



## EFL LEARNERS' COMMUNICATION OBSTACLES

### YABANCI DİL İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENENLERİNİN İLETİŞİM ENGELLERİ

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Hidayet TOK**

Adıyaman University Education Faculty,

Education Science Dept.

[htok@adiyaman.edu.tr](mailto:htok@adiyaman.edu.tr)

#### **Abstract**

The purpose of the present study is to investigate Turkish EFL learners' communication obstacles in English language classrooms. Main obstacles of communication are anxiety and unwillingness. In this study, the situation of the students' anxiety and unwillingness was determined. This study was carried out in spring term of 2007-2008 education year in Education Faculty of Adıyaman University in Turkey. A66-item survey of 139 first-year undergraduate non-English majors revealed that 1. Most of the respondents were willing to participate in interpersonal interactions and like to risk using/speaking English in the class. 2. Half of the students felt anxious to communicate in their English language classrooms and speaking to native speakers. 3. Females are less anxious and more willing to communicate in English classrooms than males. 4. The students in Social Science department feel more anxious and are more unwilling to communicate in English classroom than the students in Math, Science and Class Teacher departments. 5. Students who perceive their English "poor" feel more anxious and are more unwilling to communicate in English classes than the other students perceiving their English level "Very Good, Good and OK,"

**Keywords:** Communication Obstacles, Classroom Communication, Anxiety, Unwillingness, ELT.

#### **Öz**

Bu araştırmanın amacı yabancı dil İngilizce dil sınıflarında İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin iletişim engellerini araştırmaktır. İletişim engellerinin başında kaygı ve isteksizlik durumu gelmektedir. Bu araştırmada öğrencilerin kaygı ve isteksizlik durumları tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bu araştırma 2007/08 öğretim yılı bahar döneminde Adıyaman Üniversitesi Eğitim fakültesinde gerçekleştirildi. Araştırmaya İngilizce dersi alan 139 birinci sınıf öğrencisi, 66 maddeden oluşan ankete cevap vererek katılmışlardır. Araştırma sonucunda şu sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır: 1. Araştırmaya katılan öğrencilerin çoğu, İngilizce derslerinde kişiler arası iletişim kurmada ve sınıfta İngilizce konuşmada istekli görünmüşler. 2. Öğrencilerin yarısı İngilizce dersinde konuşmada ve anadili İngilizce olanlarla konuşmada kendilerini kaygılı hissetmişler. 3. Bayan öğrenciler erkek öğrencilere göre İngilizce dersinde iletişim kurmada daha az kaygılı ve daha istekliler. 4. Sosyal Bilimlerdeki öğrenciler, Matematik, Fen Bilgisi ve Sınıf öğretmenliği bölümündeki öğrencilere göre İngilizce dersinde iletişim kurmada kendilerini daha kaygılı ve daha isteksiz hissetmektedirler. 5. İngilizce dersinde kendilerini "zayıf" algılayanlar, kendilerini " çok iyi", "iyi", ve yeterli" algılayanlara göre İngilizce dersinde iletişim kurmada daha kaygılı ve isteksizler.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** İletişim Engelleri, Sınıf İletişimi, Kaygı, İsteksizlik, İngilizce Öğretimi

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, an increasing number of researchers have recognized obstacles in practicing a FL/SL in language classrooms and out of classrooms. Most students' common phenomenon in a speaking class of an ordinary Turkish university is that students struggle between their thoughts in their native language and the corresponding English expression for these ideas. Due to the largely uneven levels of their Turkish and English language competence, that process is doomed to be hard and laborious. This is not an exception, and this is only one of the many problems existing in EFL classrooms in Turkey.

The unwillingness during English speaking process is considered as one of the biggest obstacles for English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners (Burgoon (1976). This unwillingness can take various forms: apprehension, low self-esteem, lack of communicative competence, alienation, anomie and introversion (Burgoon, 1976, p62). Lui&Jackson (2008) quoted from McCroskey (1992) stated that people who experience a high level of communication apprehension "withdraw from and seek to avoid communication when possible" (p.79). Introverted and reserved people tend to be quieter and less willing to communicate. Participants with high level of communication apprehension have a marked tendency to avoid public speaking, furthermore, reticent people are sometime seen as less trustworthy, less competent, less dynamic, less socially and physically attractive, tense, less composed less dominant people than people who are not reticent (Lui&Jackson 2008 quoted from Burgoon , Pfau, Birk&Manusav, 1987).

The other obstacles encountered in improvement of communication in EFL classrooms is the foreign language anxiety resulting from the students' concern about making mistakes particularly in front of their friends. Language anxiety mostly results in a dominance of the teacher and confident students during discussions. Thus, even if sufficient time is allocated to oral student interaction, introverted, shy and highly anxious students cannot benefit the opportunities arising from the context. MacIntyre&Gardner, (1994, p. 284) states that Foreign language (FL) anxiety is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon referring to "the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language [L2] contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning" .

