



**UNIVERSITY
OF TURKU**

Language learner self-evaluations vs. learner goals and their correlation to Foreign Language Anxiety

Saku Hellbom

Master's Thesis

The Degree Programme of Language Learning and Teaching, Department of English

School of Languages and Translation Studies

Faculty of Humanities

University of Turku

March 2023

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin Originality Check service.

Master's Thesis

Degree Programme of Language Learning and Teaching, Department of English

Saku Hellbom

“Language learner self-evaluations vs. learner goals and their correlation to Foreign Language Anxiety”

Number of pages: 43 pages, 19 pages in appendices

We asked Finnish English language students to evaluate their own English language proficiencies and their learner goals. The distance between their perceived proficiencies and their learner goals forms a “gap”. Then the students were asked to complete a Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety questionnaire and the results of the questionnaire were then compared to the sizes of the “gap” in an attempt to see whether there was a correlation between the distance between the perceived self-evaluated English language proficiency and their learner goals. There were 20 English students as participants in the original questionnaire, and 10 non-English student participants for the qualitative interviews, which were created to gain supplemental data for analysis. The hypothesis was that those with higher “gap” would experience more from Foreign Language Anxiety and those with lower ones would experience it less. The results showed that while some outliers existed, there were no reliable correlation between the “gap” and Foreign Language Anxiety. What we can gather from the results is that while the “gap” might not have any practical use for studying Foreign Language Anxiety, it is something that hopefully can be elaborated on, as a much more substantial number of participants and further refined methods could give more insight on the possible correlation of Foreign Language Anxiety, perceived self-evaluated English language proficiency and learner goals.

Key words: Foreign Language Anxiety, Language self-evaluation, Language learner goals.

Table of contents

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 4 |
| 2 | Theoretical background | 7 |
| 2.1 | Foreign Language Anxiety | 7 |
| 2.1.1 | Classifying FLA | 7 |
| 2.1.2 | FLA Symptoms | 11 |
| 2.2 | Self-assessment | 14 |
| 2.3 | Learner goals | 15 |
| 3 | Methodology | 18 |
| 3.1 | The questionnaire | 18 |
| 3.1.1 | Self-evaluation part of the questionnaire. | 18 |
| 3.1.2 | Learner-goal evaluation part of the questionnaire | 19 |
| 3.1.3 | Foreign language classroom anxiety questionnaire part of the questionnaire | 20 |
| 3.2 | Qualitative interviews | 21 |
| 4 | Findings | 22 |
| 4.1 | Participants and their background | 22 |
| 4.1.1 | Results of the self-evaluation portion of the questionnaire | 22 |
| 4.1.2 | Results of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale | 24 |
| 4.2 | Results for the qualitative interviews | 28 |
| 4.2.1 | Participants and their background | 28 |
| 4.2.2 | Qualitative interviews self-evaluation portion | 31 |
| 5 | Discussion | 39 |
| 5.1 | FLCAS scores | 41 |
| 6 | Conclusion | 44 |
| | References | 45 |
| | Appendices | 48 |
| | Appendix 1 Questionnaire and self-evaluation portion | 48 |
| | Appendix 2 Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale | 58 |
| | Appendix 3 Finnish Summary | 61 |

1 Introduction

Often students go through their studies simply working through it monotonously, but sometimes, especially during later stages of school-life, students might begin evaluating their own learning process and already gained knowledge, outside of their grades which the school has granted them. In the same vein, as students begin learning a new set of skills, and in this case those being language skills, they often have dreams and goals related to the said skills. When it comes to language learners, specifically foreign language learners, the learned language skills are very tangible as they can be displayed immediately via speech, listening comprehension, writing and reading comprehension. These learned skills often come with the contrast of what the student wishes their language skills to be like in the future, and these come in the form of learner goals. It can be safely stated that majority of students have their learner goals thought out, especially after beginning to learn a foreign language. Being able to use the language in specific settings, for example during travel, social situations with the native speakers of the said language, or generally being able to use another language to its fullest alongside their own native one, these are all viable and common learner goals for almost any language learner. The learned language might have a practical goal that the learner wants to reach for it, or the process of learning a language itself can be a very enjoyable pastime for the learner. In some cases, learning a foreign language is a part of an external motivations, as for example a company requires a worker to learn a new language in order to work at a foreign country, or in similar vein, an immigrant has to learn a language upon beginning a new life in a country where their native language is not spoken. Then again, the attitudes and beliefs of language learners might have some effect on the results of their learning (Barcelos & Kalaja 2011) which might then improve or hinder their pursuits in reaching their language goal. Regardless, it can be said that with proper techniques, perseverance, and functional learning these goals can be reached, whether the learner has all the innate capabilities to do so or not. The question, then, is if there exists any forms obstacles for one learner to achieve their learner goal.

Language learners have individual differences, which affect their successes as language learners (Pietilä & Lintunen 2014, Saville-Troike 2014). Foreign language anxiety is a proven (for example Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope 1986, Zeidner 1998) case of psychological and physical phenomena which affects some learners of a foreign language. The fear of failure or appearing to look ridiculous in front of the teacher and rest of the class, as well as

multiple other facets and contexts can affect the learner's language learning by either hindering it or bringing it to a halt entirely. Foreign language anxiety manifests itself through psychological processes that affect their behavior or many cognitive abilities such as concentrating on the task, while physiological symptoms exist, hindering the ability to speak, increasing the production of sweat as well as many other symptoms related to stress, nervousness and anxiety. The extent to how Foreign Language Anxiety manifests itself has been researched thoroughly, as well as its effects on the learning process, but there are still aspects that have not been studied as much.

The gap between language learners' own skills and their language goals is a field that has not been studied in-depth. Still, there are comparisons with Dörnyei's concept of "the ideal and ought-to-selves" (Dörnyei 2009). While one can argue that the differentiation between acquired language skills and the ultimate goals for them is a field that might not bear any salient benefit for language research, it can be said that the gap between the two points in one's language learning spectrum can be utilized as a referral point in some other aspects of language learning and research. It can be large or small based on the distance between the two points, for example those who consider themselves to be poor at the foreign language, but wish to achieve native-like language skills form a large gap between the two points, while a student who is considered to be quite proficient in the foreign language, and considers themselves being satisfied at the level they are at form a rather small gap. The utilization of the said gap in other research is another discussion on itself, but for the purposes of this thesis, we aim to examine language learners, specifically English language learners', own language proficiencies and capabilities and then compare them to their individual language goals and wished proficiencies. We then take the gap that is formed between the two points and compare it directly to how prominent foreign language anxiety is to these learners, and then finally try to deduct if there is a direct correlation between foreign language anxiety and its prominence and the size of the gap formed between language proficiency and learner goals. In the current thesis we specifically have the participants evaluate their own language proficiency, instead of actually testing them. This could give important insight to the internal evaluations and metaphysical insight of the students about themselves, as well as how they view their language goals in relation to this. When testing the participants' experiences with foreign language anxiety we rely specifically on Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety, as it is, for the purposes of this thesis, the most accessible and relatable area where foreign

language occurs to your average language learners. Classrooms are not only a very universal experience to learners of all kinds, but they are also mandatory ones in terms of children and young adults, and as such mean that this particular context is a guaranteed one for all participants.

The results of the current study and this thesis could provide insight on the prominence of foreign language anxiety with students that have high expectations about their language proficiencies and their language goals, as well as those who do not consider their future aspirations with learning the foreign language being that great. It is interesting to see how these different mindsets correlate with foreign language anxiety, if at all. It is also interesting to see if those who consider themselves to be very proficient in English experience foreign language anxiety less or more than those who consider themselves being poor at English. This thesis will also take advantage of having English students, as well as non-English students as participants. The University-level English students are a salient foundation for the purposes of this thesis, and the non-English students are there to give an alternative view to the issue at hand from a control group perspective, as well as give insight to whether or not English students experience foreign language anxiety more, due to their high learner goals. Then again, the English students might not experience foreign language anxiety as much considering their proficiency level should be relatively high. The hypothesis for this thesis is that those who have a large gap between their language proficiency and language goals suffer more from foreign language anxiety, while those with a small gap suffer less. It is also hypothesized that the amount of foreign language anxiety experienced correlates in tandem with the size of the gap as it varies in size. The research questions in this thesis are as follows: 1. Does the gap between a language learner's self-evaluated language proficiency and their learner goal with English correlate with their experienced foreign language anxiety? 2. Do English students experience more foreign language anxiety than non-English students? 3. Is measuring the gap between a language learner's self-evaluated language proficiency and their learner goal a reliable metric for further research?

2 Theoretical background

2.1 Foreign Language Anxiety

Foreign Language Anxiety (also referred to as FLA) is a very tangible set of feelings and physical phenomena that is very similar to “regular” anxiety, as both include feelings of apprehension, worry, and dread, as well as having difficulty to concentrate, becoming forgetful, sweating, and having palpitations (Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope 1986: 126).

According to Rachman (2013: 3) Anxiety can be defined as “a tense unsettling anticipation of a threatening but formless event; a feeling of uneasy suspense”. Anxiety and fear are often used interchangeably, but they are in essence, different. Fear is the emotional reaction to specific stimuli, and leads to elevated levels of arousal, which usually diminishes as soon as the perceived threat ceases to exist or is escaped from. Unlike fear, feelings of anxiety could persist for a long period of time, even up to months. As Rachman (2013) says it:

The rise and decline of fear tends to be limited in time and in space, whereas anxiety tends to be pervasive and persistent, with uncertain points of onset and offset”. Anxiety and fear share a few things, such as elevated arousal, negative affect, they are both accompanied by bodily sensations, tense apprehensiveness and sense of unease (Rachman 2013: 5).

Anxiety and fear both are accompanied with physical sensations, most commonly muscle tightness and pounding heart, sweating and trembling (Rachman 2013: 5) as well as tremors, nausea, fast pulse and shallow breath (Rachman 2013: 4). Long-term sufferers of anxiety have also reported the experiences of dizziness, faintness and experiencing chest pain. Anxiety in general is more elusive, as often the cause of anxiety is shrouded in mystery. A person could find themselves being extremely anxious, but not knowing the origin or reason for it, whereas the source of fear is known either from a previously known phobia, or from the immediate discovery of something dangerous, such as seeing a venomous snake. Next we will be discussing Foreign language anxiety itself and its many facets.

2.1.1 Classifying FLA

Foreign Language Anxiety is not a simple thing to define, as it consists of “complex psychological phenomenon influenced by many different factors” (Kralova & Petrova 2017, 117) but there are means to try and classify it. Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) divided Foreign Language Anxiety into three separate fields: communication apprehension, fear of

negative social evaluation and test anxiety (127). Communication apprehension (CA) is a “broadly based anxiety related to oral communication” (McCroskey, 1970). CA can be divided into two perspectives: trait and state (McCroskey & Beatty 1986, 280) and it is important to note that the division between the two is not clear-cut, and that conceptualizations of CA are not that clear and instead they are more of a combination of the two. Thus, trait and state perspectives can be further divided into four types: trait-like, generalized-context, person-group, and situational CA (McCroskey & Beatty 1986, 281) which will be detailed next.

According to McCroskey & Beatty (1986), “Trait-like CA is viewed as relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward oral communication across a wide variety of contexts.” This refers to the innate CA that manifests in different contexts and varies in scale from person to person. The trait-like view also assumes that “apprehension about communication in one communication context is substantially correlated with apprehension in other contexts” (McCroskey & Beatty 1986, 282). Trait-like CA therefore is an innate form of CA that remains as prevalent regardless of the context.

Generalized-context is viewed as “relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward communication in given type communication context.” (McCroskey & Beatty, 1986). Generalized context’s difference from trait-like CA is that generalized-context does not assume that CA in one communication context correlates with other contexts. Good examples of generalized-context CA are “stage fright” and “audience anxiety”. This means that CA might be more prevalent on some contexts, but far less with some other contexts.

Person-group CA can be viewed as “relatively enduring orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people. It is not viewed as personality based, but rather as a response to situational constraints generated by the other person or group” (McCroskey & Beatty 1986, 282). In short, certain aspects, such as familiarity between the people communicating and certain problems with speech acts (e.g. hesitation, stuttering) may increase the amount of CA especially with those already reported with high levels of CA.

According to McCroskey & Beatty (1986, 283) situational CA is viewed as “transitory orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people.” Like with person-group CA, it is not personality based, but as a response to situational constraints generated by the other person or group. Also, the level of situational CA is expected to fluctuate as a

function of changed constraints generated by the other person or group. In this case, familiarity between the communicators is a big factor. Alongside familiarity increasing, levels of CA could lower or become higher depending on the situational constraint's communicators bring up. For example, if the relationship between the communicators become friendlier and open, the levels of CA could lower, while if the conversations are strained and confrontational, levels of CA could become higher, as the communicators increase their hesitation to participate in the conversation.

The second field of Foreign Language Anxiety is “fear of negative social evaluation” or more specifically, “Social-evaluative anxiety” and as Watson & Friend (1969) define it:

Social-evaluative anxiety was initially defined as the experience of distress, discomfort, fear, anxiety, etc., in social situations; as the deliberate avoidance of social situations; and finally, as a fear of receiving negative evaluations from others. (Watson & Friend 1969, 448)

Social-evaluative anxiety can be further divided into two scales: Social Avoidance and Distress (SAD) scale and Fear of Negative Evaluation (FNE) scale. These two scales were used to measure range of people's tendency and desire to avoid talking, or being talked to, with other people, or even escaping social situations where talking could occur. The scales were also used to measure people's reported experiences of being upset, distressed, tense or anxious in social interactions (Watson & Friend 1969, 449). With the use of these two scales, it was shown that:

People high in SAD tended to avoid social interactions, preferred to work alone, reported that they talked less, were more worried and less confident about social relationships, but were more likely to appear for appointments. Those high in FNE tended to become nervous in evaluative situations, and worked hard either to avoid disapproval or gain approval. (Watson & Friend 1969, 448)

The third field of Foreign Language Anxiety is “test anxiety”. As described by Zeidner (1998) it is consisted of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components that students and learners experience during test situations. The cognitive facet of test anxiety refers to the mental experiences people have during test anxiety inducing situations, and as Zeidner suggests:

A body of research evidence suggests that certain cognitive expressions of anxiety (self-focused attention and cognitive preoccupation with failure, lack of confidence and feelings of inadequacy in test situations, negative performance expectations, ruminations over potential future consequences of failure, etc.) may be the most salient response characteristic of highly test anxious people to situations in which they are evaluated. (Zeidner 1998: 31)

The cognitive facet on test anxiety includes specifically worry, self-preoccupation and cognitive interference. Worry is said to be the strongest cognitive component of test anxiety, and it refers to “distressing concerns about impending or anticipated evaluative events” (Zeidner 1998) and in a test anxiety setting, it most certainly refers to the negative expectations of one’s own test success. Self-preoccupation refers to becoming self-preoccupied with fear of failure and self-blame and making self-critical and -deprecating statements and thoughts about themselves, often resulting in general self-devaluing cognitions when facing test evaluations of any kind (Zeidner 1998). Finally, the last cognitive facet is the Cognitive interference, which, according to Zeidner (1998: 39) refers to: “thoughts that intrude and pop into one’s mind during exams, but have no functional value in solving the cognitive task at hand.” Meaning different intrusive thoughts that might pop up in one’s mind during a test, taking some focus away from the task at hand.

The affective component of test anxiety according to Zeidner (1998: 40), suggests that it “consists of both objective somatic symptoms of physiological arousal as well as more subjective manifestations of emotional arousal and tension.” The affective component is often divided between the actual physical reactions and one’s perceived perceptions of these reactions. The latter being referred to as “emotionality” for the sake of clarity. The physiological reactions are objective, measurable experiences, such as increased heart rate, rate of respiration, gastric sensations, feelings of nausea, sweating, cold and clammy hands, need to pass urine, and shaking and trembling (Zeidner 1998: 40).

The third facet of test anxiety is the behavioral facet. This includes behavioral acts, which test-anxious people tend to exhibit, such as deficient study- and test-taking skills, as well as procrastination, avoidance and escape behaviors (Zeidner 1998). The deficient study- and test-taking skills refer to general deficits in the student’s academic skills, class time utilization, taking and organizing class notes, preparing for exams, encoding information, organizing information into larger patterns of meaning and so forth, which could hinder the students and increase their anxieties with test-taking and affecting their test success (Zeidner 1998). According to Zeidner (1998): Test-anxious persons often evidence a variety of avoidance or escape behaviors at various stages of the exam process”. One of the most prominent avoidance behaviors is the academic procrastination, which means putting off different tasks, and consequently becoming anxious about the said tasks (Zeidner 1998: 49). Concerning escape and avoidance behavior, Zeidner suggests that they “may often serve high-

test-anxious subjects as a “self-protective” device in reducing their tension and distress during or immediately prior to exam situations, Thus, high-test-anxious subjects frequently attempt to avoid or escape from an impending evaluative situation or show a low degree of task persistency during the evaluative encounter when the constraints against escaping are weak”. This shows that test anxiety can be a very hindering form of anxiety, as required and mandatory tasks and exams could be avoided and left unfinished completely, thus hindering one’s entire curriculum. Next, we will be going through different symptoms people might experience while suffering from Foreign Language Anxiety.

