*영어어문교육, 15*권 1호 2009년 봄

The Cross-modality Anxiety Profiles of Korean EFL Learners

Dae-Min Kang
(Seoul National University)

Kang, Dae-Min. (2009). The cross-modality anxiety profiles of Korean EFL learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(1), 27-47.

The present study was conducted to investigate Korean EFL learners' cross-modality anxiety profiles and the impact of proficiency on the profiles, i.e., how their speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were related and how proficiency affected the relationship between their speaking anxiety and writing anxiety. A total of 95 participants, assigned to high, intermediate, and low proficiency groups, completed a questionnaire composed mainly of an adjusted Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), and 30 of them took part in a semi-structured interview. Results showed that Korean EFL learners' writing anxiety was significantly stronger than their speaking anxiety, which was attributed to an extensive difference in interest and pedagogical practice between writing and speaking. Regarding the influence of proficiency, it was revealed that proficiency significantly affected the difference between Korean EFL learners' speaking and writing anxiety. What was noteworthy was that the intermediate level EFL learners showed the highest mean difference between speaking and writing anxiety due to their largest difference in readiness between writing and speaking. In terms of pedagogical implications, the study suggests that the EFL cross-modality anxiety should be addressed more adequately taking into account proficiency levels of learners.

[anxiety/proficiency levels/EFL learners]

I. INTRODUCTION

Speaking and writing skills, pivotal in enabling language learners to communicate their messages to others, have been claimed to be similarly constrained by rules of linguistic production (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). The close relationship between the two productive skills has prompted researchers to undertake a substantial number of cross-modality research which "investigates a point of juncture where speech and writing

intersect and interrelate" (Weissberg, 2005, p. 94). Notwithstanding many interesting findings from the research, though, except for a study by Cheng, Horwitz, and Schallert (1999) very few attempts have been made to examine the connections between EFL speaking anxiety and EFL writing anxiety. Further, even Cheng et al.'s investigation inadequately addressed proficiency dependent differences in the links between EFL speaking anxiety and writing anxiety and has left unanswered questions about cross-modality anxiety profiles in relation to interlanguage development. It is hoped that the present study, which seeks to fill the gap by answering the following research questions, will report findings that adequately describe and explain how Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety are connected as well as suggest insightful implications for learners and teachers in Korean and other EFL contexts in Asia, and perhaps elsewhere.

1. How are Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety related ?
2. How does EFL proficiency affect the relationship between Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety ?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Anxiety has long been identified as having a considerable effect on second or foreign language learning. Specifically, anxiety has been found to influence learners' confidence and self-esteem (Clement, Dornyei, & Noels, 1994; Mak & White, 1997), classroom behavior (Tsui, 1996), and achievement (e.g., Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Young, 1991). Interestingly, prior research has been focused on looking into the impact of anxiety on learners' speaking performance (e.g., Liu, 2006; Meijas, Applbaum, Applbaum, & Trotter, 1991; Phillips, 1992; Steinberg & Horwitz, 1986; Young, 1986). The relationships between anxiety and the other language skills have been investigated less extensively, i.e., listening anxiety (Kim, 2000; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006), reading anxiety (Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999; Sellers, 2000), and writing anxiety (Cheng et al., 1999; Leki, 1999).

This bias in research interest (Horwitz, 2001) could be attributed in part to the prevalent use of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Cheng, 2004; Rodriguez & Abreu, 2003). The anxiety measure developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) has been argued to be appropriate for assessing anxiety associated with speaking rather than listening, reading, or writing (Rodriguez & Abreu, 2003). In order to effectively evaluate how anxiety affects learners' performance of the other language skills, various research efforts have been made, notably including the development of the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (Saito,

Horwitz, & Garza, 1999) and the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (Cheng, 2004). When considering that speaking and writing skills enable learners to encode their messages (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000) and occupy important positions in the current globalized world (Kroll, 2003), it seems that the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI henceforth) could draw more attention than the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale.

