any apparent indication of significant language anxiety in the ESOL class. Yet, when she moved to mainstream classes, she displayed visible signs of anxiety such as remaining calm and often unresponsive to the class, though looking more active and involved than Hannah and Eugene who both had a higher anxiety level. In addition to avoidance, Anna was observed forming an emotional subgroup as a defense mechanism in mainstream classes. Her use of group formation was the only case found among the participants in this study.

Anna formed an informal nationality-based subgroup with a Korean girl, Jin, who was a classmate in mainstream classes. Jin came to America six months earlier than Anna, and was exited from the ESOL class one semester earlier. She spoke a little bit better English than Anna. They were together holding each other’s hand, literally speaking, whenever they moved. The researcher witnessed various signs of their close friendship. For example, they sat together in classes whenever it was allowed, such as in music class, and ran together side by side in P.E. class. It was even observed that when Anna came back to the class from the media center, the first thing she did was look at Jin with a smile as if she was checking to see whether Jin was OK. In an interview, moreover, she identified Jin as the most comfortable person to talk with in
English, because “Jin even let me know and correct my mistakes (in speaking English).”

Facing language anxiety in mainstream classes, it is highly probable that both Anna and Jin employed subgroup formation as a defense mechanism, by which they protected and supported each other. Evidently it was not only Anna who had benefited from this subgroup. In fact, Jin was one of the participants in a pilot study for this research, and therefore the researcher was very familiar with her. In the pilot study, as mentioned earlier, it was discovered that due to English language anxiety, Jin threw up after she arrived at school for the whole first month. In light of this, therefore, it can be said that this subgroup formation had rendered mutual benefits for mitigating their language anxiety.

Here, it should be noted that other participants had not been found to employ subgroup formation as a defense mechanism. Sunny, who showed the lowest language anxiety, expressed that it did not matter whether or not she had a Korean classmate in mainstream classes now. Yet, she admitted that last semester, she also formed a subgroup with a Korean classmate and, like Anna, she had been with the Korean classmate all the time at school. Additionally, all of the remaining participants had stated to the researcher their wish to have a Korean classmate in their mainstream classes. Nevertheless, the use of subgroup formation was not a viable option for them due to the absence of candidates with whom they could form such a group. To form subgroup with American classmates, above all, their English would have to be good enough to communicate in order to build a close friendship. For example, Tom was the object of Eugene’s displacement, and they did not form a subgroup. As was seen earlier, the reason for it had much to do with communication problems between them.

With regard to forming a subgroup with a Korean classmate, it was out of the question even if they had intended to do so because Eugene, Jay, and Sunny alike had no Korean classmate in their mainstream classes. As for Hannah, she had a boy candidate for a subgroup, but the researcher observed no indication that they formed subgroup to alleviate their English language anxiety. It appeared that gender difference surely hampered its formation to some
extent, but the more important reason was that the Korean boy had already been in the US for five years, and had ample opportunities to learn English by attending preschool and kindergarten for three years. Indeed, he was very fluent in speaking English and showed no problem in getting along in mainstream classes. As such, there was not much of a mutual benefit to be gained by forming a subgroup. Rather than gender difference alone, therefore, the lack of mutual benefit could be the principal reason for the absence of a subgroup formation between them.

**Compromise Behaviors**

Compromise behaviors are in sharp contrast especially to avoidance or withdrawal, and their examples include studying harder (anticipation), seeking out help from teachers and classmates, or trying to help others rather than simply giving up. Accordingly, this kind of defense mechanism can be viewed as constructive responses to language anxiety, and usually shown by relatively mature language learners. In this study too, this defense mechanism was displayed by two participants with such a characteristic: Anna and Sunny who are sisters. They were the oldest, the most fluent English speakers, the least anxious, and the most mature ones among the participants of this study. As non-native English speakers, they were relatively fluent in English, and thus it appeared that they had little problem in getting along in the ESOL class. Yet, their English was still lacking in comparison to native English speaking peers, as the results of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) indicated. Even though their levels of language anxiety were notably lower than those of other participants, for this reason, they also had shown many indications of English language anxiety in mainstream classes such as avoidance or withdrawal under certain situations. Unlike other participants, nevertheless, their defense mechanisms against language anxiety in mainstream classes additionally included one of compromise behaviors: anticipation - studying harder.

When they had tests or assignments and thus experienced anxiety, both Ana and Sunny studied harder or prepared in advance rather than trying to rationalize - “It’s OK even though
the result is not good, because I am not a native English speaker” - or to generalize - “No ESOL student can do well on this kind of test.” This point became evident by the following conversations in an interview with Sunny and Anna.

RESEARCHER: Which subject is the most difficult for you?
SUNNY: To me? Science, sometimes.
RESEARCHER: Is it because of English or its contents?
SUNNY: Because of (English) words.
RESEARCHER: Even though you are OK with its contents?
SUNNY: Yes, but I often can’t understand the meanings of (English) vocabulary.
RESEARCHER: I saw you nodded as if you understood well when your teacher talked about Leukemia Concentration Camp or something like that. Did you really understand those?
SUNNY: Yes, I read about those yesterday (at home). Yesterday we finished Expedition part (so I knew we would talk about Depression today). Because I did not know about Depression, I searched about it in internet and read all about it. That’s why I understood the story well.

As can be seen above, this comment clearly indicates her use of anticipation. This kind of anticipation was also demonstrated by Anna, and her comments are worth noting.

RESEARCHER: Do have feel a burden when you have a test?
ANNA: In the past, yes, not anymore.
RESEARCHER: Didn’t you study very hard for a test such as for spelling test?
ANNA: (laughing)
RESEARCHER: Did you?
ANNA: Nowadays, I can take the spelling test with the simple preparation like reading and
writing the words one time for each.

RESEARCHER: How many hours did you study for a spelling test then?

ANNA: I had to study on every Thursday. On Thursday I had to go to take a tennis lesson. As
soon as I came back home from the tennis lesson, I did homework first, and then took
out the notes and studied them.

RESEARCHER: As soon as coming back home from the tennis lesson?

ANNA: Sometimes, I took a rest, but sometimes I just started to study.

RESEARCHER: So you worried about next day’s spelling test all the time?

ANNA: Yes.

RESEARCHER: So you memorized all of them completely?

ANNA: Yes, I studied just like that yesterday, too.

RESEARCHER: Still now you do that?

ANNA: Yes, I had the test today, so I did it the day before yesterday.

RESEARCHER: How many hours did you study for that test?

ANNA: …..

RESEARCHER: One or two or three hours?

ANNA: Until when I go to bed.

RESEARCHER: You continued until the bed time?

ANNA: (Yes) I memorized every single word, and then read a book. Then again memorize them.

RESEARCHER: Again?

ANNA: Yes, after that, I go to bed.

In the above Anna definitely displayed her use of anticipation. A very interesting part of
her comments was that initially she did not admit an ongoing employment of anticipation by
saying that she had used it in the past but not any more. Yet, later she acknowledged her ample
use of anticipation (thus presence of language anxiety) not only in the past but also at the present time. From her early comment, it can be noticed that Anna was protective about having her language anxiety revealed. As Cummins (1996) pointed out, a level of language proficiency exposed to others is not only the measure of students’ ability in language skills, but also often used as the measure of judgment about their significance as individuals. Accordingly, Anna might be worrying that her feelings of language anxiety due to limited English might be unduly construed by the others as an indication of her overall incompetence, not just in English. This could be one of the reasons why the participants had often been protective about their feelings of English language anxiety at least initially. In a different way, this may suggest an additional reason why mainstream classes are more anxiety provoking situation than the ESOL class. Along with three reasons detailed earlier, it may be because poor performance in mainstream classes might be unfairly carried away to mean their overall incompetence, thereby jeopardizing their self-image as competent.