To identify anxious university students and measure their anxiety, Horwitz et al. (1986) developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), which has gained widespread popularity in later research studies on language learning situations (Aida, 1994; Kitano, 2001; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey&Daley, 1999; Phillips, 1992; Saito & Samimy, 1996; Wang & Ding, 2001; Yan & Wang, 2001, Lui&Jackson, 2008).

The studies revealed that anxiety exists in almost every aspect of L2/FL learning and that much of the anxiety is associated with understanding and speaking the target language. Speaking

publicly in the target language is particularly anxiety provoking for many students, even those who feel little stress in other aspects of language learning (Horwitz, 1995). Anxious students are less likely to volunteer answers or to participate in oral classroom activities (Ely, 1986).

Qualitative studies have suggested that unwillingness to communicate and anxiety affect each other in L2/FL learning. As a result of anxiety, English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a Second Language learners often choose to remain silent and are unwilling or less willing than other students to participate in speech communication in class; then, because of their silence and unwillingness to speak the language in class, they become (more) anxious (Hilleson, 1996; Jackson, 2002; Liu, 2006; Tsui, 1996).

The most important communication obstacles the linguistics and researchers express are unwillingness and anxiety to communicate. So, the present research focused on the basic communication obstacles which are unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety of Turkish EFL learners at a tertiary level and aimed to seek answers to the following questions as well; 1. What are the main communication obstacles of EFL learners? 2. Is there a significant difference in communication obstacles according to gender? 3. Is there a significant difference in communication obstacles according to the disciplines? 4. Is there a significant difference in communication obstacles according to self-rated overall English Proficiency?

## **2. METHOD**

### *Research Design*

For the present study, there were 139 participants (63 female, 76 male) who were first year non-English majors at Adiyaman University. All participants are obliged to get a foreign language course in both the first and second semester. English is generally chosen as a foreign language by the most of the graduate students. So, English is common and compulsory for all first-year non-English majors. In Turkey, Students start to get EFL in primary schools at age of 10. We can say that most of the graduate students have FL backgrounds.

### *Instrumentation*

For this study, the participants completed the Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (UCS) developed by Burgoon (1976), and the Language Class Risk-Taking (LCR) and Language Class Sociability (LCS) scales designed by Ely (1986) to define their communication state. They also completed the FLCAS developed by Horwitz et al. (1986). These were adapted into English by Lui&Jackson (2008) and added a few items which reflect their students' situation. This survey was translated from English to Turkish and adapted into t Turkish and There were a total of 66 Items were accompanied by a 5-point response scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*.

*Unwillingness to Communicate Scale:* The UCS was chosen because unwillingness to communicate was a “much more fully developed conceptualization of an overall orientation towards communication” (McCroskey, 1992, p. 16) than other reticence constructs. There are two dimensions of the UCS (approach-avoidance and reward).

*Language Class Risk-Taking Scale:* The LCR scale, a 6-item measure developed by Ely (1986), and adapted into English by Jackson (2008) indexes the extent to which learners risk using the target language in class. Learners who risk using the target language more often are reportedly more willing to communicate with others in class.

*Language Class Sociability Scale:* The original LCS measure, a 5-item scale designed by Ely (1986), gauges the extent to which learners enjoy interacting with others in class in the target language. Like the LCR scale, the LCS was adapted to fit the present research.

*Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale:* The original of FLCAS scale developed by Horwitz et al (1986). There were thirty three items in the scale. But several modifications were made to the FLCAS by Lui & Jackson (2008). The 36-item FLCAS served to measure the degree of anxiety in Turkish EFL classrooms.

Preliminary statistical analyses revealed high internal consistency for the measures (see Table1).

Table1: Characteristics of instruments (N=139)

| Instrument                               | Number of Items | Reliability |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Unwillingness to communicate Scale       | 20              | .70         |
| Large Class Risk-Taking Scale            | 6               | .62         |
| Language Class Sociability Scale         | 4               | .65         |
| Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale | 36              | .77         |
| The Combined Scales                      | 66              | .78         |

### *Procedures*

The battery of questionnaires was administered to 8 intact classes of first-year undergraduate non-English majors at the beginning of the second term of the 2007–2008 academic year. The students completed the survey in 15 minutes at the beginning of a normal teaching lesson. Of 152 collected questionnaires, only 139 could be used. The others were discarded because they were incomplete.