The SLWAI, found to possess good reliability and validity, is composed of three subscales: Somatic Anxiety, Cognitive Anxiety, and Avoidance Behavior (Cheng, 2004). The subscales consist of seven items (Somatic Anxiety and Avoidance Behavior) and eight items (Cognitive Anxiety) measuring writers' intensified physiological stimulation caused by anxiety (Somatic Anxiety), perception of stimulation caused by anxiety including concern about negative evaluation (Cognitive Anxiety), and avoidance behavior resulting from anxiety (Avoidance Behavior). While studies have been conducted using the SLWAI to explore EFL writers' anxiety (e.g., Atay & Kurt, 2006) since Cheng constructed and validated the scale, very few, if any, attempts have been made to examine how EFL writing anxiety interfaces with speaking anxiety employing the SLWAI and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS henceforth). Given that communication through written text (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000) has become just as important as communication through spoken text in our digitally networked world (Kang, 2007; Richards, 2003) and anxiety has been revealed to negatively correlate with learners' speaking and writing performance (e.g., Hassan, 2001; Phillips, 1992), the paucity of relevant research appears to underscore the importance of undertaking a study designed to diagnose the interrelatedness between EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety.

With respect to the use of the FLCAS in the new study, it seems that two components of the anxiety scale should be taken into account for further analysis purpose (Cheng et al., 1999). Designated FLCA1 and FLCA2, the two components consist of 10 items each out of a total of 33 items on the FLCAS. According to Cheng et al., the items are focused on measuring self-confidence in English speaking (FLCA1) or anxiety in formal English-learning settings (FLCA2). As discussed earlier, since the FLCAS has been claimed to be suitable for assessing anxiety related to speaking rather than the other language skills, the English-learning situations referred to in FLCA2 items could be construed as meaning English speaking classes and thus pose no problem for the new study.

In addition to the use of the SLWAI and FLCAS, it appears that the new study needs to examine how language proficiency interacts with the interface of speaking anxiety and writing anxiety. In view of the importance of differentiating pedagogical approaches depending on proficiency level, it seems surprising that prior research has not factored in proficiency. The present study, carried out to fill the major empirical gaps, is expected to

propose pedagogically beneficial directions predicated upon the findings that could be cautiously interpreted as the diagnosis of the relationships between Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

Participants in the present study were 95 students (50 females and 45 males) from two universities located in Seoul, Korea, majoring in Liberal Arts, Science, and Business. Their ages ranged from 19 to 27. They were assigned to the high (31 students), intermediate (31 students), and low (33 students) proficiency groups. The first criterion for the assignment was their scores on TOEIC which they had all taken before. In particular, participants whose scores were above 535 points, the mean total score for TOEIC test takers in Korea (TOEIC Report on Test Takers Worldwide 2005), were divided from participants whose scores were below 535 points. Out of those above 535 points, participants who were in the score range of 700-990 were assigned to the high proficiency group (Kim & Dammers, 2008) while the rest were assigned to the intermediate proficiency group. Participants whose scores were below 535 points were assigned to the low proficiency group. The second criterion was participants' self-assessments of their EFL proficiency (Ellis, 2003). Specifically, participants were requested to self-evaluate their proficiency by choosing one of five options, ranging from very weak to very good, to the nine sub-items of item (1) on the questionnaire constructed by Llurda & Huguet (2003). The third criterion was course lecturers' holistic assessments of participants' EFL speaking and writing proficiency. The lecturers were asked to assess participants' proficiency by assigning a single numerical score from 1 (very weak) to 5 (very good). In most cases, the lecturers' assessments were consistent with participants' self-assessments and their TOEIC scores.

2. Instruments

The first instrument was a questionnaire comprising an adjusted FLCAS, the SLWAI (see Appendix), and a background questionnaire. The modification to the original FLCAS was centered on the words "(foreign) language class" and "(foreign) language" (Cheng et al., 1999). The words were substituted with "English conversation class" and "English" respectively, such as in "I worry about the consequences of failing my *English conversation class*." and "I feel very self-conscious about speaking *English* in front of other students." The reasons for the modification of the FLCAS were both that the formal

English-learning contexts mentioned in the items on the scale could be taken as denoting English speaking classes, as explained already in the literature review section, and that participants' confusion would be reduced by the replacement of the original words. The Korean translation of the FLCAS and SLWAI, made by the author, was reviewed by two Korean university lecturers who had taught English composition and English speaking. Both the FLCAS and SLWAI had five Likert-type response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews with a total of 30 participants (10 from each of the three proficiency groups) were conducted for approximately 10 minutes per person in Korean. The interviews were intended to afford the author an informed understanding mainly of factors underlying the statistical findings obtained from analyzing participants' answers to the items on the FLCAS and SLWAI. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and translated into English for reporting.