In mainstream classes, as has been seen so far, the participants of this study responded differently. In the case of Anna and Sunny, though avoidance was often used, at the same time they tried to fight through the new learning tasks by gearing themselves up as much as possible to be successful in mainstream classes. In other words, they showed a clear case of facilitating anxiety, or it may be that they transformed language anxiety, frequently debilitating to many other language learners, into facilitating one with the harder works and longer preparation which might not be necessary if they were under different situations.

**Research Question 4:**

**What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in their coping strategies?**

For reasons detailed earlier, the participants of this study showed that they were more anxious in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class. As shown in Table 10, accordingly, the defense mechanisms employed in the ESOL class and mainstream classes had been different not only in the extent of how often a certain defense mechanism, avoidance, had been used, but also
in diversity of coping strategies employed by the participants in each class. Not to mention Anna and Sunny who had a better command of English, Eugene, Hannah and Jay also displayed a

Table 10: Differences in defense mechanism between the ESOL and mainstream classes found in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight Behaviors</th>
<th>ESOL Class</th>
<th>Mainstream Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General avoidance or withdrawal: present but far less than mainstream classes</td>
<td>-General avoidance or withdrawal: clearly visible and much more frequently used than in the ESOL class (e.g., Jay not explaining about a book for the AR Test)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction formation: helping each other by pointing word by word</td>
<td>-Reaction formation: Eugene showing his completed math worksheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy: Eugene wishing the ESOL teacher was able to speak Korean</td>
<td>-Fantasy: Hannah wishing to return to Korea, and Eugene wishing not to go to school like Hannah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom: shown by Jay, Eugene, and Hannah to avoid being called upon.</td>
<td>-Boredom: Eugene giving another probable reason for not wanting to go to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalization: Eugene giving another probable reason for not wanting to go to school</td>
<td>-Generalization: Jay and Hannah stating that everybody feels anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalization: Jay and Hannah stating that everybody feels anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>ESOL Class</th>
<th>Mainstream Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition: Eugene and Hannah over the numbers of words they each wrote, and Jay trying to submit assignments the fastest</td>
<td>-Competition: Jay trying to submit assignments the fastest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement: Eugene expressing anger when his superiority on math was threatened</td>
<td>-Displacement: Eugene expressing anger when his superiority on math was threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Manipulation Behaviors</th>
<th>ESOL Class</th>
<th>Mainstream Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>Forming subgroups: Anna forming a subgroup with a Korean classmate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compromise Behaviors</th>
<th>ESOL Class</th>
<th>Mainstream Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>Anticipation: Anna and Sunny studying hard for tests and preparing for classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

marked difference in their use of avoidance between the ESOL class and mainstream classes. As mentioned earlier, they had been much more active and responsive to class activities in the
ESOL classes than in mainstream classes where avoidance had been evidently their most common defense mechanism against language anxiety. Even Anna and Sunny, who displayed almost no incidence of avoidance in the ESOL class, had been often found to rely on avoidance as a defense mechanism when they moved to mainstream classes, though less frequently than other participants. This difference is easily comprehensible considering that the level of English language anxiety was much higher in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class.

Similarly, other aspects of flight behaviors had been apparently more marked in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class. As shown in Table 10, boredom was shown by Jay, Eugene, and Hannah to avoid being called upon, Eugene rationalized not wanting to go to school, generalization of language anxiety was used by Jay and Hannah, reaction formation was employed by Eugene to get help from a classmate, and fantasy was illustrated by Hannah and Eugene. In contrast, other elements of flight behaviors, shown in the ESOL class, were only reaction formation and fantasy, but even these elements had been displayed in a milder manner than in mainstream classes.

Turning to aggressive behaviors, competition was seen both in the ESOL class and in mainstream classes. However, displacement which is emotionally a stronger form of defense mechanism than competition, was found as being associated only with mainstream classes. In the case of two remaining defense mechanisms, group manipulation behaviors and compromise behaviors, similarly, they had not been shown in the ESOL class whereas their two cases, forming subgroups and anticipation, had been displayed in mainstream classes. In light of what has been analyzed so far, in sum, it can be said that English language anxiety was more severely displayed in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class, and accordingly, the defense mechanism had been more diversely and intensively employed by the participants of this study in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class.

**Research Question 5:**

**What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students?**

Alleviating the ESOL students’ anxiety and thus minimizing their defensive behaviors, such as avoidance, detrimental to their leaning new language as well as academic progress, is one of the
most difficult tasks that the ESOL and mainstream teachers alike face. In particular, this task poses a
greater challenge for mainstream teachers, since the priority of mainstream classes is normally set on
academic development of native English speaking students, and thus the additional resources and time
that mainstream teachers can make available to the ESOL students, are often limited (Walker, Shafer
& Liams, 2004). Though under such a situation, generally speaking, the mainstream teachers in the
school of the research site were found to be well aware of the presence of language anxiety, to
understand the ESOL students’ difficulty related to language anxiety, and to have tried to provide the
ESOL students with special academic and emotional support in a variety of ways. As for the ESOL
teacher, the researcher found that she had exemplified what an ESOL teacher should do to make the
language learners feel less anxious about learning English as well as being in school in general. She
also made the ESOL class a shelter, an environment where the students felt safe. Although the
preceding characterization is fairly accurate to represent ESOL and mainstream teachers at the
research site, nevertheless, it should be noted here that there was one case that differed from such
general characterizations.

Above all, recognition of the ESOL students’ language anxiety is an essential prerequisite for
coping strategies to be construed and then for appropriate mitigating actions to be taken against
language anxiety. No further steps against language anxiety can be expected, if the presence of
language anxiety among them is not recognized. At the research site, almost all of the teachers
observed and interviewed by the researcher clearly recognized the presence of language anxiety, and
more importantly, they understood the difficulties associated with learning a new language. Needless
to say, first of all, the ESOL teacher well recognized the presence of language anxiety and difficulties
associated with it. In view of her professional training and experience in linguistic and cultural
diversity as mentioned previously, her familiarity with language anxiety was not at all surprising.
What was more than I expected was that almost all of mainstream teachers were well aware of
language anxiety due to their own experiences or out of empathy. This point can be evidenced by the
following comments:
RESEARCHER: ….Have you ever taken a foreign language?

Mrs. Debb: Have I? I took Spanish in high school.

RESEARCHER: For how long?

Mrs. Debb: Just for two years.

RESEARCHER: Did you like it?

Mrs. Debb: Uh, no. I can imagine though what it must kind of be like coming here and not knowing the language. I think I appreciate it. I think it’s wonderful that they can speak two languages. But no, I really didn’t care for it.

RESEARCHER: So were you anxious in the classroom at that time?

Mrs. Debb: Well, I was in high school, too, so that was different. I think ‘frustrate’ would be a better word. Because I know when I took Spanish 1, we were just learning, but in Spanish 2, I had this teacher and she wouldn’t even let you go to the restroom if you couldn’t ask in Spanish. You were supposed to walk in the door and speak Spanish. That was very hard so I could understand (Korean ESOL students) because Spanish is, you know, very different. I am sure Korean is, too.

Similarly, another teacher talked about her experience of being anxious, when she learned a new language.

RESEARCHER: Were you anxious in your foreign language class?

Mrs. Baker: Of course, of course I was.

RESEARCHER: Then you understand what your ESOL student feels.

Mrs. Baker: Absolutely. I remember. Oh, boy, …. She made us stand in front of class and sing the national anthem in French.

RESEARCHER: Oh!
Mrs. Baker: Back when I went to school, they weren’t quite so nice. They could do stuff like that. So yes. I was very anxious.

Another teacher spoke about language anxiety. Although she ‘loved’ learning a new language and had no experience of feeling language anxiety back then, as will been seen, her comments evidently indicated that she understood the hardship of the ESOL students by putting herself in Sunny’s shoes (empathy).