2.1.2 FLA Symptoms

FLA can also be seen through avoidance behavior, such as missing class and postponing given tasks (Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope 1986: 126). Language learning can be divided into four distinct aspects: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. When it comes to FLA, the problems are most prominently centered around listening and speaking. According to Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) speaking suffers the most with FLA, as foreign language students have reported “freezing” in role-play situations during class, despite doing well in responding to drills and giving prepared speeches. Speech disturbances, such as hesitation and mispronunciation, are the most common speech impeding reactions from SLA, according to Andrade and Williams (2009: 12). It is reported that voice quivering is also a speech-affecting phenomenon, which can also increase the anxiety and embarrassment (Tóth 2011, 44). The students can also speak too fast or too slow due to FLA (Hashemi & Abbasi 2013, 641). Talking too much or stuttering are also common symptoms (Woodrow 2006: 319). The aforementioned examples also affect fluency in general (Lennon 1990). Listening is also affected by FLA, as Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) describes:” Anxious language learners also complain of difficulties discriminating the sounds and structures of target language message. One male student claims to hear only a loud buzz whenever his teacher speaks the foreign language”.

Foreign Language Anxiety has also been found to have a negative effect on the learning process and learner behavior. As Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) explain, students have been found to “forget” the answers while doing language tests, despite perfectly recalling the correct answer way after the test itself. It is the nervousness that had arisen from

FLA that also affects spelling and syntax, leading to “careless” errors (Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope 1986: 126). FLA also manifests in overstudying, due to the fear of making errors in class. This can also be switched around, as some students suffering from FLA might willingly skip classes and avoid doing studying to alleviate their anxiousness (Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope 1986: 127). Behaviorally, students experiencing FLA have been reported to be speaking only in short phrases, shortening their speeches to one or two sentences or becoming silent entirely (Andrade & Williams, 2009: 12). This was also shown to be true by the Willingness to Communicate theory (MacIntyre et. al 1998). According to Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope’s study (1986: 127) it was noted that a multiple of students had a belief that everything they said in a foreign language in a classroom had to be said correctly, and that “it is not okay to guess an unknown foreign language word”. Such a belief will surely add to the anxiety students feel during their foreign language studies. This perfectionist mentality is shown to increase the susceptibility to FLA (Gargalianou et. al 2016, 216). Aicchorn & Puck (2017) found that communication avoidance and a severe lack of participation in communication situations as a symptom for Foreign Language Anxiety exists even in corporate life among adults, especially with the employees of multinational corporations. As described by Puck and Aicchorn (2017, 757): “Overall, when people felt anxious in English, they were less willing to communicate in English and often responded by withdrawing from such situations.” In their research communication withdrawal was a common and prevalent theme, or as Aicchorn and Puck describe it:

In our data, communication withdrawal was a key theme in spoken interactions which are immediate and synchronous and removed from the asynchronous nature of written discourse. To the degree that people perceive communication in English as unpleasant and uncomfortable, little willingness to engage in communication with others would develop. Respondents frequently tried to keep oral interactions to a minimum or refrained from engaging in discussions. They reduced contact in English to an absolute minimum, speaking only if it could not be avoided. In meetings, video-conferences and so forth, they would only speak when they were directly addressed, but stay otherwise silent. Oftentimes, people chose to simply agree with what has been discussed without entering the discussion and articulating if they did not agree” (Aicchorn & Puck 2017, 757)

Aichhorn and Puck further elaborate that communication avoidance was especially prevalent during two specific contexts: interactions involving high-ranking, elite members of an organization and interactions between native and non-native speakers. In both cases speaking in a foreign language to a high authority member of society, or a native speaker who is essentially a “high authority member” of the spoken language, avoidance and minimizing

communication was reported. The context for speaking with high-ranking organization members, a quote from one of the interviewed participants in Aicchorn and Puck's study demonstrates this well:

For certain individuals, [having to speak English] limits them clearly. When our top-level managers, like our line managers from Vienna, are visiting, it can have an impact on certain individuals. They may not be able to express what they would like to say or they stay silent instead of discussing something they would like to ask or share" (Aicchorn & Puck 2017, 757)

For the context of non-native speakers discussing with native speakers of English, the following quote from an interviewee demonstrates the point well: "The better people speak English, the less willing are those who do not speak English to participate in the conversations. They are afraid to be embarrassed. When there are no native speakers, people are more willing to speak --- Native speakers inhibit others because their language is too good. If there are no native speakers around, people dare more to speak up. That is for sure" (Aicchorn & Puck 2017, 757). This is also seen in the phenomenon known as "English as a lingua franca" where people with different native languages discuss and communicate in English (Seidholfer 2005).

The most common anxiety-inducing social situation is public speaking (Rachman 2013: 172) and as public speaking situations are prevalent in schools in forms of different oral presentations, it can be determined that they are also present foreign language classrooms and among students of English. The question then, is there any correlation between the use of a foreign language and oral presentations? Does the necessity to use a foreign language with one's oral performance increase the anxiety levels of a student? There are studies that interpret it so, but recognize the line is not always clear (Philips 1992, 20). However, according to a study by Woodrow (2006) there is a clear correlation on how anxiety does affect oral communication (Woodrow 2006, 321). Rather unsurprisingly, Woodrow also found that giving oral presentations were rated the most stress and anxiety inducing tasks in classrooms, while group discussions were rated the lowest.

Lintunen and Skaffari (2014) researched a similar topic, as they studied whether advanced learners of English considered public speaking a generic, or a language specific skill (Lintunen & Skaffari 2014: 60) by collecting learning journals of English students that were attending a course where they had to "develop their skills in preparing and giving presentations, especially academic ones, and participating in discussions" (Lintunen &

Skaffari 2014: 49). The 83 collected journals contained “speaker autobiographies” where the students reflected on their experiences speaking English, both in formal and non-formal situations, as well as public speaking situations. The results showed that “Our analysis of learner narratives found support for both views. For instance, public speaking stress was discussed as a generic feature of presentations in any language. In contrast, some learners specifically reported that giving a speech in English made them more anxious and that the use of L2 made the speaking task more complex. On the basis of these results it seems that public speaking is often considered a transferable skill from one language to the other in the sense that the experiences, failures and successes with earlier public speeches may affect future speeches in any language. Therefore, for L2 learning and teaching, it is important to note that the skills needed for L2 performance can be practised in L1 contexts as well – the affective aspect of generic speaking skills applies to both” (Lintunen & Skaffari 2014: 60). Lintunen and Skaffari add that practice in L2 is needed as well, and that speaking situations require much effort even among advanced learners.

One of the aims of this thesis is to figure out whether or not language learner’s own perceived skill level related to their goal for ultimate attainment is an indication as to why they experience FLA the way they do. This “gap” -- which has similarities with Dörnyei’s (2009) idea of “ideal and ought-to selves” -- could serve as an indication to the extent of how much language learners experience FLA, if at all. As such, we will be discussing self-assessment in second language learners next, followed by discussing learner goals and how students can reflect on what their own personal language goals are, and finally we will discuss Foreign Language Anxiety’s effect on the aforementioned concepts.

2.2 Self-assessment

According to Andrade and Valcheva (2009, 13): “Research suggests that self-regulation and achievement are closely related: Students who set goals, make flexible plans to meet them, and monitor their progress tend to learn more and do better in school than students who do not”. Therefore, self-assessment is an important tool in language learning. With classrooms often, depending on the level, having even up to 40 students, it can be extremely challenging for the teacher to give individual guidance on the students’ progress and areas to improve upon. Hence, it would be beneficial to students themselves to periodically self-evaluate and

assess their language learning process, as well as their current capabilities and level. Effective self-assessment requires the following conditions, according to Andrade and Valcheva (2009, 13): 1. Awareness of the value of self-assessment, 2. Access to clear criteria on which to base the assessment, 3. A specific task or performance to assess, 4. Models of self-assessment, 5. Direct instruction in and assistance with self-assessment, 6. Practice, 7. Cues regarding when it is appropriate to self-assess, and 8. Opportunities to revise and improve the task or performance. Most of the aforementioned conditions can be and are used by teachers in classrooms, but as Andrade and Valcheva (2009) suggest, informing the students of the criteria can be done easily and clearly using a rubric. A rubric refers to:

A scoring guide used to evaluate the quality of students' constructed responses – for example, their written compositions, oral presentations, or science projects. A rubric has three essential features: evaluative criteria, quality definitions and a scoring strategy. (Popham 1997, 72)

In European schools language learning self-assessment rubrics are known as Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR) and it is updated and supervised by Council of Europe. The rubric compartmentalizes language proficiency in six levels, from A1 to C2, which are divided into three levels: Basic user, Independent user and Proficient user. (Council of Europe, 2001). The CEFR addresses one's listening, reading speaking, and writing skills, giving it a full range of language proficiency. There exists a CEFR rubric specifically for self-assessment and each country in Europe usually have their own version of the rubric, created to be as suitable and fitting for the proficiency level of the said country. The self-assessment rubric can be a valuable tool for teaching students to self-evaluate their language skills, giving them knowledge of their own strengths and weaknesses. For the purposes of this thesis, the CEFR was utilized to create the self-assessment and learner goal - portions of the questionnaire.

2.3 Learner goals

Language learners (or learners in general) consciously or unconsciously may set learning goals for themselves. Lee and Bong (2019) define goals as such: “the cognitive embodiment of a desired future state that individuals are committed to attaining, which subsequently guides their behavior.” Language learner goals may differ in scope and range: some wish to attain a native-like proficiency in a language, while others are satisfied with merely being able

to uphold a conversation in a foreign language (Pietilä & Lintunen 2014). Learner goals can be divided into two specific goal theories, presented by Lee and Bong: the goal-setting theory (Locke and Latham 2002) and the achievement goal theory (Dweck and Leggett 1988). Basically, these theories propose that goals can be either aim-oriented or purpose-oriented. Locke and Latham (2002) describe goal-setting theory as “a goal is the object or aim of an action to attain a specific standard of proficiency, usually within a specified time limit”, meaning the goals are specific aims that learners work towards to obtain. In language learning, this can refer to a learner wanting to obtain certain level of language proficiency, for example, for work purposes or being able to hold a discussion in a foreign country. According to Dweck and Leggett (1988) achievement goal theory refers to “the purpose or the reason underlying achievement behaviors, functioning as a cognitive schema used to understand, interpret, and react to achievement-related information within a specific achievement context”. This theory can be further divided into mastery and performance goals. Mastery goal refers to students wanting to fully master the target subject, willing to put in the work to master their field and generally not being deterred from making mistakes every once in a while (Dweck and Leggett 1988), while performance goal refers to the learner’s desire to demonstrate their competence and capabilities, and are usually more distraught from making mistakes. In language learning, mastery goal can refer to the learner wanting to master the language in a native-like level, while performance goal learner might aim to learn the language enough to get by, or as not to stand out too much while conversing with other people.

According to McIntyre et al. (1997) learners’ perceived, and actual competences and language anxiety are all intercorrelated (McIntyre et al. 1997: 274). They had a questionnaire about language learners’ own perceived competence, their actual competence was studied and evaluated and their language anxiety was further tested and all of the possible correlations were analyzed. According to the study:

These results indicate that those who are more proficient tended to perceive themselves as more proficient. However, the variance shared -- between the students’ self-ratings of proficiency and the more objective ratings of proficiency was consistently below 50%. This suggests that subjective, self-rated proficiency relates substantially to actual proficiency, but the two are not isomorphic. We predicted this moderate level of correlation between subjective and objective ratings of proficiency. (McIntyre et al. 1997: 274)

This shows that learners' own perceived competence can be correlated with their own actual competence and in terms of this thesis, a very important notion when it comes to the relevancy of the current study. Curiously enough, McIntyre et al. showed in their results that language anxiety was negatively correlated, meaning that as language anxiety scores increased, the students' own perceived and self-rated competences declined. It also was noted that the negative correlation between language anxiety and the competences (both self-evaluated and actual competences) were consistent within all four categories of language learning, referring to speaking, reading, writing and comprehension (McIntyre et al. 1997: 275). The study's data shows, however, that there were systemic and consistent biases in language learners' own competence, or as McIntyre et al. describes it:

The residual scores from the regression equations show a tendency for anxious students to underestimate their level of ability and for relaxed students to overestimate theirs—evidence that “self-enhancement” occurs in less anxious students and “self-derogation” in more anxious students. (McIntyre et al. 1997, 278)

This shows that the students that felt anxious had low expectations of themselves, and the less anxious students tended to overestimate themselves. McIntyre further elaborates:

Highly anxious students do not perceive their competence to be as high as a more objective analysis reveals it to be. The arousal of anxiety probably makes some students more reluctant to speak. If language learners do not choose to communicate, they cannot re-assess their competence. Thus begins a vicious cycle, wherein the anxiety level remains high because the anxious student does not accept evidence of increasing proficiency that might reduce anxiety. Further, more frequent speaking would probably increase the students' actual level of competence, given that current pedagogical approaches emphasize the development of conversational skills. (McIntyre et al. 1997, 278-279)

This entire point is highly interesting, since it also evokes the question whether poorly rated self-evaluation or a high level of anxiety is the underlying factor, which then begins to loop into itself.

3 Methodology

The aim of this thesis is to study students' own perceived language skills and comparing it to their own learner goals and finding the gap between them, as well as to study their perceived foreign language anxiety and if there is any correlation with the language skill gap. In order to find this out, a questionnaire was designed to answer these questions, and it was sent out to university students to fill out. Questionnaires are considered to be easy to create and are versatile in collecting a large amount of data quickly in an accessible format (Dörnyei 2007, 101). Additionally, qualitative interviews were conducted as a referral group to the English students, to see if there is any correlation with the results.

3.1 The questionnaire

The questionnaire consists of three parts: A) Evaluating your own language skills B) evaluating what your destined goal is for the language, and then C) a foreign language classroom anxiety questionnaire. In its entirety, the questionnaire consists of factual questions, behavioral questions and attitudinal questions (Dörnyei 2007, 102). The participants of the questionnaire were university students at the University of Turku, specifically English majors. Aside from the main three sections, the questionnaire asked their main subject in the university, as well as how long they had studied at the said subject. They also were asked to specify if they were working on their BA- or MA-thesis, as well as what were their minor subjects. The participants also reported if they had been studying or living abroad, as well as how long, since this might give some insight on their language use and their experienced foreign language anxiety. The questionnaire was created, and answers were collected via Webropol. Questions pertaining to their age, or gender were left out, since they were not considered to add anything relevant to the questionnaire results nor the research question.

3.1.1 Self-evaluation part of the questionnaire.

The self-evaluation part of the questionnaire consisted of an 8-point scale consisting of different descriptions of language skills and "can-do" statements from four different

categories: speaking, listening, reading and writing. The 8-point scale was adapted from the CEFR self-assessment grid containing descriptions from the following levels: A2.1, A2.2, B1.1., B1.2, B2.1, B2.2, C1.1 and C2. All of the levels contain descriptions from a language learner's skills and capabilities, A2.1 being the lowest in the questionnaire and in the CEFR describing a "basic" level of language skills. C2 is the highest level in the questionnaire and in CEFR in general, describing "native speaker"-like language skills. While the questionnaire has level A2.1 as the lowest one, it still describes the skills of a capable, "basic" language learner, while all the levels under it (for example A1.1) were removed specifically because English language skills in Finland are generally very good (especially at university-level) and including them would have been unnecessary. Also, removing the three levels from the lower end of the CEFR self-assessment grid meant that the questionnaire would not appear to be as cumbersome to go through, as the existing descriptions of skill levels already took plenty of space in the questionnaire, and time to read through.

The skill-level descriptions and can-do statements consisted of multiple sentences per level and as such required some time to read through. Skill levels were as descriptive as possible to differentiate levels from one another as well as provide enough context for the participant to find the level that suited them the most. To further speed up the questionnaire-completing process, the first sentence from each level was specifically highlighted, as it gave an overall idea of the skill level, that way the participant could easily find the level closest to them and as they read the can-do statements further, they could then choose between the most suitable skill-level. For the self-evaluation portion of the questionnaire, the participants were instructed to find the option that suited their skill level, based explicitly on their own opinion, as not to rely on school grades, for example. It is hypothesized that the results of the self-evaluation part of the questionnaire would be relatively high, but lower than the results of the learner-goal evaluation part of the questionnaire, which is described next.