3. Procedure

Prior to undertaking the study in early-May 2008, the author requested several lecturers teaching English composition or English speaking at Korean universities to introduce him to the students who enrolled in their courses. Two of the lecturers gave him the names of 100 prospective participants. The author called each of the students to explain the purpose of his study and ask them to volunteer for the study. Out of the 100 students, 95 agreed to participate in the study. As the 95 students were from two different universities, the author set two separate dates for them to gather together to submit written consent to the author, complete the questionnaire, and take part in the interview.

Concerning the scoring of the participants' responses on the FLCAS and SLWAI, the positively worded items including "It wouldn't bother me at all to take more English classes" and "I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class" were reverse scored (Cheng et al., 1999).

4. Data Analysis

The relationships between participants' EFL speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were examined first by using descriptive statistical analysis. Based on the findings from the descriptive statistics, a paired-samples t-test and a two-tailed Pearson's correlation were conducted to determine the statistical significance of the relationships. The influence of language proficiency on the relationships between participants' EFL speaking anxiety and writing anxiety was investigated by performing Repeated Measures ANOVA in addition to a paired-samples t-test.

Further, the transcribed interviews were analyzed to complement the quantitative findings. It was revealed that the answers to some questions were considerably similar across proficiency level while the answers to some questions were almost identical across the members of each proficiency group. Consequently, it was decided that the representative answers would be employed together with other data in reporting the results of the study.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Relationships between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

As presented in Tables 1 and 2, participants were found to have significantly higher anxiety related to writing than speaking.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Statistics for Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FLCAS	95	1.00	5.00	2.7218	1.40722
SLWAI	95	1.00	5.00	2.9286	1.33349
Valid N (listwise)	95				

Note. FLCAS = foreign language classroom anxiety scale; SLWAI = second language writing anxiety inventory

TABLE 2

The Difference between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 FLCAS-SLWAI	-.2068	.22459	.02304	-.2526	-.1611	-8.977	94	.000

This finding, in conflict with the suggestions or claims of prior research that language learners suffer the highest level of anxiety in speaking (e.g., Bailey, 1983; Horner & Redmond, 2002; Horwitz et al., 1986; Vargas Batista; 2005), was cautiously attributed to the impact of the communicative approach on the 7th National Curriculum for English

Education in Korea that has interestingly led to the stress on the development of predominantly speaking skill (Kim, 2007). Due to the extensive emphasis placed on the need to improve their speaking ability, a great number of Korean EFL learners at different proficiency levels have participated in various study abroad language programs and spent time in the target speech community (Park, 2007). By contrast, there has been a substantial lack of EFL writing pedagogy in Korea (Chon & Kim, 2005) which might have been responsible for participants' higher degree of anxiety associated with writing than speaking (Kim & Kim, 2004; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004). A participant in the intermediate proficiency group reported as follows on behalf of other participants.

(1) Report (An intermediate proficiency level participant)
Except for my current university English composition course, I have never been taught how to write in English. My English teachers were simply not interested in writing instruction. Instead, my friends and I were led to think speaking was what mattered the most. So, when I finally had time and money, I left for an English language program in the U.K. Thanks to the experience, I don't feel very much anxiety towards speaking in English or participating in English speaking classes. However, the very thought of writing in English causes apprehension in me. As I told you, nobody advised me to pay attention to writing in English, let alone taught me how to write in English.

As is clear from (1), the lack of pedagogical interest contributed to participants' higher level of anxiety related to writing, which requires a considerable degree of productive language manipulation (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000), than speaking. In terms of correlation, participants' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were revealed to be statistically significantly correlated (see Table 3).

TABLE 3
The Correlations between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety Measured on the FLCAS and the SLWAI

		FLCAS	SLWAI
FLCAS	Pearson Correlation	1	.988**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	95	95
SLWAI	Pearson Correlation	.988**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	95	95

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In addition to the high correlation between Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety measured on the FLCAS and SLWAI, their speaking and writing anxiety assessed by the components of the FLCAS and SLWAI, i.e., FLCA1, FLCA2, Somatic Anxiety, Cognitive Anxiety, and Avoidance Behavior, was also found to be significantly correlated (see Table 4). The high significant correlations, in contrast to the non-significant or lowly/moderately significant correlations reported in a prior study (Cheng et al., 1999), appear to suggest that Korean EFL learners' cross-modality anxiety profiles should be taken into as serious consideration in addressing their speaking anxiety and writing anxiety as the outcome of Cheng et al.'s study.