RESEARCHER: Did you take a foreign language?
Mrs. Frank: I took Spanish.
RESEARCHER: In high school?
Mrs. Frank: Yes.
RESEARCHER: Did you like learning the language?
Mrs. Frank: I loved it.
RESEARCHER: Oh, so you were not anxious at all in the class?
Mrs. Frank: Mm-hmm. Not really, but now, I am going to tell you something. When I see Sunny had a Korean workbook, it was a reading workbook, she showed it to me and I opened the book and I imagined myself as a student, an American, going to her country and having to sit in class and deal with that. And it would be quiet overwhelming. So I would definitely be overwhelmed. That makes me really respect what these students have to go through; what they have to deal with and how they are doing.

As expected, it was heard and observed by the researcher that the teachers including the ESOL teacher made a variety of special efforts to mitigate the language anxiety of their ESOL students, which are summarized below:

- For the initial months at school, the ESOL students were allowed a silent period
during which they generally ceased verbal communication with English speakers. During this period, therefore, ESOL students are not required to participate in class activities that involved speaking English.

- As a corollary of the above, ESOL students were not called on unless their hands were raised; the practice of calling on individuals randomly in front of their peers was avoided.

- The ESOL students sat next to a classmate, if available, who spoke their first language or by an American classmate who would be helpful to them.

- Individual monitoring such as checking whether the ESOL students opened to the right page or making sure that they knew about a special event and/or changes in the schedule.

- Frequently praising their work so that they do not lose confidence and gain a sense of competence.

- Creating a warm social environment for the ESOL students by talking to other children about her being brand new to this country and how we could help her, reminding other children that their mistakes in English are natural, and thus not to laugh at their mistakes, or praising other children for being kind to the ESOL students.

- Using pair works or small group works rather than larger groups in which the ESOL students are more likely to be left out.

- Being a facilitator to whom the ESOL students felt comfortable asking questions or one they saw as always ready to help when needed.

- Providing the ESOL students with the opportunities to display their talents such as in math class.

- Showing teachers’ interest in the country from which the ESOL students came and giving them the chance to talk about their country in class if they volunteered.

- Employing a longer wait time for the ESOL students, but not waiting too long,
such as until they give a satisfactory response.

Among the teachers of the participants in this study, without a doubt, it was the ESOL teacher who had made full use of the above mitigating strategies and more importantly was most effective. As can been seen from earlier discussion, the participants of this study expressed clearly that they felt less anxious in the ESOL class than in mainstream classes, and the reasons for it were not only that the language proficiency required in the ESOL class was less demanding than in mainstream classes. As pointed out before, it was also possible because additional teaching strategies were employed, and a close relationship that the ESOL teacher had successfully fostered with the students, made her mitigating strategies have larger effects than normally expected. Including the mitigating strategies listed above, the ESOL teacher has shown additional strategies not observed in mainstream classes. They can be summarized as following.

- Talking slowly and clearly so that her students could understand; using repetition employing other or simpler ways (e.g., she told the class “Wrap it up,” but having noticed some students seemed not to understand it, she rephrased with easier words for them, “Let’s finish,” and “It has to be ended.”).

- Using a lot of gestures and body languages helpful to their understanding while talking to the class (while saying “Give it to me,” she made a gesture of opening her hands forward, signaling what she meant as well as her being ready to receive it).

- Giving instruction clearly by using a model or a sample. (e.g., when instruction on assignment was given, she not only said what to do, but also showed how to do it with a sample).

- Using charts or pictures (e.g., when talking an animal (ground hog) which did not exist in Korea and thus unfamiliar to the Korean ESOL students, its picture was shown to them).
- Showing her personal interest in each student of the class that fostered an intimate interpersonal relationship between her and an individual student that differed from that between her and the class as a whole (e.g., asking, “Eugene, what did you do with Jin (his brother) last weekend?).

- Summarizing what the class did at the end to help them see what they had learned and thus give the students a sense of achievement.

- Allowing the students to use their first language when they had a classmate who could speak the same first language. This may sound detrimental to their learning English, but a number of empirical studies have demonstrated otherwise (Ariza, 2002; Cummins, 1986). It appeared that she was aware of this and thus she allowed her students to do so in class. This further indicates why professional training is necessary for working with the ESOL students.

As has been discussed so far, generally speaking, it can be said that the teachers in the research site well recognized the presence of language anxiety, understood the difficulties associated with learning a new language, and accordingly had employed a number of mitigating strategies for the ESOL students. As pointed out earlier, nevertheless, there was one mainstream teacher who differed from this general characterization in important ways. This case needs to be introduced in detail, for it could demonstrate that even well qualified mainstream teachers with common sense and good intentions may not be able to effectively address the special needs of the ESOL students, unless they have had professional training and experience in working with the student with limited English proficiency. There was no question that this teacher was a superb educator, well-prepared, articulate, and cared about her students. Thus there was not much difference from the other teachers observed, except for one thing; she had neither professional training nor previous experience in working with the ESOL students until Hannah arrived. All of other teachers had sixty hours of formal training for their ESOL endorsement as well as ESOL students in their classes this year and in previous years.
Consequently, it is highly probable that this difference could account for what will be presented below.

On the existence of language anxiety, above all, she told the following to the researcher.

RESEARCHER: Did you take a foreign language when you were a high school student or…?

Mrs. Smith: Spanish. I took Spanish for eight years.

RESEARCHER: Wow. So does it help to teach ESOL children?

Mrs. Smith: Not Korean. I just use simple English words for her.

RESEARCHER: Did you enjoy learning Spanish?

Mrs. Smith: Mm-hmm. ……

RESEARCHER: I just wanted to ask you whether you were an anxious student in the foreign language class or not.

Mrs. Smith: No, I wasn’t, because everybody else was learning Spanish. We were not in with Spanish people. No, none. I didn’t have any anxiety. I was very young and it was what we had to do. And everybody did it……

Literally speaking, her comments are unambiguous that she did not feel any language anxiety when she learned a new language. Yet, the researcher wondered that she might have had at least some experience of language anxiety in light of her use of defense mechanisms: rationalization (“it was what we had to do”) and generalization (“everybody did it”). Her use of defense mechanism suggests that she might feel language anxiety, though unaware of it. She also pointed out a mitigating situation of language anxiety - no native Spanish speaker was present in the class. Nevertheless, her misconception on language anxiety was a point of concern. She indirectly stated that she did not feel language anxiety because she “was very young,” implying that young children may not experience language anxiety as adults do. As was emphasized in the beginning of this study, however, this assumption is very questionable not only in view of a number of relevant studies (e.g., Foxman, 2004;
Hembree, 1988; Hills, 1972) that have shown that children are not impervious to anxiety arousal, but also specific studies (Ariza, 2002; Swain & Burnaby, 1976) dealing with language anxiety of children, not to mention this study, that have demonstrated the existence of language anxiety among young children as well as the detrimental effects of anxiety on their language learning and performance.

Examined together, it is readily conceivable that when the aforementioned teacher learned a new language, in light of her use of defense mechanisms, she herself did experience at least some language anxiety. However, the language anxiety was not recognized. Likewise, it seemed that she did not notice the language anxiety of her ESOL student either. Rather, it appeared that to her, an indication of language anxiety must be clearly overt and intense; otherwise it could not be language anxiety as she defined it. In an interview where she described a scene of her ESOL student coming to school for the first time, she stated as follows:

RESEARCHER: Did you feel her (Hannah’s) anxiety when she came in for the first time?
Mrs. Smith: She seemed a little timid, but not very much. I mean she is really adjusted very well. I was actually very surprised. No tears, no…. when her parents left, you know, She rode the bus, got right in the bus line, she’s very strong willed. If she had a lot of anxiety, I didn’t see it.

As she implied, it is right that sometimes anxious language learners express their anxiety straightforwardly and in an intense manner, such as acting out (crying). However, it is more common that their anxiety is only recognizable when it is inferred from the behaviors seemingly unrelated to language anxiety, such as competition or forming subgroups. In fact, the ESOL student whom she talked about is the most anxious participant (Hannah) in this study, who not only scored the highest in ELAS test but also had displayed the most diverse defense mechanisms along with Eugene. In view of the fact that she had not recognized her own language anxiety, it would be not surprising that she could not identify her students’ language anxiety. Yet it was unexpected to the researcher that she
failed to see the presence of language anxiety even in Hannah who repeatedly displayed various indications of language anxiety.