3.1.2 Learner-goal evaluation part of the questionnaire

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the same skill-level descriptions and can-do statements as in the self-evaluation part of the questionnaire as well as few more in-depth questions later. It was made clear to the participant, that they should choose the skill-level that they wished to be their learner goal, as well as specifying that the descriptions and can-do

statements were the same as in the previous part of the questionnaire, as to speed up the answering process. After going through the skill-level descriptions and can-do statements, the participants were then asked to answer three additional questions. The next question had the participant evaluating their “distance” to their learner-goal on a scale of 1-10 (1= My goal is almost unreachable, 10= I have reached my learner goal). Next the participants were asked to describe verbally in a free-form question, what exactly is their learner goal and what would they like to be able to do with the language, in general. Lastly, the participants had to rate the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in an order of importance to them (1= least important skill, 4= Most important skill). The three additional questions were added to gain more knowledge about the participants’ language goals. It was hypothesized that the results of the learner-goal evaluation of the questionnaire were going to be at least the same, or higher than the results of the self-evaluation part of the questionnaire.

3.1.3 Foreign language classroom anxiety questionnaire part of the questionnaire

Lastly the participants answered a 33-point, 1-5 Likert scale (1= I totally disagree, 5= I totally agree) multiple choice question task about their perceived and experienced foreign language classroom anxiety, which was based on the questionnaire developed by Horwitz et al. (1986). The questionnaire consisted of statements about students’ feelings experienced during their English language classes, and for the purposes of the main questionnaire it was specified that the answers were related to any English language courses, or courses and classes held in English. The questionnaire consisted of statements such as: “It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying in English”, “I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students” and “English language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind”. The classroom anxiety scale specifically was used because it was considered to be more reliable in the sense that all participants had gone through at least some English language courses or had courses in English at a classroom. Also focusing on classrooms specifically helped narrow down the experienced foreign language anxiety at a certain place, whereas asking about foreign language anxiety in general at any setting would’ve proven to be challenging, since this would’ve widened the parameters too far. There is no guarantee that all participants would have an active English language use outside of their courses and classes, so to anchor the parameters within the classroom, is a guarantee that

English is indeed being used. The foreign language classroom anxiety was translated to Finnish from the original English form, as the rest of the main questionnaire was already in Finnish. The foreign language classroom anxiety questionnaire would result in giving a specific rating, which would later be compared to the results of the other two parts of the questionnaire.

3.2 Qualitative interviews

Additional, qualitative interviews were later conducted to have results from non-English students as well. The people acted as a control group of sorts and are there to demonstrate the possible differences between those who actively learn the language and those who do not. As such, the participants were asked to be either students or working adults who have not majored or minored in English subjects at a university level. The participants were asked to state their age, current state of employment and where, or what field are they studying at as well as whether or not they had studied abroad and have they had any courses or lectures fully in English. Next, they were asked to give descriptions of their English language skills in the four categories (listening comprehension, reading, speaking and writing) as well as if they had any prospects on improving on said categories and by how much. The scale and descriptions were the same as the main questionnaire, with some simplifications as well as further explanations to make the participants answer as accurately as possible. The answers were open-ended but were given main-questionnaire-based numeral value (Dörnyei 2007, 106) in order to find out if there was a gap between their self-assessed skills vs their possible prospects in improving in the language. Next was three open ended questions: What were the participants' general feelings at courses or lectures held fully in English, or any English lessons in general? Have they had any anxieties or stress when they were utilizing their English? What do they consider to be the most stressful/anxiety inducing when studying/using English? Finally, they completed the FLCAS questionnaire in a similar manner and parameters as the participants in the main questionnaire did.

4 Findings

4.1 Participants and their background

The answering process resulted in 21 completed questionnaires. 20 of the questionnaires were from English majors, with one exception being a student from the School of Languages and Translation Studies who mentioned their major being something else than English (in order to maintain anonymity the major is not detailed here) and as such, was removed from the results. 7 of the participants were on the process of working on their BA-thesis, while 13 of the participants were working on their MA-thesis. Their time spent in the university ranged from 1 year to the maximum of 8 years, with the median being 4. 16 of the participants had not lived or studied abroad, and 4 of the participants were, with their country of residence consisted of Spain, Germany and China. The participants had different kinds of minor subjects, consisting of phonetics, North American Studies, political history, teacher's pedagogical studies, German, psychology, comparative literature and East Asian Studies.

4.1.1 Results of the self-evaluation portion of the questionnaire

When it came to the students evaluating their own listening comprehension skills in English, majority of the students replied with the highest score 8 was answered by 11 students (55% of the students) while the score of 7 was chosen by 8 students (40% of the students). The lowest score was 6 answered by a single student (consisted of 5% of the results). The group average was 7,5. The reading comprehension portion of the self-evaluation section of the questionnaire followed with very similar results. 50% of the participants answered with the highest score of 8, while 45% responded with the score of 7, with a single participant answering with a score of 6. The group average was 7,45. Meanwhile, speech self-evaluation portion was a lot more divisive. 4 participants evaluated with the highest score of 8 (20%) while the majority voted for the score 7 (55%, 11 participants). 4 participants evaluated with the score of 6 (20%) while a single participant answered with the lowest score of 4 (5%). The group average was 6,85. Writing skill self-evaluation also had a bit more division, with 7 participants (35%) giving themselves the score of 8, while the majority (50%, 10 participants) gave the score of 7. 2 participants (10%) gave the score 6, while a single participant gave the score of 5 (5%). The group average was 7,15.

For the learner-goal evaluation part of the questionnaire, the results were very homogenous. When asking for their desired skill level for listening comprehension 95% (19 participants) answered the native-like highest score 8, with one participant answering with the score of 7. The group average was 7,95 (increase of 0,45 from self-evaluation average). The results were the same with the participants' desired reading comprehension scores, with 95% (19 participants) wanting to achieve the native-like score 8, with one participant answering with the score of 7. The group average was the same: 7,95 (increase of 0,5 from self-evaluation average). For the desired speech skill, the clear majority (85%, 17 participants) gave the score 8, with 3 participants (15%) gave the score 7. The group average was 7,85 (increase of 1 from self-evaluation average). The participants' desired reading skills followed a similar trend, as the majority of 80% (16 participants) gave the score 8 and 20% of the participants (4 participants) gave the score 7. The group average was 7,8 (increase of 0,65 from self-evaluation average). Overall the English students considered themselves to be highly proficient in English, with still having some room to grow (as showed by the increase across all categories from self-evaluations).

The participants then answered a few additional questions related to their learner-goals and language skills. The participants were asked to evaluate their "distance" to their desired learner-goal on a scale of 1-10 (1= My goal is almost unreachable, 10= I have reached my goal). The lowest score answered was 2 and the largest score was 10. The majority of the scores went to the score 8 (7 participants), followed by the score 9 (6 participants), then followed by the score 7 (4 participants). The scores 2, 6 and 10 were answered by a single participant each. The participants then were asked to describe freely what is their learner-goal and what is actually is, what they want to be capable of. Many answered that they wanted to be able to speak without a (finnish) accent, be more fluent with their speech, have a larger vocabulary and be in general, native-like. Next, the participants were asked to put the four language skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening) to an order of importance (1= least important, 4= most important). Speech was considered to be the most important skill with 9 participants ranking it the highest score of 4 (average 2,9) followed by listening with 8 participants ranking it with the score of 3 (average 2,7) then followed by reading with 6 participants scoring it with 2 (average 2,4) and lastly, writing was scored lowest of 1 with 9 participants (average 2,1).

4.1.2 Results of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

The final part of the questionnaire was the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale part, consisting of 33 statements related to different situations and experiences related to their experienced foreign language anxiety in classrooms, and the participants would grade from a scale of 1 to 5 (1= Totally disagree, 5= I totally agree). Unfortunately, due to an unknown error, the final questionnaire consisted of 32 statements instead of the original 33 (statement 33 was “I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance”). Either the statement was not saved to the final version of the questionnaire, or it was simply forgotten to be added. Either way, fortunately the 32 should still provide plenty of beneficial data for analysis. Next, we will be going through their results, stating through the statements themselves, their average scores, as well as the highest voted answers for each section.

The first statement of the FLCAS was “I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.” which had the average score of 2,5 where the majority of 40% responded with score 1. The second statement was “I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.” which had the average score of 3,2 where the majority was tied with the scores 2 and 4 got 35% of the answers. The third statement was “I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.” which had the average score of 2,8 with the majority of 40% responded with score 2. The fourth statement was “It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.” with the average score of 2,8 with the majority of 40% responded with score 2 as well. The fifth statement was “It wouldn't bother me at all to take more English language classes.” with the average score of 4,1 where the majority of 65% responded with score 5. The sixth statement was “During English language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the class.” with the average score of 3,1 where the majority was tied with 25% for the scores 2 and 5. The seventh statement was “I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.” with the average score of 2,6 with the majority of 45% responded with the score 2. The eighth statement was “I am usually at ease during English language tests.” which had the average score of 4,0 where the majority was tied with 40% with the scores 4 and 5. The ninth statement was “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English language class.” with the average score of 2,3 with the majority of 45% responded with the score 1. The tenth statement was “I worry about the consequences of failing my English language class.”

with the average score of 1,8 where the majority of 70% responded with the score of 1 as well.

Statement number 11 was “I don't understand why some people get so upset over classes conducted in English.” which had the average score of 2,5 where the majority of 30% was tied with the score of 1 and 2. Statement number 12 was “In classes conducted in English, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.” which had the average score of 2,0 with the majority 50% responded with score 1. Statement 13 was “It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English language class.” which had the average score of 1,9 with the majority 55% participants responded with the score 1 like they did in the previous statement. Statement number 14 was “I would not be nervous speaking with English native speakers.” which had the average score of 3,5 with the majority of 35% was tied with scores 2 and 5. Statement number 15 was “I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.” which had the average score of 2,3 with the majority of 30% was tied with scores 1 and 2. Statement number 16 was “Even if I am well prepared for language class I feel anxious about it.” which had the average score of 1,6 where the majority 65% of participants responding with the score of 1. Statement number 17 was “I often feel like not going to my English language class.” which had the average score of 1,3 where the majority of 85% of participants responded with the score 1. Statement number 18 was “I feel confident when I speak English in class.” which had the average score of 3,6 where the majority 35% of participants responded with score 5. Statement number 19 was “I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.” which had the average score of 1,6 where the majority 70% of participants responded with score of 1. Statement number 20 was “I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in English language class.” which had the average score of 2,8 where the majority 35% of participants were tied with the scores 1 and 4.

Statement number 21 was “The more I study for an English language test, the more confused I get.” which had the average score of 1,3 where the majority 80% of participants responded with the score of 1. Statement number 22 was “I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my English language class.” which had the average score of 4,0 where the majority 50% of participants responded with the score of 4. Statement number 23 was “I always feel that the other students speak better English than I do.” which had the average score of 2,5 where the majority 35% of the participants responded with the score of 1. Statement number 24 was “I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.” which

had the average score of 2,3 where the majority 40% of participants responded with the score of 1 like they did in the previous statement. Statement number 25 was “English language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.” which had the average score of 1,4 where the majority 80% of participants responded with the score of 1 as well. Statement number 26 was “I feel more tense and nervous in my English language class than in my other classes.” which had the average score of 1,4 with the majority 75% of participants responding with the score of 1. Statement number 27 was “I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.” which had the average score of 1,8 where the majority 55% of participants responded with the score of 1 as well. Statement number 28 was “When I'm on my way to my language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.” which had the average score of 4,0 where the majority 45% of participants responded with the score of 4. Statement number 29 was “I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.” which had the average score of 1,7 where the majority 55% of participants responded with the score of 1. Statement number 30 was “I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.” which had the average score of 1,3 where the majority 85% of participants responded with the score of 1 as well as in the previous statement. Statement number 31 was “I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.” which had the average score of 1,9 where the majority 45% of the participants responded with the score 1 as well. Finally, the statement 32 was “I would probably feel comfortable around English native speakers.” which had the average score of 3,7 where the majority 40% of participants responded with the score of 4.

Table 1

FLCAS average scores, the majority % and the majority scores for each FLCAS statement for English students.

| Question Number | Average Score | Majority % | Majority Score |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2,5 | 40 | 1 |
| 2 | 3,2 | 35 | 2 and 4 |
| 3 | 2,8 | 40 | 2 |
| 4 | 2,8 | 40 | 2 |
| 5 | 4,1 | 65 | 5 |
| 6 | 3,1 | 25 | 2 and 5 |
| 7 | 2,6 | 45 | 2 |
| 8 | 4,0 | 40 | 4 and 5 |

| Question Number | Average Score | Majority % | Majority Score |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| 9 | 2,3 | 45 | 1 |
| 10 | 1,8 | 70 | 1 |
| 11 | 2,5 | 30 | 1 and 2 |
| 12 | 2,0 | 50 | 1 |
| 13 | 1,9 | 55 | 1 |
| 14 | 3,5 | 35 | 2 and 5 |
| 15 | 2,3 | 30 | 1 and 2 |
| 16 | 1,6 | 65 | 1 |
| 17 | 1,3 | 85 | 1 |
| 18 | 3,6 | 35 | 5 |
| 19 | 1,6 | 70 | 1 |
| 20 | 2,8 | 35 | 1 and 4 |
| 21 | 1,3 | 80 | 1 |
| 22 | 4,0 | 50 | 4 |
| 23 | 2,5 | 35 | 1 |
| 24 | 2,3 | 40 | 1 |
| 25 | 1,4 | 80 | 1 |
| 26 | 1,4 | 75 | 1 |
| 27 | 1,8 | 55 | 1 |
| 28 | 4,0 | 45 | 4 |
| 29 | 1,7 | 55 | 1 |
| 30 | 1,3 | 85 | 1 |
| 31 | 1,9 | 45 | 1 |
| 32 | 3,7 | 40 | 1 |

The FLCAS consists of 23 negatively worded statements and 9 positively worded statements. The FLCAS score was achieved by counting the sum of all answers (adding the numbers 1 to 5 to the score depending on the answer) with the 9 positively worded answers being counted in a negative order (answering with 1 adds 5 to the score, 2 adds 4 to the score et cetera). The minimum score that a participant could get was 32, while the maximum was 160. The average score of all the participants was 68,55 (the sum of the FLCAS score of all

participants divided with the number of participants: $1371/20=68,55$). The scores of all 20 participants are as follows in ascending order: 38, 46, 46, 53, 55, 56, 61, 61, 62, 63, 66, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 87, 95, 100 and 107. Overall, the results from the FLCAS show that the English students had some deviation across all statements, but mostly disagreed with the statements that displayed anxiety during classroom situations. The FLCAS scores also show that aside from a few outliers, the students were moderately to mildly anxious, displaying that the students were mostly confident, proficient, and relaxed in foreign language classroom situations. There was some division between the scores of a few statements (mainly statements 2, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15 and 20) but otherwise the results were pretty homogenous.

4.2 Results for the qualitative interviews

4.2.1 Participants and their background

All in all only 10 participants took part in the interviews. They were all adults with the age range of 23-31 (Ages of the participants in order of age: 23, 27, 28, 29, 29, 30, 30, 30, 30, 31). The participants came from a varied employment and educational backgrounds. There was an information technology engineer, a lawyer, a welder, a calibration engineer, a project manager, a press brake operator, a maintenance engineer, a senior art director, a student at a university of applied sciences for health care and finally a university student at cultural studies as well as information technologies. This shows that the participants came from a wide array of academic backgrounds. Next the participants were told to mention if they had studied abroad, and if they had, where. Only one participant had studied in Wales for 3 months, the others had no experience studying abroad. Majority of the participants (9) had experiences in attending courses or lectures completely in English, while the one remaining one had at least had a course about English in terms of learning occupational English.

The results for the question “What were the participants’ general feelings at courses or lectures held fully in English, or any English lessons in general?” were very varied. Four participants gave positive answers and mentioned that they enjoyed the language and the process of learning. Learning new words from new topics as well as getting to use speech and learn it was one of the most positive aspects. One of the reasons some of these participants in particular enjoyed English was because they were highly skillful at it already. Despite their

high proficiency, they still considered broadening their knowledge about the language to be an enjoyable activity. One participant also stated that because they were already proficient in English, they got the chance to “shine” during lessons and therefore enjoyed the subject a lot more. Overall high skill level during classes was also cited as a positive aspect for some participants, as it meant that “at least I am not worse than others at English”. One participant even mentioned that “Because the overall skill level in the classroom was so high, it did not really matter to me whether the lesson was held in English or Finnish!”.