TABLE 4

The Correlations between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety Assessed by the Components of the FLCAS and the SLWAI

		FLCA1	FLCA2	Somatic	Avoidance	Cognitive
FLCA1	Pearson Correlation	1	.988**	.977**	.982**	.985**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	95	95	95	95	95
FLCA2	Pearson Correlation	.996**	1	.971**	.979**	.984**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	95	95	95	95	95
Somatic	Pearson Correlation	.977**	.971**	1	.984**	.974**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	95	95	95	95	95
Avoidance	Pearson Correlation	.982**	.979**	.984**	1	.989**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	95	95	95	95	95
Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	.985**	.984**	.974**	.989**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	95	95	95	95	95

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. Somatic = Somatic anxiety, Avoidance = Avoidance behavior, Cognitive = Cognitive anxiety

Similar to the case of the overall means of speaking anxiety and writing anxiety discussed earlier, participants experienced higher anxiety associated with the three aspects of writing anxiety than the two aspects of speaking anxiety (see Table 5). Further, their anxiety level was the highest in the component of Avoidance Behavior and the lowest in

the component of FLCA2. In other words, they felt most anxious at the very thought of performing writing tasks and least anxious about participating in English speaking classes.

TABLE 5
Descriptive Statistics for Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety Assessed by the Components of the FLCAS and the SLWAI

		N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
FLCAS	FLCA1	95	1.00	5.00	2.7421	1.39959
	FLCA2	95	1.00	5.00	2.6737	1.40858
SLWAI	Somatic	95	1.00	5.00	3.0223	1.45954
	Cognitive	95	1.00	5.00	2.7651	1.26829
	Avoidance	95	1.00	5.00	3.0263	1.30938
	Valid N (listwise)	95				

The differences between the facets of speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were significant except for those between FLCA1 and Cognitive Anxiety and between Somatic Anxiety and Avoidance Behavior, as shown in Table 6. In particular, it seems that the non-significant difference between FLCA1 and Cognitive Anxiety could be attributable to the fact that the two components concern themselves with self-confidence in language skills.

TABLE 6
The Differences between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety Assessed by the Components of the FLCAS and the SLWAI

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	FLCA1-FLCA2	.06842	.12227	.01254	.04351	.09333	5.454	94	.000
Pair 2	FLCA1-Somatic	-.28021	.31330	.03214	-.34403	-.21639	-8.717	94	.000
Pair 3	FLCA1-Avoidance	-.28421	.27433	.02815	-.34009	-.22833	-10.098	94	.000
Pair 4	FLCA1-Cogntivie	-.02295	.26730	.02742	-.07740	.03150	-.837	94	.405
Pair 5	FLCA2-Somatic	-.34863	.34982	.03589	-.41989	-.27737	-9.714	94	.000
Pair 6	FLCA2-Avoidance	-.35263	.29504	.03027	-.41273	-.29253	-11.649	94	.000
Pair 7	FLCA2-Cogntivie	-.09137	.27855	.02858	-.14811	-.03463	-3.197	94	.002
Pair 8	Somatic-Avoidance	-.00400	.29117	.02987	-.06331	.05531	-.134	94	.894
Pair 9	Somatic-Cognitive	.25726	.36295	.03724	.18333	.33120	6.909	94	.000
Pair 10	Avoidance-Cognitive	.26126	.19617	.02013	.22130	.30123	12.981	94	.000

In connection with the difference between FLCA1 and Cognitive Anxiety, a high proficiency level participant commented as below.

(2) Report (A high proficiency level participant)
I believe that if you have confidence in your English speaking ability, you also have confidence in your English writing ability. Certainly writing in English provokes more anxiety than speaking in English. That's for sure. What I mean is, confidence in English speaking could be linked to confidence in English writing.

From (2), it appears that participants' cross-modality confidence (Matsuda & Gobel, 2001) led to the non-significant difference between FLCA1 and Cognitive Anxiety. What attracts our attention here is that a more detailed diagnosis of how EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were interlinked could be provided using the componential approach based on the multidimensional nature of the SLWAI (Cheng, 2004) and the componentizability of the FLCAS (Cheng et al., 1999; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004). Specifically, it seems that the employment of the multidimensional or componentizable scales could provide EFL teachers and learners with a direction toward better and more effectively addressing EFL learners' cross-modality anxiety.