Nevertheless, it was heard and directly observed by the researcher that she made various efforts to mitigate the ESOL students’ difficulties in the class, if not specifically language anxiety as she understood, such as making the ESOL student sit next to a classmate who spoke Korean during the first month of school, trying not to call on the ESOL student unless their hands were raised, checking whether the ESOL students opened the right page, trying to write down the correct answers in their daily works, and individually monitoring them. In an interview, however, the teacher mentioned that rather than doing so herself, sometimes she relied on the ESOL teacher for seemingly difficult tasks, “If I need something for them to learn or grasp, I do prepare forms that go to our ESOL teacher. And she will work with them.” She later added the following:

“….. if she seems to be confused about… like if we have a change in our schedule, if we are having a celebration in the cafeteria or something, I would like him (the Korean classmate) to explain it to her so that she does not have anxiety or could understand where she is going because I don’t like that feeling, I don’t want my children to feel that way. So things like that I do. I don’t really have him interpret school work any more. I try to let her figure that out. Or have her take it to ESOL and have her to try to figure it out there.”

From the above comment, it is clear that in addition to her own efforts to lesson anxious feelings of her ESOL students, she let the matters be taken care of in the ESOL class. This could point to her close working relations with the ESOL teacher or one illustration of the view pervasive among mainstream teachers that the good learning for the ESOL students takes place in the ESOL classroom (Franson, 1999). If it is the latter, such a view could be taken as a justification for mainstream teachers not to try to make curricular and instructional adaptations for the ESOL students, and it would be detrimental to their learning English as well as academic progress (Youngs & Youngs, 2001). This point cannot be emphasized too much in light of the fact that it is mainstream classrooms where ESOL students spend most of time at school.
As has been seen, the last teacher represented the view of second language learning quite differently from other teachers observed in this study. This difference can be attributed to a number of the factors, but it is hard to pinpoint other than a lack of understanding the complexities and enormity of challenges that the ESOL students face in learning a new language. They were all highly qualified teachers, but only she had neither professional training nor previous experience in working with the ESOL students. Indeed, she did not choose to get an ESOL endorsement until forced to do so by the fact that she now had the ESOL students in her classroom. In the school of research site, 95% of mainstream teachers had formal training in working with the ESOL students, and thus those who did not composed only a small minority of mainstream teachers. It is very extraordinary in light of the fact that only 12% of K-12 teachers nationwide have training in working with the ESOL students (McCloskey, 2002). This school will be even more extraordinary in a good way, for the last teacher informed the researcher that she would participate in an ESOL training very soon.

**Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications**

In the literature review, this study began by outlining all-encompassing theories on anxiety (Bandura, 1991; Pekrun, 1992), derived from psychology, and then moved to more directly related theories developed in literature specifically dealing with language anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994a). As expected, both have provided a variety of theoretical insights very useful not only in preparing for this study but also in drawing theoretical and educational implications from its findings. In the following, a link between theory and practice will be made by recasting the findings of this study in light of some relevant theories that were reviewed earlier.

**Theoretical Implications**

Among general theories on anxiety, first of all, Pekrun’s (1992) Expectancy-Value Theory of Anxiety (EVTA) and Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-efficacy would be the most frequently used theoretical frameworks in the literature of language anxiety. As Pappamihiel (1999, 12) points out, taken together they suggest that “feelings of anxiety rest on two
components: appraisals of event as threatening or non-threatening and appraisals of one’s own self-efficacy in dealing with those events.” The key word in this conceptualization is appraisal that obviously contains an element of subjectivity. In other words, the construct of threat and appraisal of self-efficacy are made subjectively and on an individual basis, and thus the propensity to anxiety varies from person to person. In the face of a mildly threatening event, for instance, some people may exaggerate its danger, or they underestimate their control over its danger, resulting in a feeling of anxiety. For some people, conversely, an objectively threatening situation is appraised as ‘concerning but manageable,’ and thus does not result in anxiety arousal.

Though too simplified, it could be a fair synopsis that outlines the central elements of Pekrun’s (1992) Expectancy-Value Theory of Anxiety (EVTA) and Bandura’s (1991) theory of self-efficacy. As seen above, by and large, the findings of this study are consistent with these two theories. The participants indicated their own appraisal of mainstream classes as more threatening and self-efficacy as less effective - linguistically more “demanding” and “difficult”. Nevertheless, it should be noted that as Pappamihiel (2002) found, the results of this study indicate that language anxiety has much to do with social and interpersonal interaction. In this study, more specifically, language anxiety had to do more with how ‘others,’ such as classmates, would appraise the participants’ ‘overall’ competence, not just in English.

Accordingly, it appears that language anxiety might not be neither simply what Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) refer to as apprehension about negative evaluation of their second language by the fluent speakers in the class nor just what Guida and Ludow (1989) define as test anxiety stemming from the fear of failure (hence negative evaluation) in a particular test. Rather, it seems to be an apprehension about the negative halo effect (or devil effect), whereby a person evaluates another as low on overall competence because the individual is low on one aspect such as linguistic competence (Asch, 1946). As seen above, the participants of this study had displayed their anxiety more out of fear about negative evaluation of their overall competence by others than that of English made by themselves. For instance, Eugene’s superiority of math
over Tom was a bulwark against such a negative evaluation, and he constantly wanted to make it known to his classmates to prevent his limited English from being unduly taken as a sign of his overall competence. Moreover, Eugene’s level of anxiety suddenly erupted when his bulwark against this sort of negative appraisal was threatened. As such, language anxiety involves more than the mismatch between one’s own appraisal of threatening event (linguistically demanding) and self-efficacy in one aspect at hand (linguistic incompetence). Rather, it is more concerned with others’ evaluation and more importantly with broader issues (negative halo effect) than linguistic incompetence alone.

In the literature on language anxiety, secondly, language anxiety has been conceptualized as having two contrasting components: facilitating anxiety that affects language learning positively, and debilitating anxiety that hampers it (Scovel, 1978). As mentioned before, a number of studies (Chastain, 1975; Kleinmann, 1977; Tucker, Hamayan & Genesee, 1976) have empirically shown that a modest anxiety could generate a positive result, whereas too much anxiety could produce negative results. In this study, similarly, the participants with the lowest anxiety level, Anna and Sunny, displayed a sign of facilitating anxiety (anticipation - studying harder) whereas those with the highest (Eugene and Hannah) most evidently indicated the presence of debilitating anxiety (avoidance). These findings taken together might confirm that the lower level of anxiety, the more likely to be facilitating anxiety, and vice versa. However, it should be stressed that such findings could be interpreted differently.

As seen above, Anna and Sunny used a defense mechanism, anticipation, which could enhance their self-efficacy, thereby resulting in lesser and lesser anxiety as they used it further. On the contrary, Eugene and Hannah mainly relied on avoidance that might work to avert anxiety provoking situations temporarily, but could not increase their self-efficacy. Rather, their avoidance could work to increase their anxiety level, since their use of avoidance limited their social interactions and language learning opportunities, thereby resulting in lower and lower self-efficacy as they employed it further. When seen in this way, hence, it may not be
appropriate to construe the above findings as an indication of causality that Anna and Sunny showed a facilitating aspect of language anxiety because they had the lower level of anxiety, while Eugene and Hannah displayed its debilitating aspect because they had a higher anxiety level. Rather it seems more reasonable to state that Anna and Sunny showed a lower level of anxiety because they had used a defense mechanism effective in increasing their self-efficacy whereas Eugene and Hannah had mainly employed a defense mechanism harmful to becoming self-efficacious. In a word, it might be neither a lower anxiety nor a higher anxiety per se that affects performance positively (facilitating) or negatively (debilitating), but different defense mechanisms each individual chose to employ against anxiety provoking situation such that anticipation leads to a better performance whereas avoidance hampers it.