### **Data Analysis**

In order determine the communications obstacles in English courses, the researcher interviewed English language instructors about communication performance of the students and their handicaps in the lessons. In addition to this, the researcher tried to talk with students about communication performance and their obstacles. And then researcher evaluated the information he gathered from the instructors and students. The researcher comes to the conclusion that most of the

students have communication problems and these problems were classified under two titles, “Communication Anxiety” and “Unwillingness to Communicate”. In order to identify these obstacles clearly, the researcher decided to apply The Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (UCS) developed by Burgoon, (1976), the Language Class Risk-Taking (LCR) and Language Class Sociability (LCS) scales designed by Ely (1986) to define their communication state and as a last one Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) developed by Horwitz et al. (1986), were used. The UCS and the FLCAS were subjected to a factor analysis with varimax rotation to determine the component structure that most adequately represented the constructs underlying each of the measures. Correlation coefficients revealed the associations among the overall measures and their subcomponents, such that highly correlated dimensions of the constructs could be identified. For each measure, the mean, standard deviation, median, mode, maximum, and minimum were calculated to determine the extent to which the students remained unwilling to communicate or anxious in English classrooms. Then, the relationships between these scales and the students’ self-rated English proficiency were investigated.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### *Unwillingness to communicate*

Unwillingness and anxiety are main components of communication obstacles. Burgoon (1976) stated that “individuals with communication reticence exhibit the predisposition of unwillingness to communicate”.

Table 2 reveals the cohort results of the scales used for this study. 50.29% of respondents demonstrated their anxiety in communication, 26.96 % demonstrate their unwillingness as an obstacle to communication. The other Scales LCS and LCR are related to unwillingness to communicate.

Table 2: The Frequencies of Scales Identifying  
The Respondents’ Communication State

| Measures | N   | %     |
|----------|-----|-------|
| FLCAS    | 139 | 50.29 |
| UCS      | 139 | 26.96 |
| LCS      | 139 | 6.61  |
| LCR      | 139 | 9.98  |
| Total    | 139 | 100   |

Note: LCR=Language Class Risk-Taking scale; LCS=Language Class Sociability scale;  
UCS=Unwillingness to Communicate Scale; FLCAS= Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale

In this study, a factor analyses with varimax rotation for the UCS yielded two factors. Avoidance and Reward (Table 3) a finding that is consistent with view of by Lui&Jackson (2008) and

Burgoon and Koper (1984). According to them, the UCS captures two dimensions of communication reticence: approach-avoidance and reward.

The AA (Approach–Avoidance) dimension represents an individual’s tendency to avoid or participate in interpersonal and small group interactions. The R [Reward] dimension, by contrast, reflects attitudes toward communication—whether one considers it a valuable, honest, and personally rewarding enterprise or feels socially isolated and regards communication as a deceptive, manipulative, or unprofitable activity (pp. 608–609).

In the current study, 10 items (47–56) indexed the first UCS component, Approach–Avoidance (UCS1), and accounted for 45.41% of the total variance. The other 10 items (57–66) pertained to the second UCS component, Reward (UCS2), which accounted for 54.58% of the total variance (see Table 3 in Appendix).

The loadings in Table 3 indicate that each item within a subcomponent of the UCS was highly correlated with that subcomponent: Items 57 to 66 positively related to the UCS1, with coefficients ranging from .356 to .705; items 47 to 56 (62 include in this group) positively correlated with the UCS2, with a range in coefficient of .164 to .687. This finding suggests that Approach–Avoidance and Reward are important subcomponents of the UCS, which is further reinforced by the significant coefficients between the UCS and its two components: the UCS1 ( $r = .753, p < .01$ ) and the UCS2 ( $r=.870; p < .01$ ), as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 shows a significantly positive coefficient between the UCS1 and the UCS2 ( $r = .331, p < .01$ ), suggesting that the students who avoided or were less willing to participate in class tended to value interpersonal conversations less and regarded communication as a deceptive and meaningless activity and that those who approached or were more willing to be involved in interpersonal interactions held more positive attitudes toward communication and considered it more valuable and profitable.

Table 4: Correlations between the Unwillingness to Communicate Scale and Its Subscales

| Measure | Unwillingness to Communicate | Unwillingness to Communicate Scale 1 | Unwillingness to Communicate Scale 2 |
|---------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| UCS 1   | .753(**)                     | 1                                    |                                      |
| UCS2    | .870(**)                     | .331(**)                             | 1                                    |

\*\* $P < .01$

To reveal the general tendency of students’ unwillingness to communicate required the determination of the mean, standard deviation, median, mode, maximum, and minimum of the UCS, the LCR scale, and the LCS scale. When determining these statistics, the researchers adjusted the values assigned to different alternatives for some items from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Because the UCS primarily was designed to measure individuals’ unwillingness to speak in

conversations, items that expressed willingness to participate and confidence in speech conversations had the values assigned to their alternatives reversed. Namely, for these items, the response “strongly disagree” received a score of 5 instead of 1, the response “strongly agree” was given a value of 1 instead of 5, and so on. This was also the case for items that implied positive attitudes toward interpersonal communications.