2. The Influence of Proficiency on the Relationships between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

As shown in Table 7, the high proficiency group had the lowest speaking anxiety and writing anxiety followed by the intermediate and low proficiency groups, while all three groups had higher anxiety associated with writing than speaking. In terms of the influence of proficiency, it was found that the relationships between participants' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety were significantly affected by proficiency (see Table 8).

TABLE 7
Descriptive Statistics for Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety According to Proficiency Level

Group		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
High	FLCAS	1.00	1.97	1.2248	.35183
(n=31)	SLWAI	1.00	2.14	1.4090	.40801
Intermediate	FLCAS	1.97	3.39	2.3961	.45096
(n=31)	SLWAI	2.18	3.73	2.8197	.48284
Low	FLCAS	3.64	5.00	4.4339	.46231
(n=33)	SLWAI	3.77	5.00	4.4585	.43213

TABLE 8

The Effect of Proficiency on the Relationships between Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	1478.066	1	1478.066	4055.384	.000	.978
profg	317.396	2	158.698	435.421	.000	.904
Error	33.531	92	.364			

Note. profg = proficiency groups

In addition, it was revealed that there existed interesting intergroup dissimilarities in terms of mean difference between Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety as well as the significance of the difference (see Tables 9, 10, and 11).

TABLE 9

The Difference between High Proficiency Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 FLCAS-SLWAI	-.1842	.15752	.02829	-.2420	-.1264	-6.511	30	.000

TABLE 10

The Difference between Intermediate Proficiency Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 FLCAS-SLWAI	-.4235	.15379	.02762	-.4800	-.3671	-15.334	30	.000

TABLE 11

The Difference between Low Proficiency Korean EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety and Writing Anxiety

	Paired Differences							
				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 FLCAS-SLWAI	-.0245	.14990	.02609	-.0777	-.0286	-.941	32	.354

First, the mean difference between speaking anxiety and writing anxiety was revealed to be the highest in the intermediate group, i.e., -.4235, -.1842, and -.0245 for the intermediate, high, and low groups respectively. In order to identify the underlying factor responsible for the large difference in the intermediate group, the developmental features of intermediate learners discussed in a previous study (Krashen, 2003) was considered cautiously and critically. Krashen maintained that intermediate level learners are those who have developed language knowledge and are ready to carry on with developing their language skills unaided. The intermediate level participants in the present study, however, seem to have had different degrees of readiness depending on the type of language skill. According to Neufeld's (1979) readiness variables (cited in Horwitz, 1995), readiness for language learning involves language learners' openness to language learning as well as eagerness to participate in the process of language learning. As for the intermediate level participants, it appears that they were much less affectively ready and willing to perform writing tasks than speaking tasks because of the gap between their writing and speaking proficiency, as reported below by an intermediate level participant on behalf of other participants in his proficiency group.

(3) Report (An intermediate proficiency level participant)

I usually self-assess my English proficiency level to be intermediate. Yet when it comes to doing English writing, I feel a strong sense of anxiety. The sense of anxiety arising out of writing in English is much, much stronger than that arising out of speaking in English. I guess it's because my writing proficiency is substantially low compared to speaking proficiency. And writing anxiety is way more unbearable. In fact, speaking anxiety is in general bearable. I'm afraid I'm not yet emotionally prepared to take on the task of writing with confidence and enthusiasm, unlike in the case of speaking task. I think that's what caused the substantial difference between writing anxiety and speaking anxiety.

As is evident in (3), the intermediate level participants had much less affective readiness for writing than speaking. As a result, they experienced a significantly higher level of anxiety and reluctance toward performing writing tasks than speaking tasks. Compared to the intermediate level participants, it was found that the high level participants' proficiency in both speaking and writing led to less divergence between readiness for writing tasks and readiness for speaking tasks. The following is what a high level participant commented for other participants in her proficiency group.

(4) Report (A high proficiency level participant)
Although I consider myself a high proficiency EFL learner, writing in English does produce anxiety in me. And my writing anxiety is stronger than my speaking anxiety. However, I think that the difference between my writing anxiety and speaking anxiety would be less than that of intermediate level learners since I am now more proficient at speaking and much more proficient at writing than when I was an intermediate level learner.