With this conceptualization, then, it is possible to come up with the theoretical implication that language anxiety is not only situation-specific in that its level can differ from one situation to another, but also ‘response-specific’ in that its level can vary depending on what defense mechanism has been mainly employed so far. Additionally, it can be stated that the interaction between language anxiety and defense mechanisms employed is an on-going process. Therefore, a level of anxiety seen today could reflect in part how well an individual has responded to previous anxiety provoking situations. Similarly, no less significantly than the specific situations to be faced in the future or the innate propensity to anxiety, the future level of anxiety would depend on with what defense mechanism the individual will respond to the anxiety eliciting situation in the days to come. This conceptualization is possible in this study for it is the first research attempt to focus on defense mechanism with Ehrman’s (1996) theoretical framework that specifically addresses how people respond to language anxiety.

As pointed out earlier, thirdly, the previous research has paid little attention to the language anxiety that young children may experience in learning a second language. In the literature of language anxiety, consequently, there have been almost no theoretical insights specifically addressing those of young children in spite of a vast amount of relevant theories and
their empirical applications to language anxiety experienced by adults. In the current literature, the sources of language anxiety, its relations with performance and its coping strategies have been construed with no specific reference to young children. Though helpful in many cases, these theoretical insights are often found to be limited in addressing language anxiety of young children. In suggesting the coping strategies, for instance, the existing literature (e.g., Donley, 1997; 1999, Scarcella and Oxford, 1992) has highlighted what the students and teachers should do to mitigate language anxiety, but the roles of their caregivers such as parents are hardly mentioned for the obvious reasons that they are mainly concerned with the adults. In the case of adults, appraisals of events as threatening or non-threatening and appraisals of one’s own self-efficacy are made mostly on their own. As for young children, however, they are greatly influenced by their caregivers, and hence their level of anxiety is much subject to whether or not their caregivers provide them with necessary support and encouragement.

In the current literature, moreover, detrimental effects of language anxiety are usually related to their language learning (Hembree, 1988; Blankstein, Toner & Flett, 1989; Cassady & Johnson, 2002). Therefore, language anxiety is problematic mainly because it hampers their language learning. This could be so in case of the adults, but to young children it has more dire consequences than simply not learning the language well. These may include low self-esteem, deficient interpersonal skills and adjustment difficulty, which seriously and enduringly hinder meaningful social interactions with others. The deficiencies in social interactions could have serious consequence for children not only because they usually acquire the language of socialization and daily life from social interaction with other students and adults (Tabors, 1997) but also because residuals of these deficiencies could remain with them through life (Berk, 2003). Tabors (1997) refers to children caught in this double bind situation as “omega children” (Tabors, 1997, p. 35) and writes that they are often socially ineffective because they lack the skills to interact in English, and are often excluded from interaction that would help develop their linguistic skills exactly because they do not possess such skills to maintain effective
Because of language limitations, as seen earlier, the participants of this study tended to have few friends, and routine social interaction with American peers was difficult for them, thereby resulting in a vicious cycle of little interaction with American peers and social isolation at school ensued which induced language anxiety. In light of the above discussion, in summary, it can be said that the lack of attention to the language anxiety of young children in the current literature not only caused an underestimation of its negative effects on young children but also hindered the theoretical progress in fleshing out specific strategies to mitigate language anxiety unique to young children - important roles of caregivers.

**Pedagogical Implications**

Turning to pedagogical implications, the first thing to highlight would be the need of professional ESOL education training for mainstream teachers. Common sense and good intention are not enough in working with language minority students. As pointed out before, it was consistently found in the previous studies (Byrnes, Kiger & Manning, 1996; 1997; Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004; Youngs & Youngs, 2001) that professional training is one of the most important factors in fostering positive attitudes towards the ESOL students, which in turn facilitates a better accommodation of their social needs (being comfortable in the class), not to mention the teachers’ acquisition of a broad range of pedagogical expertise in addressing their academic needs (academic progress at school). The results of this study also indicate a similar effect. It was the ESOL teacher who was found to be the most effective in addressing their social needs. In contrast, it was one mainstream teacher with neither formal training nor experience in working with language minority students, who displayed the least understanding on language anxiety experienced by ESOL students and also made the least mitigating efforts among the mainstream teachers. In view of this difference as well as considering that only 12% of K-12 teachers nationwide have training in working with the ESOL students (McCloskey, 2002), providing mainstream teachers with the professional training in working with language minority students might be a high priority for US
The second pedagocial implication is concerned with the inclusion model. The inclusion model, originally developed from special education, has been suggested and widely practiced as an alternative to a self-contained classroom for ESOL instruction (Walker, Shafer & Liams, 2004). The logic behind the inclusion model is to admit limited English proficient students quickly into mainstream regular classroom activities so they can be fully involved in the standard curriculum and ideally reach educational equity with English speaking peers (Platt, 2001). In addition, the inclusion model has been also touted as offering them more opportunities for the social interactions with native English speaking peers. Yet, the inclusion model can be successful when a number of requisite conditions are met such as adequate teacher training, existence of curricular resources, positive teacher attitudes, and sufficient resources to support students in inclusion settings. As Platt (2001) pointed out, numerous studies (e.g., Harklau, 1994; Platt, Harper & Mendoza, 2003) have shown that in reality these conditions are hard to obtain. Hence, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to have its successful implementation, even if the rationales for inclusion model are sensible.

Whereas other research has questioned the implementability of the inclusion model, the findings of this study cast a doubt on the soundness of its rationales. As seen above, high anxiety level is associated with mainstream classes, and inclusion might further heighten the anxiety level that the ESOL students experience in mainstream classes. It is highly probable that without an adequate level of social English, increased opportunities of social interaction with native English speaking peers are of little use. Likewise without an adequate level of academic English, inclusion could leads to diminished feelings of self-efficacy. Therefore, inclusion might mean more opportunities for becoming highly anxious and thus more frequent use of unconstructive defense mechanisms such as avoidance or withdrawal. Nevertheless, it appears that the inclusion model shares an anachronistic assumption, ‘sink or swim’ presupposing that the learner naturally learns swimming in order not to be drowned in an inhospitable educational sea. On the contrary to this assumption, however, a number of studies (Bailey, Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 1999; Pappamihiel, 1999; 2002) including this study have
indicated that the most common response to such a situation is avoidance or withdrawal, and its detrimental effects on language learning can be hardly exaggerated.

On this point, Vygotsky’s social development theory (1978) also challenges inclusion model. Vygotsky (1978) suggests that learning and development are a continual movement from the current intellectual level to a higher level, which approximates the learner's potential. This movement takes place in the so-called Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In the ZPD lies a set of things which students cannot learn on their own, but which they can learn with the guidance from teachers and/or with the help of more capable peers. As learning and development are largely mediated by social interaction with more knowledgeable others, students’ social interactions with teachers and more capable peers have an important role in their learning and development (Hausfather, 1996). In this light, the ESOL students’ language learning and development could not be optimized in isolation, but rather they are attained through reciprocal experiences and interactions among the ESOL students and teachers as well as more capable peers. When the ESOL students withdraw from interactions with teachers and/or peers because they are placed into more anxious situations, consequently, their language learning and development could be negatively affected. Indeed, the importance of social interaction in language learning has been supported by many studies. For instance, the most successful language learners are found to be those students who engage in frequent and ongoing linguistic and social interactions with native speakers (Lindfors, 1991; Wong Fillmore, 1991). By contrast, it is shown that socially incompetent children usually avoid engaging in social interactions with native speakers and therefore, they tend to be poor language learners (Tabors, 1997).

Considering the significance of social contexts of learning and development, in sum, it can be stated that in reality the inclusion model might not materialize its intended effects, but on the contrary could lead to more avoidance or withdrawal that preempts the ESOL students’ emotional, cognitive and social interchange with teachers and/or peers, thereby possibly rendering the detrimental effects on their language learning and development.