For the remaining six participants the overall experiences were not as positive. For four of the participants the classes overall seemed redundant, frustrating, and downright boring, mostly because they considered the topics and material being too easy for them. One wished that the material would be more in-depth than it was, and that the topics were too vague and mundane. One even mentioned that they considered their English learning to be more beneficial outside of the classroom. One participant also mentioned that the frustration also stemmed from the fact that he was one of the best learners and that being in a class with less-proficient students meant that the topics would be “dumbed down”. For two participants, the negative experiences stemmed from different aspects, mainly their own internal experiences. One mentioned that they had trouble speaking up and participating in general due to being afraid of others’ reactions, which also led to their pronunciation being especially rigid. The other participant mentioned that the gap for participating and learning in English was especially hard compared to other subjects, although this apparently had changed later in their studies and in professional careers.

Next free-form question was “Have they had any anxieties or stress when they were utilizing their English?”. Nine out of the ten participants had experienced some type of anxiety or stress during their English lessons. The one participant who had not experienced any anxiety mentioned that, for example, presentations were easier when held in English. This was in complete contrast to five of the remaining participants, as all of them had reported experiencing anxiety and stress especially during presentations that they held in English. For one participant the anxiety and stress stemming from holding a presentation was mostly due to general stage fright, and not as much about having to use English itself during it, but it was still an effecting factor. The participants mentioned several symptoms that were caused the anxiety and stress from using English during lessons: Increased heartrate, stuttering, sweating palms, “pinching” sensation in the pit of their stomach, forgetfulness, as well as general

anxiety and stress. Other notable sensations and experiences stemming from anxiety and stress are where the participants had to repeatedly try to memorize how to pronounce certain words, as well as remembering which words to apply. One participant particularly mentioned that they experienced sensations of fear as well, because they had such high expectations about their own English skills, that they were afraid of sounding stupid. An another participant mentioned that they considered the act of making their language use as clear and fluent as possible, utilizing long sentences being a source of their anxiety, which goes in line with the previously mentioned participant regarding their own perceived expectations of their language skills affecting their anxiety and stress levels. One participant cited arguments online as one of their sources for English-related anxiety and stress: wanting to prove the opponent wrong and elaborating on their points as clearly as possible was something that made them anxious. Not wanting to seem foolish was something they desperately wanted to avoid. An another participant mentioned that official situations were the ones that brought them anxiety, when using English. More casual settings were the ones where using English was more relaxed and much less anxiety-inducing. In terms of improving their situation, one participant mentioned that as their English language use in work environments had increased, they had later become more accustomed to it, as well as experiencing less stress and anxiety because of it. This statement falls in line with the idea that increasing foreign language use, such as oral presentations, lessens the effect of language anxiety (Gürbüz & Cabaroğlu 2021, 610). For two participants, severe lack of use and practice meant that they had become more anxious in their respective workplaces, as they had to use English.

The final free-form question was “What do you consider to be the most stressful/anxiety inducing aspect when studying/using English?”. Two participants answered that being misunderstood was the most stressful aspect, with the other participant specified that in a discussion held in English, the fact that the other person does not understand their “fancy expressions or more complex language” is the main factor. The other participant of the two specified that being misunderstood applied more to casual settings and studying otherwise was pleasurable. Three participants specified that pronouncing words or phrases wrong is the most anxiety inducing aspect of language learning. One participant specified that the idea that they had to sound and perform perfectly was the reason behind their anxieties towards pronunciation, and that they were worried and stressed about that factor beforehand. They also added that their mistakes were almost never noticed by themselves in the moment,

but that they would recall it always afterwards. One participant cited that grammar specifically was the most stressful part and mentioned pronouns as an example. Other participant specified performing in front of an audience as the most anxiety inducing part, specifically holding presentations or answering the teacher's questions out loud. One participant specified speaking in English as the most anxiety inducing part, adding that the distinct lack of speaking exercises during classes was the main cause, and that in their experiences there should have been a lot more of it in classrooms. One participant mentioned learning the language in theory versus in practice, and considered it stressful not understanding how to apply learnt knowledge in theory, for example in speech. The second to last participant mentioned that if they had to get personal in classes, and specifically explain and tell things about themselves or from their point of view as being the most anxiety inducing aspect. Discussing topics from other perspectives other than from their own, they considered it being completely fine and stress-free. The final participant did not find any aspect of language-learning to being particularly anxiety inducing or stressful.

4.2.2 Qualitative interviews self-evaluation portion

The ten participants were all from different backgrounds in terms of their education and profession, and yet they all had strong ideas of what their levels were in different aspects of English, as well as their future prospects for them. Just like in the main questionnaire, the scale from was 1 to 8, with the maximum score being nativelike, and the lowest score being extremely poor. While the parameters were the same as in the main questionnaire, in an interview setting it would have been challenging to go through each score in their full length, thus the score descriptions were simplified a bit. Regardless, the outcome was similar and fairly conducted as in the main questionnaire. Next, we will go through the four aspects of language learning and their results. First, the listening comprehension portion of the self-evaluation all 10 of the participants answered with above average scores. Four participants responded with a score of 6 (40% of the participants). Five participants responded with a score of 7 (50% of the participants). One participant evaluated themselves with a score of 8 (10% of the participants.) The group average score for the listening comprehension portion was 6,7.

The reading comprehension portion of the interview also had above-average scores but more below-average ones. One participant gave the score of 4 (10% of the participants) while

another participant gave the score of 5 (10% of the participants). Three participants gave the score of 6 (30% of the participants). Four participants gave the score of 7 (40% of the participants). One participant gave the maximum score of 8 (10% of the participants). The group average for reading comprehension portion of the self-evaluation was 6,3.

The speech self-evaluation portion of the interview had varying scores. Three participants gave the score of 4 (30% of the participants). Three participants gave the score of 6 (30% of the participants). Four participants gave the score of 7 (40% of the participants). No maximum scores were given. The group average was 5,8.

The writing self-evaluation portion of the interview produced the lowest scores of all categories. One participant gave the score of 3 (10% of the participants), giving the lowest score from all categories and participants. Four participants gave the score of 5 (40% of the participants). Two participants gave the score of 6 (20% of the participants). Another two participants gave the score of 7 (20% of the participants). Finally, one participant gave the maximum score of 8 (10% of the participants). The group average for the writing self-evaluation portion of the interview was 5,7, which was the lowest group average.

For the learner-goal evaluation part of the interviews all participants showed desire to improve on categories, but there was also cases where the participants were fine being at the level they considered being in, without improving further. For the listening comprehension portion of the learner-goal section the results are as follows: Three participants gave the score of 6 (30% of the participants) keeping their original self-evaluation score. Five participants gave the score of 7 (50% of the participants) where only one participant raised their score from the self-evaluation portion. Two participants gave the maximum score of 8 (20% of the participants) one retaining their original self-evaluation score, and the other raising their score. The group average for listening comprehension portion for learner-goal was 6,9, which had an overall group increase of 0,2 from the self-evaluation portion.

The reading comprehension portion of the learner-goal section the results are as follows: One participant gave the score of 4 (10% of the participants) while another gave the score of 5 (10% of the participants) both retaining their score from the self-evaluation portion. Six participants gave the score of 7 (60% of the participants) three of them retaining their original score, and the other three increasing their score from the self-evaluating portion. The

group average score was 6,7, which had an overall group increase of 0,4 from the self-evaluation portion.

The speech portion of the learner-goal section of the results are as follows: Two participants gave the score of 6 (20% of the participants) both increasing their score from the original self-evaluation portion. Three participants gave the score of 7 (30% of the participants) with one participant retaining their score, while the other two of the participants increasing their score from the self-evaluation portion. Five participants gave the maximum score of 8 (50% of the participants), all of which increased their score from the self-evaluation portion. The group average for the speech portion of the learner-goal section of the interviews are 7,3, which had an increase of 1,5 from the self-evaluation portion, which was clearly the largest increase out of all of the categories.

The writing portion of the learner-goal section of the results are as follows: One participant gave the score of 4 (10% of the participants) increasing their score from the self-evaluation portion. Two participants gave the score of 5 (20% of the participants) both retaining their original score from the self-evaluation portion. One participant gave the score of 6 (10% of the participants) increasing their score from the self-evaluation portion. Four participants gave the score of 7 (40% of the participants) three of which increased their score, while one participant retained their score from the original self-evaluation portion of the interview. Two participants gave the maximum score of 8 (20% of the participants) with one participant retaining their score and the other increasing their original score from the self-evaluation portion. The group average score for the writing portion of the learner-goal section was 6,4, which had an 0,7 increase from the original group average of the self-evaluation section.

The difference between the participants' self-evaluation and their future prospects for the four different categories form a "gap". For the listening comprehension portion, all but two participants had a gap of 0, meaning there is no chance between their own perceived skill level, and the skill level they wish to attain. The two remaining participants had a gap of 1, which is a very slight increase. For the reading comprehension portion, the trend was similar to the listening comprehension, as all but three had a gap of 0. The three remaining participants had a gap of 1. For speech portion there were more variation. Only one participant had a gap of 0, meaning no change between self-evaluation and learner goal. Five

participants had a gap of 1, meaning a slight increase in their learner goal from self-evaluation. Three participants had a gap of 2 which meant a more prominent increase between self-evaluation and learner goal. None of the participants had a gap of 3, but a singular participant had a gap of 4, which is a very prominent increase between self-evaluation and learner goal. Considering the scale for both self-evaluation and learner goal portions were 1 to 8, a 4 is a high gap, which was easily the highest gap in the entire questionnaire. Overall the difference between the skills and goals with the non-English students could also show that maybe they do not consider themselves to be language learners no longer, and instead consider themselves language users in professional fields (Pietilä & Lintunen 2014).

4.3.3 Qualitative interviews Foreign Language Anxiety

The ten participants in the qualitative interview also took part in the same FLCAS questionnaire to determine their levels of classroom anxiety. The FLCAS was kept as a 32-part questionnaire to match the one in the main questionnaire of this thesis. We will go through the results next, from question to question. The first statement was “I never quite feel sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class”. The average for the statement was 2,0 with the majority of the participants (40%) responding with option 1. The second statement was “I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.” The average for the statement was 3,4 with the majority of the participants (60%) responding with option 4. The third statement was “I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.” The average for the statement was 2,8 with the majority of the participants (30%) responding with option 1. The statement was quite divisive, however, as options 2, 4 and 5 each had 20% of the participants scoring them. The fourth statement was “It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.” The average for the statement was 2,0 with the clear majority (60%) of the participants responding with option 1. The fifth statement was “It wouldn't bother me at all to take more English language classes.” which had the average of 4,1 with the majority of the participants (70%) responding with option 4. The sixth statement was “During English language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the class.” which had an average of 3,5 with the majority of the participants (40%) responding with option 2. The statement was quite divisive, however, as the remaining 60% responded with options 4 and 5 (30% each). The seventh statement was “I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.” which had the average of 1,4 with the clear majority (80%) responding with option 1. The eighth statement was “I

am usually at ease during English language tests.” which had the average of 3,9 with the majority of respondents (50%) choosing option 4. The ninth statement was “I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English language class.” which had the average of 1,6 with the majority of the respondents (60%) chose option 1. The tenth statement was “I worry about the consequences of failing my English language class.” which had an average of 1,7 with the majority (70%) of the participants choosing option 1.

Statement number 11 was “I don't understand why some people get so upset over classes conducted in English.” which had an average of 2,6 with the majority (40%) of the participants choosing option 4. Statement number 12 was “In classes conducted in English, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.” which had an average of 1,7 with the majority (70% of the participants choosing option 1. Statement 13 was “It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English language class.” which had an average of 1,6 with the majority (60%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 14 was “I would not be nervous speaking with English native speakers.” which had an average of 4,0 with the majority (50%) of the participants choosing option 5. Statement number 15 was “I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.” which had an average of 2,3 with the majority (40%) of the participants choosing option 3. Statement number 16 was “Even if I am well prepared for language class I feel anxious about it.” which had an average of 1,9 with the majority (50%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 17 was “I often feel like not going to my English language class.” which had an average of 1,7 with the majority (60%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 18 was “I feel confident when I speak English in class.” which had an average of 3,7. This statement was quite divisive, as the participants chose options 3, 4 and 5 (30% of the participants each, the remaining 10% chose option 1. Statement number 19 was “I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.” which had an average of 1,3 with the majority (80%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 20 was “I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in English language class.” which had an average of 2,1 with the majority (40%) of the participants choosing option 1.

Statement number 21 was “The more I study for an English language test, the more confused I get.” which had an average of 1,3 with the majority (70%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 22 was “I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my English language class.” which had an average of 3,7 with the majority (40%) of the

participants choosing option 5. Statement number 23 was “I always feel that the other students speak better English than I do.” which had an average of 1,3 with the majority (90%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 24 was “I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.” which had an average of 2,5 with the majority (40%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 25 was “English language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.” which had an average of 1,4 with the majority (70%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 26 was “I feel more tense and nervous in my English language class than in my other classes.” which had an average of 1,3 with the majority (70%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 27 was “I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.” which had an average of 1,2 with the majority (80%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 28 was “When I'm on my way to my language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.” which had an average of 4,4 with the majority (60%) of the participants choosing option 5. Statement number 29 was “I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.” which had an average of 2,1 with the majority (50%) of the participants choosing option 2. Statement number 30 was “I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.” which had an average of 1,6 with the majority (60%) of the participants choosing option 1. Statement number 31 was “I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.” which had an average of 1,3 with the majority (80%) of the participants choosing option 1. Finally, the statement 32 was “I would probably feel comfortable around English native speakers.” which had an average of 4,4 with the majority (70%) of the participants choosing option 5.

Table 2

FLCAS average scores, the majority % and the majority scores for each FLCAS statement for the qualitative interview participants.

| Question Number | Average Score | Majority % | Majority Score |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| 1 | 2,0 | 40 | 1 |
| 2 | 3,4 | 60 | 4 |
| 3 | 2,8 | 30 | 1 |
| 4 | 2,0 | 60 | 1 |
| 5 | 4,1 | 70 | 4 |
| 6 | 3,5 | 40 | 2 |
| 7 | 1,4 | 80 | 1 |

| Question Number | Average Score | Majority % | Majority Score |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| 8 | 3,9 | 50 | 4 |
| 9 | 1,6 | 60 | 1 |
| 10 | 1,7 | 70 | 1 |
| 11 | 2,6 | 40 | 4 |
| 12 | 1,7 | 70 | 1 |
| 13 | 1,6 | 60 | 1 |
| 14 | 4,0 | 50 | 5 |
| 15 | 2,3 | 40 | 3 |
| 16 | 1,9 | 50 | 1 |
| 17 | 1,7 | 60 | 1 |
| 18 | 3,7 | 30 | 3, 4 and 5 |
| 19 | 1,3 | 80 | 1 |
| 20 | 2,1 | 40 | 1 |
| 21 | 1,3 | 70 | 1 |
| 22 | 3,7 | 40 | 5 |
| 23 | 1,3 | 90 | 1 |
| 24 | 2,5 | 40 | 1 |
| 25 | 1,4 | 70 | 1 |
| 26 | 1,3 | 70 | 1 |
| 27 | 1,2 | 80 | 1 |
| 28 | 4,4 | 60 | 5 |
| 29 | 2,1 | 50 | 2 |
| 30 | 1,6 | 60 | 1 |
| 31 | 1,3 | 80 | 1 |
| 32 | 4,4 | 70 | 5 |

As mentioned before, the FLCAS consists of 23 negatively worded statements and 9 positively worded statements. The FLCAS score was achieved by counting the sum of all answers (adding the numbers 1 to 5 to the score depending on the answer) with the 9 positively worded answers being counted in a negative order (answering with 1 adds 5 to the score, 2 adds 4 to the score et cetera). The minimum score that a participant could get was 32,

while the maximum was 160. The average score of all the participants was 61,6 (Total score from all participants was 616 divided by the amount of participants $616/10=61,6$). The scores from all participants in ascending order are: 44, 50, 53, 53, 54, 59, 66, 70, 72, and 95. Overall the FLCAS scores show that the non-English students had a lot more unity with choosing a score for a statement, with the majority percentages having a lot higher results than their English student counterparts. There was also a lot less division with what the agreed score was, with the exception of one statement (statement 18 with the majority % divided between 3 scores). FLCAS scores seem to show that the non-English students were generally very relaxed in classroom situations, as majority of the participants were considered to be mildly to moderately anxious, with none of the participants breaching the threshold for high anxiety levels.