What is noteworthy about (4) is that, in the areas of speaking and writing skills, it seems to support the argument that proficiency builds self-confidence (Gardner, Tremblay, & Masgoret, 1997), the lack of which constitutes language anxiety (Arnold & Brown, 1999), over the argument that self-confidence builds proficiency (Clement, 1980). This preference, though, is not reflected in the report below by a low level participant.

(5) Report (A low proficiency level participant)
I am definitely a low level EFL learner. And I feel very much anxiety about both writing in English and speaking in English. Since the degrees of anxiety toward writing and speaking are almost equally high, I guess the difference between my writing anxiety and speaking anxiety is almost negligible. The biggest hurdle to my efforts to speak and write in English is this immense anxiety about speaking and writing and, in my opinion, what should be done is to reduce anxiety and build confidence. Without dealing with the issue of decreasing speaking anxiety and writing anxiety, I'm worried that I would constantly find myself stuck at the low proficiency level. You see, we low level learners are simply not proficient enough to have decreased anxiety unlike high or intermediate level learners.

From (5), it seems that the low level participants viewed anxiety reduction as leading to proficiency (Clement, 1980), contrary to the high level participants. In addition to the interview reports from participants discussed heretofore, the insignificant difference between the low level participants' writing anxiety and speaking anxiety (see Table 11

provided earlier) resulting from the similarly high levels of writing anxiety and speaking anxiety (Cheng et al., 1999) appears to underline the importance of taking different pedagogical approaches to addressing EFL learners' cross-modality anxiety depending on proficiency level.

Specifically, first with regard to low level learners, efforts should be made to lessen both their speaking anxiety and writing anxiety with equal intensity. The anxiety-decreasing efforts could include correcting their errors with care (Jang, 2003) so as not to threaten them and create debilitating language anxiety (Maeng, 2008; Ohata, 2005) in them. Second, regarding intermediate level learners, attempts to reduce anxiety should be made depending on modality, i.e., speaking and writing. As for writing anxiety, intense efforts need to be made to lower it so that the consequent self-confidence could result in writing proficiency (Clement, 1980) as in the case of low level learners. Concerning speaking anxiety, our attention should be directed more toward enhancing speaking proficiency than decreasing the anxiety, from the perspective of facilitative anxiety (Bailey, 1983; Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). The resulting speaking proficiency could lead to self-confidence in performing speaking tasks (Gardner et al., 1997). Further, more attention should be given to diminishing writing anxiety than speaking anxiety. Third, with respect to high level learners, more attempts need to be made to encourage them to improve writing proficiency than speaking proficiency. Similar to the case of intermediate level learners, focus should be placed more on increasing proficiency than on lessening facilitative anxiety.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study was undertaken to examine Korean EFL learners' cross-modality anxiety profiles and the influence of proficiency on the profiles, i.e., how Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety are connected and how proficiency influences the relationship between their speaking anxiety and writing anxiety. A total of 95 participants from two Korean universities were assigned to the high, intermediate, and low proficiency groups and asked to complete a questionnaire consisting of an adjusted Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI), and a background questionnaire. After answering the questionnaire, 30 participants were interviewed in a semi-structured way by the author.

Results showed that Korean EFL learners had significantly higher anxiety associated with writing than speaking. The difference was attributed to a large gap between writing and speaking in terms of interest and pedagogy. The components of the FLCAS and the SLWAI, i.e., FLCA1, FLCA2, Somatic Anxiety, Cognitive Anxiety, and Avoidance

Behavior, were significantly correlated as were the FLCAS and the SLWAI. Further, Korean EFL learners' anxiety level was the highest in the Avoidance Behavior component of the SLWAI measuring avoidance behavior arising out of writing anxiety and the lowest in the FLCA2 component of the FLCAS measuring speaking anxiety in formal English-learning settings.

Concerning the influence of proficiency, it was found that EFL proficiency significantly affected the difference between Korean EFL learners' speaking anxiety and writing anxiety. Interestingly, the intermediate level EFL learners were revealed to have higher mean difference between speaking anxiety and writing anxiety compared to the high or low level EFL learners. The considerable disparity was ascribed to the intermediate level learners' far lower affective readiness and willingness to write in English than to speak in English, resulting from the proficiency difference between speaking and writing. By contrast, the similarly advanced speaking and writing proficiency levels of the high level learners and the similarly poor speaking and writing proficiency levels of the low level learners were found to have caused the mean difference between speaking anxiety and writing anxiety which was less than that of the intermediate level learners.