Unlike the case of adults, finally, the roles of caregivers are important in mitigating the
language anxiety of young children. Because of their chronological age, it can hardly be expected that these young students are capable of controlling their language anxiety by themselves. In fact, they usually do not know what language anxiety is, not to mention how it affects their learning a new language. In this study, even the teacher showed little understanding about language anxiety, and all parents needed a long explanation from the researcher to comprehend rudimentary facts about language anxiety. For instance, Eugene’s mother had no idea why her son suddenly expressed anger at her remark that Tom also liked math. Thus it required the researcher’s detailed and painstaking explanation that he became very upset because she jeopardized the prerequisite of his initial defense mechanism, competition, against language anxiety. In this light, parents also need to understand at least the basic facts regarding language anxiety in order to help mitigate their children’s language anxiety. In particular, they might as well realize that children's language anxiety is mostly expressed through behaviors seemingly unrelated to language learning, such as avoidance, competition, or forming subgroups. At first, therefore, parents may not make the connection, but with increased understanding and a closer observation of children’s behaviors, they would be in a better position to notice and come up with coping strategies best suited to their children.

In addition, most parents could experience anxiety at one time or another, and they could be role models to the children. Therefore, the children will learn from the examples shown by the parents. If parents provide successful role models and encouragement, the children model positive risk-taking and coping strategies for managing language anxiety. Having specifically addressed language anxiety of young children, in summary, this study suggests pedagogical implications that call for an approach distinctive from those seen in the current literature on language anxiety.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Summary of Research Findings

With the purpose to filling in the gap of the previous research which paid little attention to the language anxiety of young children, this study has examined the dynamics of language anxiety with a main focus on young Korean elementary ESOL students in an American school setting. For the first time, in addition, this study has employed Ehrman’s (1996) specification of defense mechanisms in addressing how people respond to language anxiety. The findings of this study can be summarized as follows.

Research Question 1:

Is there a difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?

All of the participants of this study have shown one consistent pattern. They all felt language anxiety both in the ESOL class and in mainstream classes, but in a differing degree. The ESOL class was less anxiety provoking than mainstream classes. First, the result of the ELAS administered to the participants of this study demonstrated a modest but consistent pattern that they felt more anxious in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class, and this difference was manifested regardless of their individual level of language anxiety. Likewise, both observation and interviews have confirmed the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety with the latter being more anxiety-provoking than the former. This tendency was also found among the participants with a low level of language anxiety. As highly anxious participants did, they likewise became more anxious when they moved from the ESOL class to mainstream classes.
Research Question 2:

What factors account for the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of English language anxiety that Korean ESOL students experience?

Generally speaking, this study found three factors that explain the difference between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in the level of language anxiety. First, the higher level of English proficiency required to understand and succeed in mainstream classes than the ESOL class induced more anxiety there. As all participants of this study indicated, not surprisingly, mainstream classes posed greater challenges since they were deficient especially in Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP: Cummins, 2001), which is necessary to compete on an equal footing with native English speaking peers in mainstream classes. When they moved from the ESOL class to mainstream classes, as a result, they found mainstream classes more threatening and thus became more anxious.

Second, this study found homogeneity of class as non-native English speakers as another factor contributing to the lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class. This homogeneity fostered intimate interpersonal relationships among classmates, thereby creating a warm social environment that resulted in a lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class. By nature of the class homogeneity as English language learners, on the other hand, the ESOL teacher could use teaching strategies specifically tailored to the needs of the ESOL students. In the ESOL class, fluency in English was not taken for granted, and homework, class assignments and activities have usually taken that into account, thereby helping students feel more comfortable in the ESOL class.

The third factor contributing to the lower level of anxiety in the ESOL class was that the ESOL class was taught by teachers who had positive attitudes towards non-native English language learners. Not to mention educational expertise in working with language minority students, the ESOL teacher was found to have more positive attitudes towards non-native English language learners than most mainstream teachers. Such positive attitudes contributed not only to developing close relationships with the ESOL students but also to providing better educational services to them. In other words, this study discovered that the ESOL teacher’s positive attitudes towards English language learners better accommodated their academic needs (their progress in school) as well as their
social needs (their being comfortable in the class).

**Research Question 3:**

*How do Korean ESOL students cope with English language anxiety in their ESOL class and in their mainstream classes?*

Facing English language anxiety, the participants of this study displayed a range of coping strategies, and every participant used some or all of them in greater or lesser degrees in both ESOL and mainstream classes. The defense mechanisms most commonly shown by the participants were flight behaviors, especially avoidance or withdrawal. Here it is important to note that avoidance was found not only among the highly anxious participants but also among the less anxious participants. Other flight behaviors were boredom, rationalization, generalization, reaction formation and fantasy, which the participants had employed to alleviate their language anxiety. In addition, they displayed aggressive behaviors such as competition and displacement. In mainstream classes, manipulation behaviors and compromise behaviors were also shown by some participants. A participant formed a subgroup with a Korean classmate, whereas some participants exhibited anticipation such as studying harder for tests than they would do if they had not been in anxiety provoking environment.

**Research Question 4:**

*What are the differences between the ESOL class and mainstream classes in their coping strategies?*

As language anxiety was more severe in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class, the defense mechanisms employed in the ESOL class and mainstream classes had been different not only in the extent of but also in the diversity of coping strategies employed by the participants in each class. Regardless of individual level of language anxiety, as will be summarized in Table 4, avoidance or withdrawal was the most common defense mechanism in mainstream classes whereas the extent of its use was less evident in the ESOL class. Not to mention the highly anxious participants, in other words, even the participants with a lower level of language anxiety seldom participated in class activities in mainstream classes, but remained silent and
unresponsive. Similarly, the use of other defense mechanisms was more apparently marked in mainstream classes than in the ESOL class. Defense mechanisms other than avoidance, associated with mainstream classes were boredom, rationalization, generalization, reaction formation, fantasy, competition, forming subgroup, anticipation, and displacement. In contrast, defense mechanisms, related to the ESOL class were limited to reaction formation, competition, and fantasy, and even these elements had been displayed in a milder manner than in mainstream classes.

**Research Question 5:**

*What do teachers do to mitigate English language anxiety for Korean ESOL students?*

In general, the teachers in the research site well recognized the presence of language anxiety, understood the difficulties associated with learning a new language, and accordingly employed a number of mitigating strategies for the ESOL students, including being a facilitator, showing teachers’ interest in the ESOL students’ country, creating a warm social environment, and frequently praising their works. Among the teachers, the ESOL teacher made the most complete use of mitigating strategies. Along with those used by mainstream teachers, she had also employed additional mitigating strategies, such as giving instruction clearly by using a model or a sample, showing her personal interest in each student in the class, and allowing the students to use their first language. Lastly, this study found one case different from the general characterization of the teachers in the school of research site. It appeared that as will be detailed later, this teacher held some misconception regarding language anxiety, which could be considered pervasive nationwide among mainstream teachers who had neither professional training nor previous experience in working with language minority students (Franson, 1999).

**Limitations of the Study**

This study is one of a few research that specifically address language anxiety of young children, and furthermore, this study is the first research attempt to make a use of Ehrman’s (1996) specification of defense mechanisms in addressing how people respond to language anxiety. While the findings in this study are noteworthy from both a theoretical and practical
perspective, however, there are several major limitations of the present study. Given the nature of a qualitative case study with five main participants, this study carries little justification in generalizing its findings beyond the particular settings that this study has investigated. Evidently, this point has been the most commonly raised limitation intrinsic to qualitative case studies, even though it has instead allowed for gathering in-depth and detailed information on the research topics. Similarly the present study shares this same limitation and merit as a qualitative case study. Therefore, this study should not be taken to produce findings generalizable beyond its boundary. Rather, as emphasized in the beginning, this study has aimed to fill one of the gaps that the previous research has omitted: language anxiety of elementary school ESOL children. As such, the findings of this study should be combined with those of previous studies to yield a fuller picture of language anxiety.