5 Discussion

The main goal of the questionnaire was to discover a “gap” between language learners’ self-evaluated language skills and their self-evaluated language goals. This gap was then to be compared with the participants’ FLCAS scores, to find out whether or not there was correlation with language learners’ foreign language anxieties and the size of the gap. This could then help explain why some learners are more anxious about language learning than others. All of the participants in this study were relatively homogeneous, with the clear majority evaluating themselves as fairly competent in their English language skills overall. Reading and listening comprehension was evaluated with scores 7 or 8 (the score of 8 representing native-like capabilities) with a single outlier evaluating themselves with 6 for both categories. Self-evaluating speech skills and writing skills proved to be a lot more divisive, with speech skills getting scores 4, 6, 7 and 8 with varying responses for each score, and writing skills getting scores 5, 6, 7 and 8 with varying responses for each score as well. Responses for learner-goals for each category were all fairly similar, as all participants responded with either scores 7 or 8, which is not surprising, considering that the desire for becoming native-like in a foreign language is very common (Dweck and Leggett 1988). The question asking the participants to evaluate the importance of the four different language skills sort of correlates with this, with speech being evaluated as the most important language skill, which could in turn mean that due to its importance to the participants, self-evaluating one’s speech skill could be more challenging and therefore varied among the participants. Then again, writing was evaluated as the least important language skill, and yet it was the second most varied language skill in the self-evaluation portion. This shows that the participants’ opinion of the importance of the four language skills is separate from their own self-evaluation in said skills, and the possible correlation thereof is questionable.

In general, the results show that English students in general consider themselves to be proficient in English, as well as desiring to become native-like as their goal. In terms of the self-evaluation and learner-goal gap, the clear majority had the gap range of 1 across the four different categories, meaning their language-goals are nearly being reached. This also correlates with the results from the question asking the participants to evaluate their “distance” towards their language-goals, with the clear majority responding with the score of 7 or 8 (10 corresponding that their language goal has been achieved, while 1 corresponding that their language goal is nearly unreachable). The second most common gap range was 2

(e.g., speech-skill was evaluated as 6 and their goal for the said skill was 8) which appeared mostly in the speech-skill and writing-skill categories. The largest gap range was 3 and it came from a single participant, who scored with the gap range of 2 with the other categories. Unsurprisingly, the gap range of 3 was in speech-skill.

For the supplemental, qualitative interviews we had people from different academic and employment fields, all of them non-language learners or specialists in that regard. While it is desirable to have more participants (at least as many as the ones in the main questionnaire) from the data we can form at least some interesting truths. On group average, across all categories of language learning: listening and reading comprehension, speaking and writing, the English students had larger averages compared to the ones in the qualitative interviews, both in self-evaluation and learner goals. For English students in self-evaluation, the averages for listening comprehension was 7,5 (vs. 6,7 for non-language learners), reading comprehension was 7,45 (vs. 6,3 for non-language learners), speaking was 6,85 (vs. 5,8 for non-language learners) and writing was 7,15 (vs. 5,7 for non-language learners). For learner goals the English students had higher group averages across all categories, in listening comprehension the average was 7,95 (vs. 6,9 for non-language learners), in writing comprehension the average was 7,95 (vs. 6,7 for non-language learners), in speaking the average was 7,85 (vs. 7,3 for non-language learners) and finally for writing the average was 7,8 (vs. 6,4 for non-language learners). This shows us that all categories were already high for English learners and higher than non-language learners, but this trend does not follow the increases itself from self-evaluation to learner goal with both groups. For listening comprehension and reading comprehension the increase was higher for the English students (0,45 and 0,5 respectively vs. 0,2 and 0,4 for non-language learners) but for speaking and writing the increase was lower for English students (1 and 0,65 respectively vs. 1,5 and 0,7 for non-language learners). The gap results show that the participants, for the most part, were satisfied with the level they had attained on the four categories in English. The clear majority gap result was 0, which elaborated the participants' satisfaction with their levels. Second most prevalent gap result was 1, followed by gap result of 2. Only a singular gap result of 4 was collected and, not surprisingly, it was in speech. The uniform nature of gap results for both the English students and non-language learner group brings to question the original parameters for self-assessment as well as learner goals, and their validity. Not taking into account the clear outliers from both groups, the scores were similar in that gaps were low.

Despite using the “modified” CEFR parameters specified for Finnish learners, there was not much variation. Having more variation and length in the gaps would have given more room for analysis, but then again, the overall level in English proficiency in Finland is quite high so the results with the uniform and similar gaps is to be expected. In the future, different, more specific parameters would be more beneficial for similar research, as more variation and clearer results give more to work on in terms of data analysis.

5.1 FLCAS scores

The 32- point FLCAS was given to the participants in order to get a relatable, concrete score of their own perceived anxiety. As mentioned before, the minimum possible score from FLCAS was 32 and the maximum possible score was 160. The higher the score, the more anxiety does the participant experience. Considering the halfway point between the minimum and maximum scores is 96, it can be estimated that any score above it can be seen as “moderate” or “high” anxiety, while anything below the halfway point can be seen as “moderate” or “low” depending on their approximation to the minimum and maximum scores. Going by this definition, it can be stated that the clear majority of the participants were low to moderately anxious with 18 participants being below the halfway point, while two participants were above it. The group average for the score was 68,55. Curiously enough, the one participant with the highest gap between the self-evaluation vs. language-goal was also the one with the highest FLCAS score of 107, which correlates with the hypothesis that people with large gap in self-evaluated language skills vs. self-evaluated language goals. This person also evaluated their “distance” to their language goal with one of the lowest scores, a 6, with the clear majority responding with 8 or above.

For the quantitative interviews the participants also completed the FLCAS. All of the participants had their scores below the middle point for the scale (96) meaning that all of the participants were “moderate” to “low” in terms of their Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. The participant with the highest FLCAS score had 95, just below the middle point, and had a gap of 2 in speech and a gap of 1 in writing, which does not correlate with the hypothesis that increase in gap correlates with anxiety experienced. The participant with the largest gap of 4 in speech had a FLCAS score of 66, a pretty low score. The average FLCAS score for the whole group was 61,6, which was lower than the one for the English students (6,95 point difference) which was not insignificant.

For the specific FLCAS statements, there were a few that had much higher pick-rates (over 70%, up to 90%) and curiously enough the English students had less such statements than non-English students. The English students had 7 statements which had over 70% pick rates, while non-English students had 12. This could mean that due to English students being more learned of the language, they might choose their answers more carefully, and analyze their experiences with much more care, while the non-english students might have more generalized ideas of their experiences and might have less desire to choose their responses more specifically. The statements that got 70% pick rate and higher for English students were statements (in ascending order) 10, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26 and 30, while non-English students had statements (in ascending order) 5, 7, 10, 12, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 31 and 32. There were similarities with the five following statements: 10 (I worry about the consequences of failing my English language class), 19 (I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make), 21 (The more I study for an English language test, the more confused I get), 25 (English language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind), and 26 (I feel more tense and nervous in my English language class than in my other classes), as in they were all picked by 70% or higher by both groups. The statements 10 and 21 refers to the fears and worry one feels about the consequences of failing an English language class, meaning that it falls under the test anxiety category (Horwitz et al. 1986). Statements 19, 25, and 26 refer to the fears of receiving negative evaluations from others, making it fall under fear of negative evaluation category (Horwitz et al. 1986). The statements which had 70% or over pick rates were mostly referring to the fear of negative evaluation category; for English students all but two statements referred to this, while the remaining two referred to test anxiety category. For non-English students two statements referred to test anxiety, three to communication apprehension (statements 27, 31, 32) and the remaining seven statements referred to fear of negative evaluation. With these results we can determine that fear of negative evaluation is the largest category for Foreign Language Anxiety, although a much larger amount of participants would make this claim a lot more credible.

The most divisive statements were the ones with the lowest pick rate percentages spread across all 5 scores. From the results we can see two distinct statements, one for each group: for English students it is statement 6 (“During English language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the class”) and for non-English students it is statement 3 (“I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class”). For

statement 6 the pick rates for all the scores were as follows: Score one 30%, score two 20%, score three 10%, score four 20% and score five 20%. For statement 3 the pick rates for all scores were as follows: Score one 20%, score two 25%, score three 10% score four 20% and score five 25%. Statement 6 was concerning fear of negative evaluation and statement 3 was concerning communication apprehension (Horwitz et al 1986). The specific form of communication apprehension with statement 3 falls under the Generalized-context CA (McCroskey & Beatty, 1986). Statement 6 falls under the specific form of fear of negative evaluation, where avoidance is internalized as the student knowingly or unknowingly occupies their mind with something other than the class itself (Watson & Friend 1969). Comparing these two divisive statements shows that non-English students have differentiating experiences with things like stage fright, but as the statement suggests, it can be considered more of a neutral experience as students give answers during class, as for English students the most divisive statement was about internalized avoidance during lessons. The divisiveness most likely stemming from avoidance being a very personal act, as some students have their mind wonder from the topics during class being too easy or boring, while some (perhaps the minority) purposefully avoid thinking about the lesson at hand. Again, more participants in both groups would have given more interesting results to analyze and ponder.

6 Conclusion

Overall, for this thesis, the lack of participants was the greatest hindrance for what could have been more substantial results, and as of now, the results are quite middling. The gap range throughout majority of the participants were pretty homogenous and showing that most were satisfied with the level of proficiency they had. While there were clear outliers to this, it can be seen that the relation of the gap's size to the learners' Foreign Language Anxiety has no bearing, as there were no clear, undeniable results to this. This also shows that the nature of Foreign Language Anxiety is so complex and multifaceted, that trying to get decisive results that determine ones FLA levels from simply one metric is impossible. University-level English majors are already very homogenous when it comes to self-perceived language skills, as well as anxiety levels, and this seems to extend into non-language learners who mostly are far into their professional careers, where they might consider their language learning journey to have ended. Taking these into consideration, research for FLA should be more multifaceted and should spectate the issue from multiple facets. For future studies, it would be interesting to see a larger, clearer scale for self-evaluation and learner-goal in order to get more salient gaps. Also, having substantially more participant would actually give scientifically valid results.

References

- Aicchorn, Nathalie, and Puck, Jonas. 2017. ““ I just don’t feel comfortable speaking English”: Foreign language anxiety as a catalyst for spoken-language barriers in MNC’s.” *International Business Review* 26: 749-763.
- Andrade, Heidi, and Valtcheva, Anna. 2009. “Promoting Learning and Achievement Through Self-Assessment.” *Theory Into Practice* 48: 12-19
- Andrade, Melvin, and Williams, Kenneth. 2009: “Foreign Language Learning Anxiety in Japanese EFL University Classes: Physical, Emotional, Expressive, and Verbal Reactions.” *Sophia Junior College Faculty Journal* 29: 1-24.
- Barcelos, A. M. F. and Kalaja, P. 2011. Introduction to beliefs about SLA revisited. *System*, 39: 281–289.
- Council of Europe, 2001. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/level-descriptions>. Accessed online 26.10.2021
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2009. "2. The L2 Motivational Self System." *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*, edited by Zoltán Dörnyei and Ema Ushioda, Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 2009, pp. 9-42
- Dweck, Carol, and Leggett, Ellen. 1988. “A Social-Cognitive Approach to Motivation and Personality.” *Psychological Review* 95: 256-273.
- Gargalianou, Vasiliki, Muehlfield, Katrin, Urbig, Diemo and Witteloostuijn, Arjen van. 2016. “Foreign Language Anxiety in Professional Contexts.” *Schmalenbach Business Review* 17:195–223
- Gürbüz, Cem, and Cabaroğlu, Neşe. 2021. “EFL students’ perceptions of oral presentations: Implications for motivation, language ability and speech anxiety.” *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1); 600-614
- Hashemi, Masoud, and Abbasi, Moghtada. 2013. “The Role of the Teacher in Alleviating Anxiety in Language Classes.” *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences* 4(3): 640-646.
- Horwitz, Elaine, Horwitz, Michael, and Cope, Joann. 1988. “Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety.” *The Modern Language Journal* 70: 125-132
- Kralova, Zdena, and Petrova, Gabriela. 2017. “Causes and consequences of foreign language anxiety.” *XLinguae* 10(3):110-122

- Lee, Minhye, and Bong, Mimi. 2019. "Relevance of goal theories to language learning research." *System* 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102122>. Accessed online 27.10.2021
- Lennon, P. 1990. "Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach." *Language Learning* 40: 387–417
- Lintunen, Pekka, and Skaffari, Janne. 2014. "L2 English learners as public speakers: generic and language-specific features in learner narratives." *Soveltavan Kielitieteen Tutkimuksia* 6: 43-63.
- Locke, Edwin, and Latham, Gary. 2002. "Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation." *American Psychologist* 57, no 9: 705-717.
- MacIntyre, Peter, Noels, Kimberly, and Clément, Richard. 1997. "Biases in Self-Ratings of Second Language Proficiency: The Role of Language Anxiety." *Language Learning* 47, no 2: 265-287.
- . MacIntyre, P. D., Z. Dörnyei, R. Clément, and K.A. Noels. 1998. "Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation." *The Modern Language Journal* 82(4):545–62
- McCroskey, James, and Beatty, Michael. 1986. "Oral Communication Apprehension." *Shyness: Perspectives on Research and Treatment* 279-293
- McCroskey, James. 1970. "Measures of Communication-Bound Anxiety." *Speech Monographs* 37, no 4: 269-277
- Phillips, Elaine M. 1992. "The Effects of Language Anxiety on Students' Oral Test Performance and Attitudes." *The Modern Language Journal* 76(1): 14-26
- Pietilä, Päivi. 2014. "Yksilölliset erot kielenoppimisessa." In *Kuinka kieltä opitaan: opas vieraan kielen opettajalle ja opiskelijalle*, edited by Päivi Pietilä and Pekka Lintunen. Gaudeamus.
- Pietilä, Päivi and Lintunen, Pekka. 2014. "Kielen oppiminen ja opettaminen." In *Kuinka kieltä opitaan: opas vieraan kielen opettajalle ja opiskelijalle*, edited by Päivi Pietilä and Pekka Lintunen. Gaudeamus.
- Popham, James. 1997. "What's Wrong-and What's Right-with Rubrics." *Educational Leadership* 55, no 2: 72-75
- Rachman, Stanley. [1998] 2013. "Anxiety." London: Psychology Press.
- Seidlhofer, Barbara. 2005. "English as a lingua franca." *ELF Journal* 59: 4, 339–340

- Muriel, Saville-Troike. [2006] 2014. *"Introducing Second Language Acquisition."*
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tóth, Zsuzsa. 2011. "Foreign Language Anxiety and Advanced EFL Learners: An Interview Study." *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy* 5: 39-57
- Watson, David, and Friend, Ronald. 1969. "Measurement of Social-Evaluative Anxiety." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33, no 4: 448-457
- Woodrow, Lindy. 2006. "Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second Language." *Regional Language Centre Journal* 37, no 3: 308-328
- Zeidner, Moshe. 1998. *"Test Anxiety. The state of the Art."* New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Zoltán Dörnyei 2007. *"Research Methods in Applied Linguistics."* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Questionnaire and self-evaluation portion

Kielitaito ja -tavoite sekä kieliahdistuskysely

Tässä kyselyssä vastaat omaa kielitaitoasi koskeviin kysymyksiin, kielitavoitteisiin koskeviin kysymyksiin sekä vieraan kielen ahdistukseen koskeviin kysymyksiin.

Kysely on anonymi ja sen vastauksia käytetään kyselyn laatijan Pro Gradu- tutkielmassa.

Kuvaus henkilötietojen käsittelystä löytyy oheisesta

linkistä: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nS1jdP2O68Ya9JJDAzmjzoD5sIYAzPsOU_ugNkPrAI/edit?usp=sharing

Kyselyn vastaamiseen kuluu suunnilleen 15 minuuttia

Kiitos jo etukäteen vastaamisesta!

1. Opiskeletko kieli- ja käännöstieteen laitoksella vai matemaattis-luonnontieteellisellä tiedekunnalla?

2. Mikä on pääaineesi?

3. Missä vaiheessa opintosi ovat?

Olen suorittamassa kandidaatintutkintoani

Olen suorittamassa maisterintutkintoani

Muu, mikä?

4. Kuinka mones opintovuosi sinulla on käynnissä oppiaineessasi?

5. Oletko asunut tai opiskellut ulkomailla?

En ole

Kyllä olen (merkitse missä ja kuinka pitkään)

6. Mitä sivuaineita olet opiskellut?

Seuraavaksi vastaat kysymyksiin kielitaidoistasi. Vastausten tulisi perustua siihen, mitä ITSE

KOET taitotasosi olevan. Kysymykset käsittelevät kuullun ymmärtämistä, luetun

ymmärtämistä, puhumista ja kirjoittamista. Valitse se väittämä, joka parhaiten kuvaa taitotasiasi. Pyri vastaamaan mahdollisimman rehellisesti.