In terms of pedagogical implications, the present study has two suggestions. First, the issue of EFL cross-modality anxiety should be attended to more adequately by both classroom teachers and researchers. Given that the improvement of writing and speaking skills is of critical importance in the current interconnected world, it seems that the EFL cross-modality anxiety should be addressed more sufficiently than ever before. Second, the EFL cross-modality anxiety needs to be dealt with according to proficiency level of learners. The failure to carefully consider learners' proficiency dependent developmental stages of writing and speaking skills would prevent attempts to address the EFL cross-modality anxiety from achieving their desired result.

Notwithstanding its limitations including the number of participants, the present study proposes a suggestion for future research; the conduct of longitudinal studies designed to investigate the effects of proficiency dependent approaches to EFL learners' writing anxiety and speaking anxiety. In view of the importance of such approaches, the studies will be able to help construct a more informed framework for addressing the cross-modality anxiety of learners in Korean and other EFL contexts in Asia, and perhaps elsewhere.

REFERENCES

Arnold, J., & Brown, H. D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Atay, D., & Kurt, G. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *The Asian EFL*

Journal Quarterly, 8(4), 100-118. Retrieved October 9, 2008, from the World Wide Web: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/December_2006_EBook.pdf.

Bailey, K. M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language acquisition: Looking at and through the diary studies. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition* (pp. 67-103). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Brown, J. D., Robson, G., & Rosenkjar, P. R. (2001). Personality, motivation, anxiety, strategies and language proficiency of Japanese students. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition, 23*, 361-398.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, Y-S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13,* 313-335.

Cheng, Y-S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*(3), 417-446.

Chon, Y. V., & Kim, H-D. (2005). University EFL learners' prior experience of writing instruction in L1 and L2. *English Teaching, 60,* 97-124.

Clement, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact, and communication competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson & P. M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives: Selected papers from the first International Conference on Social Psychology and Language held at the University of Bristol, England, July 1979* (pp. 147-154). New York: Pergamon Press.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning, 44*, 417-448.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. *Language Learning, 43*, 157-194.

Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., & Masgoret, A. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: An empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 344-362.

Hassan, B. A. (2001). *The relationship of writing apprehension and self-esteem to the writing quality and quantity of EFL university students*. ERIC Document ED459671. Retrieved November 7, 2008, from the World Wide Web: http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/19/8e/f9.pdf.

Horner, L., & Redmond, M. L. (2002). *Fear factor: Foreign language anxiety in the secondary Spanish program. Annual research forum: Studies in teaching 2002*

research digest (pp. 61-65). Winston-Salem, NC: Wake Forest University Press.

Horwitz, E. K. (1995). Student affective reactions and the teaching and learning of foreign languages. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*(7), 573-579.

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112-126.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70*, 125-132.

Jang, J.-D. (2003). Levels of language anxiety relative to proficiency levels. *English Language Teaching, 15*(4), 15-41.

Kang, D.-M. (2007). *The use of lexical collocations, given-new contract, and metadiscourse by Korean learners of English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seoul National University, Seoul.

Kim, H-M. (2007). The Korean middle school EFL learners' perception towards NESTs and Non-NESTs. *English Teaching, 62*(4), 195-220.

Kim, H-S., & Dammers, K. (2008). Korean students' perception of English word-order. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(2), 67-86.

Kim, J-H. (2000). *Foreign language listening anxiety: A study of Korean students learning English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Kim, S-Y., & Kim, J-H. (2004). When the learner becomes a teacher: Foreign language anxiety as an occupational hazard. *English Teaching, 59*(1), 165-185.

Krashen, S. (2003). Dealing with English fever. In Y-J. Chen & Y-N. Leung (Eds.), *Selected papers from the twelfth international symposium on English teaching* (pp. 100-108). Taipei: Crane.

Kroll, B. (2003). Introduction: Teaching the next generation of second language writers. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 1-10). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (1999). Techniques for reducing second language writing anxiety. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 64-88). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System, 34*, 301-316.

Llurda, E., & Huguet, A. (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness, 12*(3), 220-233.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning, 39*, 251-275.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning, 44*, 283-305.

Maeng, U. (2008). English teachers' language anxiety in the intensive teacher training

program and in the classroom. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(2), 149-172.

Mak, B. S., & White, C. (1997). Communication apprehension of Chinese ESL students. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*, 81-95.

Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2001). Quiet apprehension: reading and classroom anxieties. *JALT Journal, 23*, 227-247.

Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System, 32*, 21-36.

Mejias, H., Applbaum, R. L., Applbaum, S. J., & Trotter, R. T. (1991). Oral communication apprehension and Hispanics: An exploration of oral communication apprehension among Mexican American students in Texas. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 169-176). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: Self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*, 276-295.

Ohata, K. (2005). Language anxiety from the teacher's perspective: Interviews with seven experienced ESL/EFL teachers. *Journal of Language and Learning, 3*(1), 133-155. Retrieved December 19, 2008, from the World Wide Web: http://www.shakespeare.uk.net/ journal/jllearn/3_1/ohata.pdf.

Park, E-S. (2007). A qualitative analysis of Korean university students' perceptions about the effects of studying abroad. *English Language Teaching, 19*(4), 51-74.

Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *Modern Language Journal, 76*, 14-26.

Richards, J. C. (2003). Series editor's preface. In K. Hyland's *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rodriguez, M., & Abreu, O. (2003). The stability of general foreign language classroom anxiety across English and French. *Modern Language Journal, 87,* 365-374.

Saito, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Garza, T. J. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 83*, 202-218.

Sellers, V. (2000). Anxiety and reading comprehension in Spanish as a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*, 512-521.

Steinberg, F. S., & Horwitz, E. K. (1986). The effects of induced anxiety on the denotative and interpretive content of second language speech. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 131-136.

TOEIC Report on Test Takers Worldwide 2005. Retrieved November 5, 2008, from the World Wide Web: http://www.eu.toeic.eu/fileadmin/free_resources/Europe%20web site /3548-TOEIC_TTRep.pdf.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vargas B. G. M. (2005). *Teaching units to lower language anxiety for 8th and 9th grade ESL students in Puerto Rico*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Puerto Rico. Retrieved November 19, 2008, from the World Wide Web: http://grad.uprm.edu/tesis/vargasbatista.pdf.

Weissberg, R. (2005). Talking about writing: Cross-modality research and second language speaking/writing connections. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 93-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Young, D. J. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals, 19*, 439-445.

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 426-439.

Appendix

FLCA1

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English conversation class.
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in English conversation class.
3. I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.
4. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English conversation class.
5. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.
6. I feel confident when I speak in English conversation class.
7. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.
8. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.
9. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English conversation class.
10. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.

FLCA2

1. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.
2. I worry about the consequences of failing my English conversation class.
3. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
4. I am afraid that my English conversation teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.

5. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in English conversation class.
6. The more I study for an English conversation test, the more confused I get.
7. English conversation class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
8. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the English conversation teacher says.
9. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak English.
10. I get nervous when the English conversation teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.

Somatic Anxiety

1. My thoughts become jumbled when I write English compositions under time constraint.
2. I often feel panic when I write English compositions under time constraint.
3. I tremble or perspire when I write English compositions under time pressure.
4. I feel my heart pounding when I write English compositions under time constraint.
5. I usually feel my whole body rigid and tense when I write English compositions.
6. I freeze up when unexpectedly asked to write English compositions.
7. My mind often goes blank when I start to work on English composition.

Avoidance Behavior

1. I would do my best to excuse myself if asked to write English compositions.
2. Whenever possible, I would use English to write compositions.
3. I usually seek every possible chance to write English compositions outside of class.
4. I often choose to write down my thoughts in English.
5. I usually do my best to avoid writing English compositions.
6. Unless I have no choice, I would not use English to write compositions.
7. I do my best to avoid situations in which I have to write in English.

Cognitive Anxiety

1. I don't worry at all about what other people would think of my English compositions.
2. I'm not afraid at all that my English compositions would be rated as very poor.
3. I don't worry that my English compositions are a lot worse than others.
4. I'm afraid that the other students would deride my English composition if they read it.
5. I'm afraid of my English composition being chosen as a sample for discussion in class.
6. While writing in English, I'm not nervous at all.
7. If my English composition is to evaluated, I would worry about getting a very poor

grade.

8. While writing English compositions, I feel worried and uneasy if I know they will be evaluated.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Dae-Min Kang
Center for Educational Research,
Seoul National University
Sahn 56-1, Sillim 9-dong, Gwanak-gu
Seoul 151-748, Korea
Tel: (02) 880-8834
Email: kdm01@snu.ac.kr

Received in January, 2009
Reviewed in February, 2009
Revised version received in March, 2009