Another limitation is that this study did not include a longitudinal aspect that could examine the relationship between levels of language anxiety and the use of defense mechanisms. It is highly probable that present levels of anxiety could have been influenced by the defense mechanisms used in the past. For instance, it could be expected that the more frequently avoidance is used, the lesser feeling of self-efficacy and thus the higher level of anxiety will be developed, whereas the more often anticipation is employed, the stronger feeling of self-efficacy and thus the lower level of anxiety will follow. In fact, the results of this study indicate this possibility: the lower level anxiety shown by Anna and Sunny relative to other participants might be because they had responded to anxiety provoking situation with anticipation, thereby resulting in their learning English better than other participants who had mainly employed avoidance. Accordingly, it is fair to state that this study pointed to this possibility, but could not elucidate it clearly, for not including a longitudinal analysis necessary for such a task.

An additional limitation of this study is concerned with the socioeconomic status of participant families. As Hoff, Laursen and Tardiff (2002) show, child outcomes such as school achievement are closely related to SES (Social Economic Status) levels. The higher SES families are, the better parenting styles they have, such as educated mothers using more
language at home and providing a cognitively stimulating environment, thereby resulting in better child outcomes. Likewise, levels of anxiety that young children experience might be much influenced by whether or not their parents provide them with necessary support and encouragement. It would be nice if this study looked into whether or not language anxiety is mediated through the home environment in various family SES. However, all five participants of this study belong to the family with relatively high SES levels. Their parents are either professors in Korea or Ph.D. students who can afford to study in the US with their families. No Korean ESOL students other than the present participants were available in the research site of this study, and hence, the effects of differing family SES levels on language anxiety could not have been investigated in the present study.

A final limitation is related to understatements about language anxiety shown by the participants of this study. In any questionnaires and interviews, there could rise response effects that undermine the validity of responses (Heilenmann, 1990). For instance, Pappamihiel (1999) highlights one example of response effects, overstated concerns about language anxiety. Just asking about English language anxiety in interview could be bringing up the idea in interviewees’ minds and sensitizing to it. Moreover, they may intentionally overstate their level of anxiety simply to please the researcher, thinking that is what the researcher wants to hear. In this study, by contrast, it was not overstatement, but understatement about English language anxiety that threatened the validity of their expressed anxiety level. Above all, since the participants were young children, they had difficulty to express their feeling of language anxiety. More importantly, since Korean translation of anxiety has a derogative connotation, defective in mental state, they all exhibited a tendency to hide their feelings of language anxiety, and this tendency was more marked among the older participants. In interviews, as seen in the above, they were very protective about their feelings of language anxiety. Moreover, this tendency was reinforced by their apprehension about the negative halo effect that their expressed language anxiety might be unduly taken by the researcher as an indication of their overall competence.
Therefore, it was very challenging for the researcher to verify the exact levels of their language anxiety, especially among the older participants. If more interviews as well as longer observations were conducted, it might not be impossible that they turned out to be more anxious ones than as reported in the present study.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

As compared to other age groups, as mentioned before, there has been relatively little attention paid to the language anxiety that young children may experience in learning a second language. Even the present study included, there is still a long way to go to make the level of understanding about the language anxiety of young children close to those of other age groups. As this study indicates, young children are not immune to language anxiety. With negative effects typically associated with language anxiety, consequently, it could have more serious consequences for young children. People with more anxiety-provoking experience in the past are more likely to become anxious about similar situations later, and accordingly, children can have major problems later in learning language if these difficulties are not dealt with earlier. In light of this, more research on the language anxiety of young children need to be conducted to develop the viable strategies and programs for young children to cope with language anxiety.

More specifically, more attention should be paid to the roles of caregivers affecting the language anxiety of young children, such as how parenting styles might influence their language anxiety or how family emotional environment that parents provide for their children in and out of the home might influence the levels as well as types of language anxiety they experiences. Added to these would be studies on the relationship between language anxiety and family SES or interrelatedness between school and home settings in addressing language anxiety problems.

Another focus of the future research would be on defense mechanisms that children employ against language anxiety. The present study is the first research effort to apply Erlman’s (1996) categorization and specification of how people respond to anxiety-provoking situations to children. Regarding defense mechanisms, therefore, there are still a vast amount of research
questions to remain unanswered, such as who is more prone to avoidance or anticipation, how
differing defense mechanisms employed by children affect their subsequent level of language
anxiety, sense of self-efficacy and performance. With a longitudinal method, these questions can
be addressed so that their causal relationships and thus factors determining the choice made by
children and utility of each defense mechanism are brought into light.

As cultural and ethnic diversity is marked in the US school, especially in the ESOL class,
social interactions not only between the ESOL students and native English speaking peers but
also among the ESOL students would be another focus of the future research. As mentioned
before, language anxiety has much to do with social interactions, and thus their relationships
with language anxiety deserve far more research attention than it is now. Specifically, the future
research efforts can be directed to addressing whether there is a cultural or an ethnic tension in
the ESOL class, and if there is, how it is developed and how it affects language anxiety and
language learning, or whether the homogeneity of class as language minority is overwhelmed by
its cultural and ethnic diversity, not to mention by their SES. As long as the language anxiety of
young children is concerned, in summary, it is a new research area in the literature of language
anxiety, plentiful with important but still unanswered questions, and thus additional efforts on
this subject will not be but more than welcomed.

Overall Impressions

As a non-native English speaker, the researcher is in no way immune to English
language anxiety. I myself have experienced language anxiety in manifold ways. During this
research process, therefore, I could empathize their apprehension and fears that the participants
have displayed in behaviors and expressed in words. As young children, at first, they were
unaware of language anxiety and then unsure about it, but still conscious of a generalized
feeling of uneasiness, frustration and nervousness. In fact, that is exactly what I have gone
through in the US as far as language anxiety is concerned. I often find many native English
speakers having little understanding of what English language learners are experiencing when
being in a position to have to use a limited communication medium. Indeed, no less frequently, limited English is taken as a reflection of how the second language learners might function generally. Through this study, I have become more convinced that language anxiety has to do much with social interactions. It is not simply a limited English proficiency per se that is wholly responsible for language anxiety, but also included among the anxiety provoking factors are nature and intensity of social interactions that the second language learners have experienced. Then, it is my hope that this study has made some contribution to highlighting social aspects of language anxiety.

During the process of this study, I have gained a profound respect for the ESOL teachers and their valuable services to language minority students. The findings of this study are quite clear in making the connection between language anxiety and teacher behavior. The teachers’ positive attitude toward the second language learner itself is a very significant determinant affecting the level of language anxiety each student might experience in particular classes. Teachers who provide a supportive environment and who employ non-threatening teaching methods are clearly effective in lessening language anxiety. To many teachers, however, such tasks are easier said than done. Common sense and good intension are not enough to successfully address the social and academic needs of second language learners. They should be coupled with professional training for the ESOL education. During both pilot studies and this research, I have witnessed how large difference this has made to the classes. The ESOL teachers have been paramount in alleviating language anxiety, more vital perhaps than any other factors.