7. Valitse se vaihtoehto, joka kuvaa parhaiten **KUULLUN YMMÄRTÄMISEN** tasoasi englannin kielessä *

1: Pystyn ymmärtämään yksinkertaista puhetta tai seuraamaan keskustelua aiheista, jotka ovat minulle välittömän tärkeitä. Pystyn ymmärtämään lyhyiden, yksinkertaisten, itseäni kiinnostavien keskustelujen ja viestien ydinsisällön. Yksinkertaisenkin viestin ymmärtäminen edellyttää normaalilla nopeudella ja selkeästi puhuttua yleiskielistä puhetta, joka usein täytyy lisäksi toistaa.

2: Ymmärrän tarpeeksi kyetäkseni tyydyttämään konkreetit tarpeeni. Pystyn seuraamaan hyvin summittaisesti selväpiirteisen asiapuheen pääkohtia. Pystyn yleensä tunnistamaan ympärilläni käytävän keskustelun aiheen. Ymmärrän tavallista sanastoa ja hyvin rajallisen joukon idiomeja. Yksinkertaisenkin viestin ymmärtäminen edellyttää yleispuhekieltä, joka äännetään hitaasti ja selvästi. Toistoa tarvitaan melko usein.

3: Ymmärrän pääajatukset ja keskeisiä yksityiskohtia puheesta, joka käsittelee koulussa, työssä tai vapaa-aikana säännöllisesti toistuvia teemoja mukaan lukien lyhyt kerronta. Tavoitan elokuvien, tv-ohjelmien ja selkeiden puhelinviestien pääkohdat. Pystyn seuraamaan yhteiseen kokemukseen tai yleistietoon perustuvaa puhetta. Ymmärrän tavallista sanastoa ja rajallisen joukon idiomeja. Pitemmän viestin ymmärtäminen edellyttää normaalia hitaampaa ja selkeämpää yleiskielistä puhetta. Toistoa tarvitaan silloin tällöin

4: Ymmärrän selväpiirteistä asiantietoa, joka liittyy tuttuihin ja melko yleisiin aiheisiin jonkin verran vaativissa yhteyksissä (epäsuora tiedustelu, työkeskustelut, ennakoitavissa olevat puhelinviestit). Ymmärrän pääkohdat ja tärkeimmät yksityiskohdat ympärilläni käytävästä laajemmasta muodollisesta ja epämuodollisesta keskustelusta. Ymmärtäminen edellyttää yleiskieltä tai melko tuttua aksenttia sekä satunnaisia toistoja ja uudelleenmuotoiluja. Nopea syntyperäisten välinen keskustelu ja vieraiden aiheiden tuntemattomat yksityiskohdat tuottavat vaikeuksia.

5: Ymmärrän asiallisesti ja kielellisesti kompleksisen puheen pääajatukset, kun se käsittelee konkreetteja tai abstrakteja aiheita. Ymmärrän puheen pääkohdat, puhujan tarkoituksen, asenteita, muodollisuusastetta ja tyyliä. Pystyn seuraamaan laajaa puhetta

ja monimutkaista argumentointia, jos puheen kulku on selvästi merkitty erilaisin jäsentimin (sidesanat, rytmitys). Pystyn tiivistämään tai ilmaisemaan kuulemastani avainkohdat ja tärkeät yksityiskohdat. Ymmärrän suuren osan ympärilläni käytävästä keskustelusta, mutta voin kokea vaikeaksi ymmärtää useamman syntyperäisen välistä keskustelua, jos nämä eivät mitenkään helpota sanottavaansa.

6: Ymmärrän elävää tai tallennettua, selkeästi jäsentynyttä yleiskielistä puhetta kaikissa sosiaalisen elämän, koulutuksen ja työelämän tilanteissa (myös muodollinen keskustelu ja syntyperäisten välinen vilkas keskustelu). Pystyn yhdistämään vaativia tehtäviä varten kompleksista ja yksityiskohtaista tietoa kuulemistani laajoista keskusteluista tai esityksistä. Osaan päätellä ääneen lausumattomia asenteita ja sosiokulttuurisia viitteitä sekä arvioida kriittisesti kuulemaani. Ymmärrän vieraita puhujia ja kielimuotoja. Huomattava taustamelu, kielellinen huumori ja harvinaisemmat idiomit ja kulttuuriviittaukset saattavat yhä tuottaa vaikeuksia.

7: Ymmärrän suhteellisen vaivattomasti pitempääkin puhetta tai esitystä (elokuvia, luentoja, keskusteluja, väittelyjä) erilaisista tutuista ja yleisistä aiheista myös silloin, kun puhe ei ole selkeästi jäsenneiltyä ja sisältää idiomaattisia ilmauksia ja rekisterinvaihdoksia. Ymmärrän hyvin erilaisia äänitemateriaaleja yksityiskohtaisesti ja puhujien välisiä suhteita ja tarkoituksia tunnistuen. Vierias aksentti tai hyvin murteellinen puhekieli tuottavat vaikeuksia.

8: Ymmärrän vaikeuksitta kaikenlaista elävää ja nauhoitettua puhetta silloinkin, kun on kyse syntyperäisen kielenpuhujan nopeasta puheesta. Vierias aksentti ei aiheuta ymmärrysvaikeuksia ja ymmärrän kaiken kuulemani.

8. Valitse se vaihtoehto, joka kuvaa parhaiten **LUETUN YMMÄRTÄMISEN**

tasoasi englannin kielessä *

1: Ymmärrän yksinkertaisia ja kaikkein tavanomaisinta sanastoa sisältäviä tekstejä (yksityisviestejä, arkisimpia käyttöohjeita). Ymmärrän tekstin pääajatuksen ja joitakin yksityiskohtia parin kappaleen pituisesta tekstistä. Osaan paikantaa ja verrata yksittäisiä tietoja ja pystyn hyvin yksinkertaiseen päättelyyn kontekstin avulla. Lyhyenkin tekstipätkän lukeminen ja ymmärtäminen on hidasta.

2: Ymmärrän pääasiat ja joitakin yksityiskohtia muutaman kappaleen pituisista

viesteistä jonkin verran vaativissa arkisissa yhteyksissä (mainokset, kirjeet, ruokalistat, aikataulut). Pystyn hankkimaan helposti ennakoitavaa uutta tietoa tutuista aiheista selkeästi jäsenellystä muutamana kappaleen pituisesta tekstistä. Osaan päätellä tuntemattomien sanojen merkityksiä niiden kieliasusta ja kontekstista. Tarvitsen usein uudelleen lukemista ja apuvälineitä tekstikappaleen ymmärtämiseksi.

3: Pystyn lukemaan monenlaisia, muutamana sivun pituisia tekstejä (taulukot, kalenterit, kurssiohjelmat, keittokirjat) tutuista aiheista ja seuraamaan tekstin pääajatuksia, avainsanoja ja tärkeitä yksityiskohtia myös valmistautumatta. Pystyn seuraamaan tuttua aihetta käsittelevän parisivuisen tekstin pääajatuksia, avainsanoja ja tärkeitä yksityiskohtia. Arkikokemuksesta poikkeavien aiheiden ja tekstin yksityiskohtien ymmärtäminen voi olla puutteellista.

4: Pystyn lukemaan muutamana kappaleen pituisia tekstejä monenlaisista aiheista (lehtiartikkelit, yksinkertainen kaunokirjallisuus) ja selviän myös jonkin verran päättelyä vaativista teksteistä käytännönläheisissä ja itselleni tärkeissä tilanteissa. Pystyn etsimään ja yhdistelemään tietoja useammasta muutamana sivun pituisesta tekstistä suorittaakseni jonkin tehtävän. Pitkien tekstien jotkin yksityiskohdat ja sävyt saattavat jäädä epäselviksi.

5: Pystyn lukemaan itsenäisesti muutamana sivun pituisia tekstejä (lehtiartikkeleita, novelleja, viihde- ja tietokirjallisuutta, ja raportteja) oman alan tai yleisistä aiheista. Tekstit voivat käsitellä abstrakteja, käsitteellisiä tai ammatillisia aiheita, ja niissä on tosiasioita, asenteita ja mielipiteitä. Pystyn tunnistamaan kirjoittajan ja tekstin tarkoituksen, paikantamaan useita eri yksityiskohtia pitkästä tekstistä. Vaikeuksia tuottavat vain pitkien tekstien idiomit ja kulttuuriviittaukset.

6: Pystyn lukemaan itsenäisesti useana sivun pituisia, eri tarkoituksiin laadittuja kompleksisia tekstejä (päivälehtiä, novelleja, kaunokirjallisuutta). Jotkin näistä voivat olla vain osittain tuttuja tai tuntemattomia, mutta itseni kannalta merkityksellisiä. Pystyn tunnistamaan kirjoittajan asennoitumisen ja tekstin tarkoituksen. Pystyn paikantamaan ja yhdistämään useita käsitteellisiä tietoja monimutkaisista teksteistä. Ymmärrän riittävästi tiivistääkseni pääkohdat tai ilmaistaakseni ne toisin sanoin. Vaikeuksia tuottavat vain pitkien tekstien harvinaisemmat idiomit ja kulttuuriviittaukset.

7: Ymmärrän yksityiskohtaisesti pitkäköjiä, kompleksisia tekstejä eri aloilta.

Pystyn vaihtelevaan lukutapaani tarpeen mukaan. Osaan lukea kriittisesti ja tyyllisiä vivahteita arvioiden sekä tunnistan kirjoittajan asennoitumisen ja tekstin piilomerkityksiä. Pystyn paikantamaan ja yhdistämään useita käsitteellisiä tietoja monimutkaisista teksteistä, tiivistämään ne ja tekemään niistä vaativia johtopäätöksiä. Vaativimmat yksityiskohdat ja idiomaattiset tekstikohdat saattavat vaatia useamman lukukerran tai apuvälineiden käyttöä.

8: Pystyn lukemaan vaivatta käytännöllisesti katsoen kaikenlaista kirjoitettua kieltä, myös abstrakteja, rakenteellisesti tai kielellisesti monimutkaisia tekstejä kuten erityisalojen artikkeleita ja kaunokirjallisuutta. Käytännössä ymmärrän kaiken lukemani, sisältäen myös kaikki idiomaattiset ilmaisut ja tyylliset vivahteet.

9. Valitse se vaihtoehto, joka kuvaa parhaiten **PUHUMISEN** tasoasi englannin kielessä

1: Osaan kuvata lähipiiriäni muutamien lyhyin lausein. Selviydyn yksinkertaisista sosiaalisista kohtaamisista ja tavallisimmista palvelutilanteista. Kykenen harvoin ylläpitämään pitempää keskustelua. Tuotan sujuvasti joitakin tuttuja jaksoja, mutta puheessani on paljon hyvin ilmeisiä taukoja ja väriä aloituksia. Ääntäminen on ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on hyvin ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä voi koitua satunnaisia ymmärtämisongelmia. Hallitsen kaikkein yksinkertaisimman kieliopin alkeellisessa vapaassa puheessa, mutta virheitä esiintyy yhä paljon perusrakenteissakin.

2: Osaan esittää pienen, luettelomaisen kuvauksen lähipiiristäni ja sen jokapäiväisistä puolista. Pystyn osallistumaan rutiinomaisiin keskusteluihin omista tai itselleni tärkeistä asioista. Voin tarvita apua keskustelussa ja vältellä joitakin aihepiirejä. Puheeni on välillä sujuvaa, mutta erilaiset katkokset ovat hyvin ilmeisiä. Ääntäminen on ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä esiintyy. Osaan kohtalaisen hyvin tavallisen, jokapäiväisen sanaston ja jonkin verran idiomaattisia ilmaisuja. Laajemmassa vapaassa puheessa esiintyy paljon virheitä perusasioissa ja ne voivat joskus haitata ymmärrettävyyttä.

3: Osaan kertoa tutuista asioista myös joitakin yksityiskohtia. Selviydyn kielialueella tavallisimmista arkitilanteista ja epävirallisista keskusteluista. Pidän yllä ymmärrettävää puhetta, vaikka pitemmissä puhejaksoissa esiintyy taukoja ja epäröintiä. Ääntäminen on

selvästi ymmärrettävää, vaikka vieras korostus on joskus ilmeistä ja ääntämisvirheitä esiintyy jonkin verran. Osaan käyttää melko laajaa jokapäiväistä sanastoa ja joitakin yleisiä fraaseja ja idiomeja. Laajemmassa vapaassa puheessa kielioppivirheet ovat tavallisia mutta ne haittaavat harvoin ymmärrettävyyttä.

4: Osaan kertoa tavallisista, konkreeteista aiheista kuvaillen, eritellen ja vertaillen ja selostaa myös muita aiheita, kuten elokuvia, kirjoja tai musiikkia. Osaan viestiä varmasti useimmissa tavallisissa tilanteissa. Kielellinen ilmaisu ei ehkä ole kovin tarkkaa. Vaikka taukoja ja katkoksia esiintyy, puhe jatkuu ja viesti välittyy. Ääntäminen on hyvin ymmärrettävää, vaikka intonaatio ja painotus eivät ole aivan kohdekielen mukaisia. Osaan käyttää kohtalaisen laajaa sanastoa ja tavallisia idiomeja. Käytän myös monenlaisia rakenteita ja mutkikkaitakin lauseita. Kielioppivirheitä esiintyy jonkin verran, mutta ne haittaavat harvoin laajempaakaan viestintää.

5: Osaan esittää selkeitä, täsmällisiä kuvauksia monista kokemuspiiriini liittyvistä asioista, kertoa tuntemuksistani sekä tuoda esiin tapahtumien ja kokemusten henkilökohtaisen merkityksen. Pystyn osallistumaan aktiivisesti useimpiin käytännöllisiin ja sosiaalisiin tilanteisiin sekä melko muodollisiin keskusteluihin. Pystyn säännölliseen vuorovaikutukseen syntyperäisten kanssa. Kielellinen ilmaisu ei aina ole täysin tyylikästä. Pystyn tuottamaan puhejaksoja melko tasaiseen tahtiin, ja puheessa on vain harvoin pitempiä taukoja. Ääntäminen ja intonaatio ovat selkeitä ja luontevia. Osaan käyttää monipuolisesti kielen rakenteita ja laajahkoa sanastoa mukaan lukien idiomaattinen ja käsitteellinen sanasto. Kieliopin hallinta on melko hyvää, eivätkä satunnaiset virheet yleensä haittaa ymmärrettävyyttä.

6: Osaan pitää valmistellun esityksen monenlaisista yleisistäkin aiheista. Pystyn tehokkaaseen sosiaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen syntyperäisten kanssa. Osaan keskustella ja neuvotella monista asioista, esittää ja kommentoida vaativia ajatuskulkuja ja kytkeä sanottaviani toisten puheenvuoroihin. Esitys voi olla kaavamaista, ja turvaudun toisinaan kiertoilmauksiin. Ääntäminen ja intonaatio ovat hyvin selkeitä ja luontevia. Hallitsen laajasti kielelliset keinot ilmaista konkreetteja ja käsitteellisiä, tuttuja ja tuntemattomia aiheita varmasti, selkeästi ja tilanteen vaatimaa muodollisuusastetta noudattaen. Kielelliset syyt rajoittavat ilmaisua erittäin harvoin. Kieliopin hallinta on hyvää. Usein korjaan virheeni itse, eivätkä virheet haittaa ymmärrettävyyttä.

7: Osaan pitää pitkähkön, valmistellun muodollisenkin esityksen. Pystyn ottamaan aktiivisesti osaa monimutkaisiin käsitteellisiin ja yksityiskohtia sisältäviin tilanteisiin. Osaan käyttää kieltä monenlaiseen sosiaaliseen vuorovaikutukseen. Osaan viestiä sujuvasti, spontaanisti ja lähes vaivattomasti. Osaan vaihdella intonaatiota ja sijoittaa lausepainot oikein. Sanasto ja rakenteisto ovat hyvin laajat ja rajoittavat ilmaisua erittäin harvoin. Osaan ilmaista itseäni varmasti, selkeästi ja kohteliaasti tilanteen vaatimalla tavalla. Kieliopin hallinta on hyvää. Satunnaiset virheet eivät hankaloita ymmärtämistä, ja osaan korjata ne itse.

8: Pystyn ottamaan vaivatta osaa asioiden käsittelyyn ja kaikkiin keskusteluihin. Tunnen hyvin kielelle tyypilliset, idiomaattiset ilmaukset ja puhekieliset ilmaukset. Pystyn tuomaan esille ajatuksiani sujuvasti ja välittämään täsmällisesti hienojakin merkitysvivahteita. Osaan perääntyä ja kiertää mahdolliset ongelmat niin sujuvasti, että muut tuskin havaitsevat olleenkaan ongelmia. Pystyn esittämään selkeän ja sujuvan kuvauksen tai perustelun asiayhteyden sopivalla tyyllillä. Esityksessäni on tehokas looginen rakenne, joka auttaa vastaanottajaa havaitsemaan ja muistamaan tärkeitä seikkoja.

10. Valitse vaihtoehto, joka kuvaa parhaiten **KIRJOITTAMISEN** tasoasi englannin kielessä

1: Selviydyn kirjoittamalla kaikkein rutiininomaisimmista arkitilanteista. Osaan kirjoittaa lyhyitä, yksinkertaisia viestejä, jotka liittyvät arkisiin tarpeisiin sekä yksinkertaisia, luettelomaisia kuvauksia hyvin tutuista aiheista. Osaan käyttää perustarpeisiin liittyvää konkreettia sanastoa ja perusaikamuotoja sekä yksinkertaisin sidossanoin liitettyjä rinnasteisia lauseita. Kirjoitan kaikkein yksinkertaisimmat sanat ja rakenteet melko oikein, mutta teen toistuvasti virheitä perusasioissa ja tuotan paljon kömpelöitä ilmaisuja vapaassa tuotoksessa.

2: Selviydyn kirjoittamalla tavanomaisissa arkitilanteissa. Osaan kirjoittaa hyvin lyhyen, yksinkertaisen kuvauksen tapahtumista, menneistä toimista ja henkilökohtaisista kokemuksista tai elinympäristöni arkipäiväisistä puolista. Osaan arkisen perussanaston, rakenteet ja tavallisimmat sidoskeinot. Kirjoitan yksinkertaiset sanat ja rakenteet oikein, mutta teen virheitä harvinaisemmissa rakenteissa ja muodoissa ja tuotan kömpelöitä

ilmaisuja.

3: Pystyn kirjoittamaan ymmärrettävän, jonkin verran yksityiskohtaistakin arkitietoa välittävän tekstin tutuista, itseäni kiinnostavista todellisista tai kuvitelluista aiheista. Osaan kirjoittaa selväpiirteisen sidosteisen tekstin. Pystyn välittämään tehokkaasti tuttua tietoa. Osaan useimpien tutuissa tilanteissa tarvittavien tekstien laadintaan riittävän sanaston ja rakenteet, vaikka teksteissä esiintyy interferenssiä ja ilmeisiä kiertoilmaisuja. Rutiininomainen kieliaines ja perusrakenteet ovat jo suhteellisen virheettömiä, mutta jotkut vaativammat rakenteet ja sanaliitot tuottavat ongelmia.

4: Osaan kirjoittaa henkilökohtaisia ja julkisempiakin viestejä, kertoa niissä uutisia ja ilmaista ajatuksiani tutuista abstrakteista ja kulttuuriaiheista, kuten musiikista tai elokuvista. Osaan kirjoittaa muutaman kappaleen pituisen jäsenyneen tekstin. Osaan esittää jonkin verran tukitietoa pääajatuksille ja ottaa lukijan huomioon. Hallitsen melko monenlaiseen kirjoittamiseen tarvittavaa sanastoa ja lauserakenteita. Pystyn kirjoittamaan ymmärrettävää ja kohtuullisen virheetöntä kieltä, vaikka virheitä esiintyy vaativissa rakenteissa, tekstin jäsentelyssä ja tyyliässä ja vaikka äidinkielen tai jonkin muun kielen vaikutus on ilmeinen.

5: Osaan kirjoittaa selkeitä ja yksityiskohtaisia tekstejä monista itseäni kiinnostavista aihepiireistä, tutuista abstrakteista aiheista, rutiiniluonteisia asiaviestejä sekä muodollisempia sosiaalisia viestejä. Osaan kirjoittaessani ilmaista tietoja ja näkemyksiä tehokkaasti ja kommentoida muiden näkemyksiä. Osaan yhdistellä tai tiivistää eri lähteistä poimittuja tietoja omaan tekstiin. Osaan laajan sanaston ja vaativia lauserakenteita sekä kielelliset keinot selkeän, sidosteisen tekstin laatimiseksi. Sävyä ja tyylin joustavuus on rajallinen, ja pitkässä esityksessä voi ilmetä hyppäyksiä asiasta toiseen. Hallitsen melko hyvin oikeinkirjoituksen, kieliopin ja välimerkkien käytön, eivätkä virheet johda väärinkäsityksiin. Tuotoksessa saattaa näkyä äidinkielen vaikutus. Vaativat rakenteet sekä ilmaisun ja tyylin joustavuus tuottavat ongelmia.

6: Osaan kirjoittaa selkeitä, yksityiskohtaisia, muodollisia ja epämuodollisia tekstejä monimutkaisista todellisista tai kuvitelluista tapahtumista ja kokemuksista enimmäkseen tutuille ja toisinaan tuntemattomille lukijoille. Osaan kirjoittaa esseiden, muodollisen tai epämuodollisen selostuksen, muistiinpanoja jatkotehtäviä varten ja

yhteenvedoja. Osaan kirjoittaa selkeän ja jäsenyneen tekstin, ilmaista kantani, kehitellä argumentteja systemaattisesti, analysoida, pohtia ja tiivistää tietoa ja ajatuksia.

Kielellinen ilmaisuvarasto ei rajoita havaittavasti kirjoittamista. Hallitsen hyvin kieliopin, sanaston ja tekstin jäsennyksen. Virheitä voi esiintyä harvinaisissa rakenteissa ja idiomattisissa ilmauksissa sekä tyylliseikoissa.

7: Pystyn kirjoittamaan selkeitä, hyvin jäsenyneitä tekstejä monimutkaisista aiheista, ilmaisemaan itseäni täsmällisesti ja ottamaan huomioon vastaanottajan.

Osaan kirjoittaa todellisista ja kuvitteellisista aiheista varmalla, persoonallisella tyyllillä käyttäen kieltä joustavasti ja monitasoisesti. Pystyn kirjoittamaan selkeitä ja laajoja selostuksia vaativistakin aiheista. Osoitan, että hallitsen monia keinoja tekstin jäsentämiseksi ja sidosteisuuden edistämiseksi. Kielellinen ilmaisuvarasto on hyvin laaja.

Hallitsen hyvin idiomattiset ilmaukset ja tavalliset sanonnat. Hallitsen todella hyvin kieliopin, sanaston ja tekstin jäsennyksen. Virheitä voi esiintyä satunnaisesti idiomattisissa ilmauksissa sekä tyylliseikoissa.

8: Osaan kirjoittaa selkeää, erittäin hyvin jäsenyneitä, sujuvaa tekstiä erittäin monimutkaisista aiheista asiaankuuluvalla tyyllillä ottaen huomioon kaikki mahdolliset vastaanottajat. Osaan kirjoittaa todellisista ja kuvitteellisista aiheista varmalla, persoonallisella tyyllillä käyttäen kieltä täydellisesti. Pystyn kirjoittamaan selkeitä ja laajoja selostuksia kaikkein vaativimmistakin aiheista. Osoitan, että hallitsen erittäin monia keinoja tekstin jäsentämiseksi ja sidosteisuuden edistämiseksi. Kielellinen ilmaisuvarasto on erittäin laaja. Hallitsen hyvin lähes kaikki idiomattiset ilmaukset ja sanonnat. Hallitsen erittäin hyvin kieliopin, sanaston ja tekstin jäsennyksen. Virheitä esiintyy todella harvoin, jos koskaan.

15. Arvioi asteikolla 1-10 kuinka pitkä "matka" sinulla on haluamaasi kielitavoitteeseen (1= Tavoitteeni on lähes saavuttamaton, 2= olen erittäin kaukana tavoitteestani, 9= olen erittäin lähellä tavoitettani, 10= olen saavuttanut kielitavoitteeni)

16. Kuvaile sanallisesti, MIKÄ on haluamasi kielitavoite? Mitä haluaisit osata?

17. Laita edellä mainitut taitotasot (luetun ymmärtäminen, kirjoittaminen, kuullun ymmärtäminen ja puhuminen) mielestäsi tärkeysjärjestykseen.

Minkälaisessa tärkeysjärjestyksessä edellä mainitut taidot ovat sinulle englannin kieltä käyttäessäsi? 1= Vähiten tärkeä 4= Tärkein *

Luetun ymmärtäminen

Kuullun ymmärtäminen

Kirjoittaminen

Puhuminen

Appendix 2 Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) developed by Horwitz et al. (1986)

The statements below refer to YOUR FEELING EXPERIENCED DURING YOUR ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES. Choose one of the following:

Alla olevat väittämät liittyvät ENGLANNIN KURSSEILLA TAI ENGLANNIKSI PIDETTÄVILLÄ KURSSEILLA TAI LUENNOILLA KOKEMIISI TUNTEISIIN. Valitse vaihtoehto, joka vastaa parhaiten omaa kokemustasi:

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 – I totally disagree | Täysin eri mieltä |
| 2 – I rather disagree | Jokseenkin eri mieltä |
| 3 – I do not know | En osaa sanoa |
| 4 – I rather agree | Jokseenkin samaa mieltä |
| 5 – I totally agree | Täysin samaa mieltä |

| | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| 1 | I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class. En ole koskaan oikein varma itsestäni, kun puhun englannin kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2 | I don't worry about making mistakes in language class. En ole huolissani virheiden tekemisestä englannin kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3 | I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class. Minua hermostuttaa, kun tiedän, että minun pitää kohta vastata englanniksi opettajan kysymykseen. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4 | It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. Säikähdän jos en ymmärrä, mitä opettaja sanoo englanniksi. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5 | It wouldn't bother me at all to take more English language classes. Ottaisin mielelläni lisää englannin kursseja. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6 | During English language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the class. Englannin kurssilla huomaan ajattelevani asioita, joilla ei ole mitään tekemistä oppitunnin kanssa. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7 | I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am. Ajattelen usein, että toiset opiskelijat ovat parempia englannissa kuin minä. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8 | I am usually at ease during English language tests. Olen yleensä rentoutunut englannin kokeiden aikana. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9 | I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English language class. Hätäännyn, jos joudun puhumaan englannin kurssilla ilman mahdollisuutta valmistautua siihen etukäteen. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10 | I worry about the consequences of failing my English language class. Olen huolissani siitä, mitä seuraa, jos saan hylätyn englannin kurssista. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11 | I don't understand why some people get so upset over classes conducted in English. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| | En ymmärrä, miksi jotkut ihmiset ovat niin hermostuneita englanniksi pidettävien kurssien takia. | |
| 12 | In classes conducted in English, I can get so nervous I forget things I know. Saatan olla englanniksi pidettävillä kursseilla niin hermostunut, että unohtelen asioita, jotka tiedän osaavani. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13 | It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English language class. Minua nolottaa tarjoutua vastaamaan englannin kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14 | I would not be nervous speaking with English native speakers. Minua ei hermostuttaisi puhua englantia ihmisten kanssa, jotka puhuvat sitä äidinkielenään. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15 | I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. Hermostun, kun en ymmärrä, mitä opettaja korjaa puheessani. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16 | Even if I am well prepared for language class I feel anxious about it. Jännitän englannin kursseja silloinkin, kun olen valmistautunut niihin hyvin. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 17 | I often feel like not going to my English language class. Minusta tuntuu usein siltä, etten haluaisi mennä englannin kurssille. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 18 | I feel confident when I speak English in class. Tunnen oloni itsevarmaksi, kun puhun englantia kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 19 | I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. Pelkään, että englannin opettajani korjaa välittömästi kaikki tekemäni virheet. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 20 | I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in English language class. Sydämeni pamppailee, kun odotan vastausvuoroani englannin kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 21 | The more I study for an English language test, the more confused I get. Mitä enemmän luen englannin kokeeseen, sitä enemmän pääni menee sekaisin. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 22 | I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my English language class. En tunne painetta valmistautua erityisen hyvin englannin kursseja varten. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 23 | I always feel that the other students speak better English than I do. Minusta tuntuu aina siltä, että toiset opiskelijat puhuvat englantia paremmin kuin minä. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 24 | I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. Tunnen oloni hyvin vaivaantuneeksi, kun joudun puhumaan englantia toisten opiskelijoiden edessä. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 25 | English language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind. Englannin kurssit etenevät niin nopeasti, että pelkään jääväni jälkeen. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | |
|----|--|-----------|
| 26 | I feel more tense and nervous in my English language class than in my other classes. Tunnen oloni englannin kursseilla jännittyneemmäksi ja hermostuneemmaksi kuin muilla kursseilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 27 | I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class. Olen hermostunut ja ymmälläni puhuessani englannin kurssilla. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 28 | When I'm on my way to my language class, I feel very sure and relaxed. Kun olen menossa englannin kurssille, tunnen oloni hyvin varmaksi ja rentoutuneeksi. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 29 | I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says. Minua hermostuttaa, jos en ymmärrä jokaista sanaa, jonka opettaja sanoo englanniksi. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 30 | I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language. Englannin puhumista varten opeteltavien sääntöjen määrä tuntuu minusta ylivoimaiselta. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 31 | I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. Pelkään toisten opiskelijoiden nauravan minulle, kun puhun englantia. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 32 | I would probably feel comfortable around English native speakers. Tuntisin todennäköisesti oloni rennoksi sellaisten ihmisten seurassa, jotka puhuvat englantia äidinkielenään. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 33 | I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. Minua hermostuttaa, kun englannin opettaja esittää kysymyksiä, joihin en ole valmistautunut vastaamaan. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Appendix 3 Finnish Summary

Vieraan kielen ahdistus on suhteellisen yleinen sarja sekä henkisiä, että fyysisiä tuntemuksia, joita vieraan kielen käyttäjät voivat tuntea puhuessaan vierasta kieltä (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope 1986). Sillä on samanlaisuuksia varsinaisen ahdistuksen kanssa, sillä molemmissa esiintyy pelon, murheen ja kauhun tunteita, sekä keskittymisvaikeuksia, unohtelvaisuutta, hikoilua ja sydämen tykytyksiä (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope 1986: 126). Varsinainen ahdistus voidaan kuvailla ”jännittävänä, epämiellyttävänä odotuksena uhkaavasta, mutta muodottomasta tapahtumasta; tuntemus epämukavasta jännityksestä.” (Rachman 2013: 3). Ahdistusta ei tule kuitenkaan tulla sekoittaa esimerkiksi yleiseen pelkoon, vaikka näin on tavanomaista, sillä ne kaksi tuntemusta ovat kuitenkin erilaisia. Pelko koetaan yleensä äkillisenä ja spesifinä tuntemuksena tiettyihin stimuluksiin, johtuen korostuneeseen vireillä oloon, mutta joka kuitenkin väistyy pois, kun oletettu uhka lakkaa olemasta tai siitä on paettu. Toisin kuin pelko, ahdistus ja sen tuntemukset voivat jatkua pitkäänkin, jopa kuukausia (Rachman 2013). Sekä pelossa että ahdistuksessa koetaan monia fyysisiä tuntemuksia, kuten lihasten jännittyneisyytenä, hakkaavina sydämen lyönteinä, hikoiluna, tärisemisenä, sekä vapiseksena, pahoinvointina, kohonneena pulssina ja tiheänä hengityksenä (Rachman 2013: 4-5). Ahdistus on yleisesti vaikeaselkoisempi, koska sen alkuperä voi olla kokijalleen täysin mysteeri. Ihminen voi kokea olevansa ahdistunut täysin tietämättömästä syystä, kun taas pelon syyt usein tiedetään aikaisemmista fobioista, tai jonkun välittömän vaaran esiintymisestä, kuten myrkkykäärmeen näkemisestä. Seuraavaksi käsittelemme vieraan kielen ahdistusta enemmän.

Horwitz, Horwitz ja Cope (1986: 127) jakoi vieraan kielen ahdistuksen kolmeen eri luokkaan: huoli kommunikaatiosta (Communication Apprehension), pelko negatiivisesta sosiaalisesta arvioinnista (Fear of Negative Social Evaluation) ja testi ahdistus (Test Anxiety). Huoli kommunikaatiosta konseptina on jaettu vielä kahteen eri perspektiiviin: ominaisuus (trait) ja olotila (state) (McCroskey & Beatty 1986: 280). Tämä viittaa siihen, miten huoli kommunikaatiosta voi esiintyä ihmisen sisäisenä piirteenä tai tiettyinä hetkinä riippuen kontekstista. Jako ominaisuuden ja olotilan perspektiivien välillä ei ole helpposelitteinen, siksi McCroskey ja Beatty (1986) jakoi nämä vielä neljään eri tyyppiin: piirteenkaltainen (trait-like), yleiskontekstuaalinen (generalized-context), yksilö-ryhmä (person-group) ja tilannekohtainen huoli kommunikaatiosta (situational communication apprehension). Piirteenkaltainen -tyyppi viittaa siihen, miten huoli kommunikaatiosta on henkilösidonnainen,

eli se vaihtelee henkilöstä toiseen, ja on täten mukana monessa eri konteksteissa ja sosiaalisissa tilanteissa, sekä on korrelaatiossa muihin ahdistustiloihin. Yleiskontekstuaalinen on muutoin samanlainen piirteenkaltaisen kanssa, mutta ahdistuksen tunteet eivät välttämättä korreloi kaikissa konteksteissa. Esimerkkinä tästä voi olla ”ramppikuume” ja ”yleisöahdistus”. Yksilö-ryhmä -tyyppi viittaa miten ahdistus esiintyy vain tietyissä sosiaalisissa konteksteissa, joissa tuttuus ryhmän jäsenten kanssa ja siellä toteutuvat puheongelmat voivat lisätä ahdistusta. Toisen henkilön tai ryhmän muodostavat tilannekohtaiset rajoitteet voivat lisätä myös ahdistusta. Lopuksi, tilannekohtainen huoli kommunikaatiosta -tyyppi on samanlainen yksilö-ryhmä -tyypissä, paitsi että suhteella ryhmän muihin jäseniin on suurempi vaikutus siihen, koetaanko puhetilanne ahdistavana. Tuttuus ryhmän muihin jäseniin voi nosta huolta kommunikaatiosta tai laskea sitä, riippuen millaisia rajoitteita ryhmän jäsenet tuovat (McCroskey & Beatty 1986).