In some ways, doing this research has been my own personal journey toward understanding myself. During the observations and interviews with young children, I have seen a younger version of myself under a variety of anxiety-provoking situations, responding to them with a wide range of defense mechanisms and taking every opportunity to hide the feelings of anxiety, yet still trying to get the best out of every situation. Indeed, my participants are survivors who, at very young ages, have endured distressing situations that are not always obvious to others around them. As for this
researcher, there is no question that I, too, am a survivor having arrived at this last page no less anxious to continue in my studies; yet this time not out of fear but out of a sense of purpose and resolve.
APPENDIX A. English Language Anxiety Scale (ELAS)

1 strongly agree  2 agree  3 neutral  4 disagree  5 strongly disagree

1. In ESL classes, I forget how to say things I know.
2. In regular classes, I forget how to say things I know.
3. In ESL classes, I tremble when I know I’m going to have to speak in English.
4. In regular classes, I tremble when I know I’m going to have to speak in English.
5. In ESL classes, I start to panic when I have to speak English without preparation.
6. In regular classes, I start to panic when I have to speak in English without preparation.
7. In ESL classes, when I speak English, I feel like a different person.
8. In regular classes, when I speak English, I feel like a different person.
9. In ESL classes, even when I’m prepared to speak English, I get nervous.
10. In regular classes, even when I’m prepared to speak English, I get nervous.
11. In ESL classes, I’m afraid that my teachers are ready to correct every mistake I make.
12. In regular classes, I’m afraid that my teachers are ready to correct every mistake I make.
13. In ESL classes, I can’t express my true feelings in English and this makes me uncomfortable.
14. In regular classes, I can’t express my true feelings in English and this makes me uncomfortable.
15. In regular classes, I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of native speaking students.
16. In ESL classes, I get nervous and confused when I’m speaking English.
17. In regular classes, I get nervous and confused when I’m speaking English.
18. In regular classes, there are so many rules in English, I feel like I can’t learn them all.
19. In ESL classes, there are so many rules in English, I feel like I can’t learn them all.
20. In ESL classes, I’m afraid that native English speakers will laugh at me when I speak English.
APPENDIX B. Korean version of the ELAS (English Language Anxiety Scale)

성별: 남 ______ 여 ______ 생년월일: ____________ 년 _____ 월 _____일

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>번호</th>
<th>문항</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 영어로 말할 때 내가 아는 것도 어떻게 말해야 하는지 잊어버릴 때가 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 내가 아는 것도 어떻게 말하는지 잊어버릴 때가 있다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 내가 말해야 될 것 같으면 두려다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 내가 말해야 될 것 같으면 두려다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 아무 준비 없이 내가 말해야 하게 되면 너무 당황스럽다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 아무 준비 없이 내가 말해야 하게 되면 너무 당황스럽다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 영어로 말할 때 내가 다른 사람같이 느껴진다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 영어로 말할 때 내가 다른 사람같이 느껴진다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 내가 영어로 말할 준비가 다 되어있다 해도 떨린다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>내 학급 시간에 내가 영어로 말할 준비가 다 되어있다 해도 떨린다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 선생님께서 내 영어가 틀릴 때마다 지적하실 거라고 생각하면 떨린다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>내 학급 시간에 선생님께서 영어가 틀릴 때마다 지적하실 거라고 생각하면 떨린다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 어떤 때는 내가 느끼는 그대로 영어로 표현할 수 없고 그래서 마음이 불편하다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>수업시간에 어떤 때는 내가 느끼는 그대로 영어로 표현할 수 없고 그래서 마음이 불편하다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>내 학급시간에 영어로 말하려면 자신이 없다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 영어로 말하려면 두렵고 혼동된다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 영어로 말하려면 두렵고 혼동된다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>내 학급에서 영어로 너무 많은 문법들이 있어서 다 못 배울 것 같은 느낌이 든다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 영어에 너무 많은 문법들이 있어서 다 못 배울 것 같은 느낌이 든다.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>이술 시간에 미국 사람들이 내가 영어로 얘기하면 비웃을 것 같아서 걱정이 된다.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

① 정말 그렇다 ② 그렇다 ③ 보통이다 ④ 그렇지 않다 ⑤ 절대 그렇지 않다
APPENDIX C. Human Subject Approval

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-8633  FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 12/17/2004

To: Haekyung Cha
1800 Miccosukee Commons Drive #117
Tallahassee FL 32308

Dept.: MIDDLE AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

From: John Tomkowiak, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
How do Highly Anxious Korean Elementary ESOL Students Interact in the ESOL and Mainstream Classroom

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 12/8/2004. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 12/7/2005 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Eleni Pappamihel
HSC No. 2004.648
Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Eleni Pappamihiel in the Multilingual/Multicultural Education Program at Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to find out more about how Korean ESOL children deal with English language anxiety in their classes.

Your child's participation will initially involve responding to a survey. If your child is identified as being highly anxious, I will ask your child to answer short questions about how they deal with anxiety. I will also observe your child in his/her classes. Your participation, as well as that of your child, in this study is voluntary. If you or your child choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty, (it will not affect your child's grade). The results of the research study may be published, but your child's name will not be used.

If your child is identified as having English language anxiety, he/she will be helped in dealing with anxiety-producing situations. It is hoped that by discussing his/her anxiety, it will be reduced.

If you have any questions concerning this research study or your child's participation in the study, please call me at 297-1809 or Dr. Pappamihiel at 644-2129.

Sincerely,

Haekyung Cha

I give consent for my child __________________ to participate in the above study (Korean children’s English language anxiety and defense mechanism in the ESOL and mainstream classes: Theoretical and educational implications for TESOL).

Parent's Name:________________________________

Parent's Signature ________________________________ (Date) ________________

If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Vice President for the Office of Research at (850) 644-8633.
보호자 동의서

학부모님께, 저는 플로리다주립대학 Multicultural/Multilingual 교육 프로그램에서 엘리니 파파미힐 교수의 지도하에 있는 대학원생입니다. 저는 한국 ESOL 어린이들이 수업시간에 어떻게 언어불안에 대처하고 있나를 알아보기위한 리서치를 하고있습니다.

먼저 어린이들이 하게 될 것은 설문에 답하는 것입니다. 그리고는 제가 어떻게 언어불안에 대처하고 있나에 대해서 간단한 질문들도 할 것입니다. 또한 교실에서 관찰도 할 것입니다. 만약 학부모님이 아이가 더 이상 참여하고 싶지 않으시다면 언제든지 그만하실 수 있고 어떠한 불편함도 (예를 들자면 아이의 성적에 영향을 끼치는 것) 없을 것입니다. 이 리서치 결과는 출판될 수도 있지만 아이의 이름은 사용되지 않도록 하겠습니다.

아이나 학부모님들의 비밀은 법이 허락하는 최대한으로 보호될 것입니다.

만약 이 리서치에 대해 아닐경우 아이의 이 리서치 참가에 어떤 질문이라도 있으시다면 297-1809로 저에게 전화를 주시면 644-2129로 파파미힐 박사께 전화주십시오.

차해경

한국 ESOL 초등학생들이 어떻게 ESOL시간과 일반학급시간에 언어불안에 대처하는지를 연구하는 리서치에 내 아이 ______________가 참가하는 것을 허락합니다.

보호자 성함: ______________

보호자 싸인: ______________ 날짜: ______________
Child Consent Form

I have been told that my parents (mom or dad) have said it’s okay (or, have given permission) for me to participate, if I want to, in a project about English language anxiety.

I know that I can stop at any time I want to and it will be okay to stop.

Name: __________________ Date: __________________
어린이 동의서

제 부모님(어머니 혹은 아버지)으로부터 제가 만약 원하면 언어별언 프로젝트에 참여해도 괜찮다는 말을 들었습니다 (허락을 받았습니다).

저는 원한다면 언제든지 그만 할 수도 있고 내가 그만하고싶다면 그래도 된다는 것을 압니다.

이름: ____________ 날짜: ________________
Teacher Consent

Dear ________________.

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Eleni Pappamihiel in the Multilingual/Multicultural Education Program at Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to investigate how Korean ESOL students cope with English language anxiety in their classes.

Your participation will involve responding to questions about what you do in your classes to potentially mitigate a student’s English language anxiety. I would also like to observe my student participants in your class for approximately one month. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you if you agree to participate in the study. By participating in this study, it is hoped that you become more aware of how English language anxiety can affect the learning process of young ESL students and that you will become better equipped to work with highly anxious students.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, please call me at 297-1809 or Dr. Pappamihiel at 644-2129. You may also email me at your convenience (maria-cha@hanmail.net).

Sincerely,

Haekyung Cha

I give my consent to participate in the above study. I understand that my name will never be used in any report, dissertation or future publication.

Signature: _______________________________ date: _____________________
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