Vieraan kielen ahdistuksen toinen luokka on pelko negatiivisesta arviosta (Fear of negative social evaluation). Watson ja Friend (1969) kuvailevat tätä erilaisiksi pelon, ahdistuksen, epämukavuuden ja hädän tunteisiin sosiaalisissa tilanteissa, tahalliseksi sosiaalisten tilanteiden välttelyksi sekä lopuksi pelkona negatiivisen arvion saantina toisilta (1969: 448). Watson ja Friend jakoivat tämän luokan kahteen skaalaan: sosiaalinen välttely ja ahdinko (Social Avoidance and Distress) sekä pelko negatiivisesta arviosta (Fear of Negative Evaluation). Näillä kahdella skaalalla mitattiin ihmisten taipumuksia ja haluja keskustelemisen välttelemisestä, sekä erilaisia jännityksen, hätäntymisen ja ahdistumisen tunteita sosiaalisissa interaktioissa (Watson & Friend 1969: 449). Näillä kahdella skaalalla osoitettiin, että ne joilla oli suuret tasot sosiaalisessa välttelyssä ja ahdingossa puhuivat vähemmän, työskentelivät enemmän yksin, välttelivät keskustelua, mutta todennäköisemmin osallistuivat tapaamisiin. Ne, joilla oli suuret tasot pelko negatiivisesta arvioista tulivat hermostuneiksi arviointitilanteissa ja työskentelivät erityisen kovaa vältelläkseen paheksuntaa tai saavuttaakseen hyväksyntää (Watson & Friend 1969: 448).

Vieraan kielen ahdistuksen kolmas luokka on testi ahdistus joka tarkoittaa kognitiivisia, affektiivisiä ja behavioraalisia piirteitä joita oppilaat kokevat koetilanteissa (Zeidner 1998). Kognitiiviset piirteet viittaavat tässä tilanteessa murheeseen, ajatusten valtaamiseen, ja kognitiivisiin häiriötekijöihin. Murhe on vahvin kognitiivinen piirre testi ahdistuksessa ja viittaa yleisesti murheelliseen odotukseen väistymättömistä tai odotetuista arvioitilanteista (Zeidner 1998). Ajatusten valtaaminen viittaa tässä siihen, miten oppija alkaa

ylitsevuotavasti fokuoitumaan epäonnistumisen pelkoonsa, itsekriittisyyteen tai itsensä halventamiseen. Viimeinen kognitiivinen piirre on kognitiiviset häiriötekijät jotka tässä kontekstissa viittaavat häiritseviin, tunkeutuviin ajatuksiin jotka tulevat mieleen koetilanteessa, joista ei ole mitään hyötyä itse koetilanteessa.

Affektiiviset piirteet viittaavat testi ahdistuksessa yksinkertaisemmin ”emotionaalisuuteen”, mutta Zeidnerin mukaan ne viittaavat ”Sekä objektiivisiin somaattisiin oireisiin fysiologisista virikkeistä, että subjektiiviset manifestaatiot emotionaalisesta virikkeisyydestä ja jännityksestä (1998: 40). Oireisiin kuuluu lisääntynyt syke, hengitystaajuus ja pahoinvointi, hikoilu, kylmät kädet, värinä ja vapina (Zeidner 1998: 40).

Kolmas piirre testi ahdistuksessa on behavioraaliset piirteet. Tämä sisältää testi ahdistuneitten keskuudessa heikentyneet opiskelu- ja testintekotaidot, prokrastinaatio, välttely sekä pakoilukäytöksiä (Zeidner 1998). Opiskeluajankäytön heikentyminen, muistilappujen ja muistiinpanojen huono organisointi ja opitun informaation käsittely vaikuttavat kaikki opiskelijamenestykseen ja esiintyvät testiahdistuneilla usein. Myös kokeiden välttely nähdään keinona ”suojella” itseään ahdistavalta tilanteelta ja tämä voi myös vaikuttaa opiskelijamenestykseen.

Vieraan kielen ahdistukseen sisältää edellä mainittujen lisäksi myös monia muita oireita, joita käydään lyhykäisyydessään läpi seuraavaksi. Vieraan kielen ahdistus voi aiheuttaa puheeseen, saamalla puhujan änkyttämään, epäröimään, toistelemaan ja ”jäätymään” (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope 1986). Oppijoilla voi puhe myös ”väristä” (Tóth 2011: 44), puhe voi nopeutua tai hidastua (Hashemi & Abbasi 2013: 641) ja oppilas voi myös puhua (Woodrow 2006: 319). Oppijat voivat myös vähentää puhettaan vain muutaman fraasiin tai hiljentyä kokonaan (Andrade & Williams 2009: 12). Vieraan kielen puhujat voivat myös aktiivisesti vetäytyä puhetilanteista, varsinkin kun kyseessä on korkea-arvoinen henkilö tai kyseisen vieraan kielen natiivista puhujasta (Aicchorn & Puck 2017). Puheitten pitäminen todettiin myös yhdeksi ahdistavimmaksi tilanteeksi (Rachman 2013: 172) ja vieraalla kielellä puheen pitäminen koettiin vieläkin ahdistavammaksi (Lintunen & Skaffari 2014).

Tämän gradutyön tavoitteena on arvioida kieltenoppijoiden itsearvioitua taitotasoa ja sen suhdetta heidän kielitaitotavoitteeseen. Näiden kahden välille muodostuu ”väli” jonka suuruutta verrataan sitten heidän kokemaansa vieraan kielen ahdistukseen ja pyritään selvittämään, onko näillä korrelaatiota. Siksi käymme seuraavaksi läpi itsearviointia ja

kielitavoitteita. Andraden ja Valtchevan (2009) mukaan opiskelijat, jotka asettavat itsellensä tavoitteita ja pyrkivät saavuttamaan ne monitoroiden samalla heidän kehittymistään usein pärjäävät paremmin koulussa kuin muut oppilaat (2009: 13). Tehokas itsearviointi sisältää Andraden ja Valtchevan mukaan 1. Tietoisuus itsearvioinnin arvosta, 2. Pääsy selkeihin kriteereihin, johon perustaa arviointinsa, 3. Spesifi tehtävä tai suoritus arvioimiseen 4. Itsearvioinnit eri mallit, 5. Suora ohjeistus ja avustus itsearvioinnissa, 6. Harjoitukset, 7. Merkit milloin soveliaista itsearvioida ja 8. Mahdollisuudet uusia ja parantaa tehtäviään tai suorituksiaan (Andrade & Valtcheva 2009: 13). He myös lisäävät, että nämä toteutuvat käyttämällä rubriikkia, tai pisteytysopasta. Eurooppalaisissa kouluissa kielten kohdalla käytetään pisteytysoppaiden kohdalla kieliä koskevaa yhteistä eurooppalaista viitekehystä (Common Framework of Reference for Language CEFR). Eurooppalainen viitekehys jaetaan kuuntelemiseen, lukemiseen, kirjoittamiseen ja puhumiseen ja eri arvioihin näillä neljällä kategoriolla (Council of Europe 2001). Kielitaidot lokeroidaan kuuteen osaamistasoon A1:stä C2:een, jotka jaetaan kolmeen tasoon: perustason kielenkäyttäjä, itsenäinen kielenkäyttäjä ja taitava kielenkäyttäjä.

Kielitavoitteet voivat olla tiedostamattomia tai tiedostettuja tavoitteita mitä oppijat asettavat itselleen. Kielitavoitteet voidaan jakaa kahteen tavoiteteoriaan: tavoitteen asettamisteoria (Dweck & Leggett 1988) ja tavoitteen saavutusteoria (Locke & Latham 2002). Locke ja Latham kuvailevat teoriaansa siten, että tavoitteet ovat spesifit päämäärät joihin oppijat pyrkivät. Kielenoppimisessa tämä voi tarkoittaa tietyn kielitason saavuttamisen, esimerkiksi että voi pitää keskustelua yllä vieraassa maassa. Dweck ja Leggett viittaavat taas teoriallaan siihen, että tavoitteet halutaan saavuttaa tietyn aiheen täyteen osaamiseen, tai jotta osaamistaan voidaan esitellä muille. Kielenoppimisessa tämä voi viitata kielen täyteen hallitsemiseen tai että pystyy keskustelemaan vieraskielisten kanssa ilman ongelmia.

Tämän gradun tavoitteena oli löytää englannin oppijoiden itsearvioidun kielitason ja heidän kielitavoitteensa välisen suuruuden mahdollinen korrelaation heidän vieraan kielen ahdistukseensa. Hypoteesina oli, että mitä suurempi väli kielitason ja -tavoitteen välillä, sitä suurempi vieraan kielen ahdistus. Tutkimuskysymyksiä oli kolme seuraavaa: 1. Korreloiko kieltenopiskelijoiden itsearvioidun kielitason ja heidän kielitavoitteen muodostama välin suuruus heidän kokemansa vieraan kielen ahdistuksen kanssa? 2. Kokevatko englannin kielen opiskelijat enemmän vieraan kielen ahdistusta kuin ei-englannin kielen opiskelijat? 3. Onko

kielten oppijoiden itsearvioiman kielitason ja kielitavoitteen väliin muodostuvan välin käyttö reliaabeli jatkotutkimuksessa?

Kyselyyn osallistuneet olivat Turun Yliopiston englannin kielen opiskelijoita. Heiltä kysyttiin, kuinka kauan he olivat opiskelleet yliopistossa, olivatko he tekemässä kandidutkielmaansa vai pro gradututkielmaansa, olivatko he olleet opiskelijavaihdossa tai asuneet muutoin ulkomailla. Osallistujia oli lopulta 20 kappaletta. Sama kysely pyrittiin lähettämään myös matemaattis-luonnontieteen opiskelijoille jotta saataisiin verrokkiryhmä englannin kielen opiskelijoille, mutta valitettavasti yhtään vastausta ei saatu. Tästä syystä laadittiin myöhemmin laadullinen haastattelu, johon otettiin työelämästä tai muualta korkeakouluista suunnilleen samanikäisiä osallistujia, jolla pystyttiin edes jotenkin saamaan verrokkiryhmä. Kaikki laadullisen haastatteluun osallistuneet eivät olleet opiskelleet englantia pää- tai sivuaineenaan. Osallistujia laadulliseen haastatteluun saatiin 10 kappaletta.

Tutkimusta varten laadittiin kysely webropol-palvelussa, joka koostui kolmesta osasta: 1. Osallistujat arvioivat omaa kielitasoaan, 2. Osallistujat arvioivat omaa kielitavoitettaan, ja 3. Täyttivät vieraan kielen luokkahuoneahdistuskyselyn (FLCAS). Itsearviointilomake koostui 8-pisteisistä väittämistä, jotka kuvasivat erilaisia osaamistasoja. Väittämät oli muotoiltu eurooppalaisen viitekehyksen kuvauksista, ja sisälsivät kuvauksia tasoilta A2.1, A2.2, B1.1, B1.2, C1.1 ja C2. Alin taso oli perustason kielenkäyttäjät ja ylin taitavan, natiivinkaltaisen käyttäjän tasoa. Eurooppalaisen viitekehyksen alin taso oli poistettu, koska kielitason koettiin suomalaisten keskuudessa olevan niin hyvä. Osallistujia kehoitettiin tutustumaan tarkkoihin ja pitkiin tasokuvauksiin huolella ja valitsemaan itseään kaikkein kuvaavin vaihtoehto. Kielitavoite-osuus kyselyssä oli vastaava kuin kielitason arvioinnissa, paitsi että osuuden lopussa oli muutama avoimempi kysymys jolla pyrittiin saamaan lisätietoa kielitavoitteista. Osallistujat arvioivat ”etäisyyttään” kielitavoitteestaan asteikolla 1-10, 1 kuvasi tavoitetta mahdottomaksi, 10 tavoitteen saavutetuksi. Seuraavaksi osallistujat kuvasivat vapaamuotoisesti tavoitettaan ja mitä spesifisti halusivat hallita ja osata kielessä. Viimeisenä, osallistujat arvioivat neljää kielitaitoa (kuullun ymmärtäminen, kirjoittaminen, luetun ymmärtäminen ja puhuminen) ja asettivat ne tärkeysjärjestykseen. Luokkahuoneahdistuskysely teetettiin viimeisenä, ja se valittiin koska luokkahuonetilanteet ovat kaikille nuorille ja opiskelijoille tuttu konteksti, täten saatiin mahdollisimman relevantti yhteys vieraan kielen ahdistukseen. Vieraan kielen luokkahuoneahdistuskysely (Horwitz et al. 1986) on 33-osainen 1-5 asteikkoinen monivalintakysely, jossa 1 tarkoitti ”täysin eri mieltä”

ja 5 ”täysin samaa mieltä”. Kysely sisälsi väittämiä opiskelijoiden tuntemuksista ja kokemuksista luokkahuoneessa, nimenomaan englannin kielen tunneilla, ja niihin liittyvistä ahdistuksen tunteista. Kysely antaisi pistetuloksen, joka määrittäisi luokkahuoneahdistuneisuuden määrän osallistujalla.

Lisänä teetätettiin laadullinen haastattelu, jotta englannin kielen opiskelijoilla olisi verrokkiryhmä. Heiltä kysyttiin ikä, pääaine/työpaikka, olivatko he opiskelleet tai asuneet ulkomailla ja kuinka pitkään. Heillä teetätettiin samanlainen, haastatteluun soveltuvampi versio englannin kielitason itsearviosta ja kielitavoitteesta, kuitenkin pitäen sama skaala kuin englannin opiskelijoilla. Tätä seurasi kolme avointa kysymystä: 1. Mikä on yleinen tuntemukseksi kurseista tai luennoista, joita pidettiin täysin englanniksi, tai englannin aiheista yleisesti? 2. Onko sinulla yhtään ahdistusta tai stressiä, kun käytät englantia? 3. Mikä on mielestäsi ahdistavinta/stressaavinta englannin kielen opiskelussa/käytössä? Lopuksi he suorittivat saman vieraan kielen luokkahuoneahdistuskyselyn kuin englannin pääaineopiskelijat.

Tuloksissa todettiin, että englannin opiskelijat arvioivat itseään korkeatasoisiksi ja osaaviksi englannin kielessä, ja monilla tavoitteena oli natiivinkaltainen taso. Tason ja tavoitteen väli oli yleisesti hyvin pieni. Ei-englannin opiskelijoilla taitotaso oli hieman alempi, mutta tavoite oli monilla jo täytynyt tai ainakin alempi kuin englannin opiskelijoilla. Tason ja tavoitteen väli oli hyvin vaihteleva, mutta muutamalla osallistujalla huomattavasti suurempi kuin englannin kielen opiskelijoilla. Vieraan kielen luokkahuoneahdistuskyselyssä todettiin, että englannin opiskelijoilla oli enemmän luokkahuoneahdistusta kuin ei-englannin opiskelijoilla. Vieraan kielen luokkahuoneahdistuksen korrelaatiota on saaduilla tuloksilla mahdotonta todeta varmaksi. Tietämättömän virheen takia myös alun perin 33-osainen kysely päättyi osallistujille 32-osaisena, joka varmasti vaikutti tuloksiin.

Tämän gradun tutkimus kärsi eniten osallistujien vähydestä ja kielitaitotason sekä -tavoitteen parametrien kapeudesta. Näillä tuloksilla voidaan todeta että itsearvioidun kielitason ja -tavoitteen väli ei korreloi vieraan kielen ahdistuksen kanssa. Olisi kiinnostavaa nähdä vastaava tutkimus, jossa parametrejä laajennettaisiin, jotta välieroja syntyisi enemmän ja osallistujia olisi huomattavasti enemmän. Toisaalta on mahdollista, että korkean taitotason takia eroja ei löydy.