Thus, the total score of the UCS revealed a respondent’s general tendency not to communicate in speech conversations. The higher the score, the less willing the respondent.

With a possible range of scores from 20 to 100, analysis of the UCS data shown in Table 5 revealed that the actual range in this study was 31 to 82 and that the mean score for the 139 participants was 56. (SD =7.20). These findings, along with the UCS median (57) and mode (57), which were all far below the average score of 60, suggest that more than half the respondents were willing to participate in interpersonal interactions. This finding was further supported by the statistical results of the LCS measure. With a possible score range of 4 to 20, the actual range of the LCS scale in the present study was also 4 to 20, as Table 4 reveals. Meanwhile, a mean of 13.78, as well as a median of 14 and as a mode of 16, all far above the average of 12, indicate that more than half the respondents were moderately or highly sociable in English class. Nevertheless, despite their scores on the UCS and the LCS measures, these participants actually engage in interpersonal communication in class, as supported by the results of LCR data reported in Table 5. With a possible score range of 6 to 30, the actual range of the LCR scores in the present study was 8 to 30. Meanwhile, a mean of 20, a median of 21, and a mode of 20, all above the average score of 18, were implicative of high risk-taking in English class. Table 4 shows that the UCS1 had a score range of 14 to 38 (the possible range was 10 to 50), a mean of 25.53, a median of 26, and a mode of 27, and that the UCS2 had an actual score range of 15 to 44 (the possible range was 10 to 50), a mean of 30.69, a median of 31, and a mode of 29. All the scores were approximately at the average of 30. This finding implies that half the participants were willing to communicate with others in English class and held positive attitudes toward speaking with others.

Table 5: Statistical Analyses of the Unwillingness to Communicate, Language Class Risk-Taking, and Language Class Sociability Scales (N = 139)

| Measure | M     | SD   | Mdn | Mode | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------|-------|------|-----|------|---------|---------|
| UCS     | 56.23 | 7.20 | 57  | 57   | 31      | 82      |
| UCS1    | 25.53 | 3.7  | 26  | 27   | 14      | 38      |
| UCS2    | 30.69 | 5.0  | 31  | 29   | 15      | 44      |
| LCR     | 20.82 | 4.1  | 21  | 20   | 8       | 30      |
| LCS     | 13.78 | 3.3  | 14  | 16   | 4       | 20      |

*Note:* LCR=Language Class Risk-Taking scale; LCS=Language Class Sociability scale; UCS=Unwillingness to Communicate Scale; UCS1 = Unwillingness to Communicate Scale 1; UCS2 = Unwillingness to Communicate Scale 2.

*Foreign Language Anxiety*

As was the case for the UCS, a factor analysis with varimax rotation for the FLCAS served to reveal its underlying components. A three-factor solution emerged. As previously discussed, the FLCAS measured three dimensions of FL anxiety: fear of negative evaluation, communication apprehension, and test anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986). But in this research, reverse to this classification done by Horwitz et al., a different three-factor solution emerged. Fear of negative evaluation, communication apprehension, and anxiety of speaking to native people. The third factor FLCAS3 consisted with study of Woodrow (2006) and Aida (1994). Woodrow (2006) says that the most frequent source of anxiety was interacting with the native speakers. There were 21 items (3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 35) that indexed the first FLCAS component (FLCAS1), fear of negative evaluation. All the FLCAS1 items made reference to the fear of making mistakes, or of being negatively evaluated in English classrooms, or both, and accounted for 58.83% of the total variance. 13 items (1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 22, 24, 27, and 28, ) reflected the second FLCAS component (FLCAS2), communication apprehension, or fear of speaking English in class, and accounted for 35.91% of the total variance. Two items (14 and 32) comprised the third FLCAS component (FLCAS3), anxiety of speaking to native people English, which entailed feelings about speaking to native people and accounted for 5.24% of the total variance. The results are summarized in Table 6.

The loadings in Table 6 reveal that most of the items within a subcomponent of the FLCAS were significantly correlated with that subcomponent. The 21 items included in the FLCAS1 were related to the FLCAS1, with coefficients ranging from .297 to .667; the 13 items in the FLCAS2 related to the FLCAS2, with a range of coefficients from -.683 to -.243; and the 2 items in the FLCAS3 related to the FLCAS3, with a range of .743 to .664. Further support is suggested by the significant coefficients between the FLCAS and its three components: the FLCAS1 ( $r = .942, p < .01$ ); the FLCAS2 ( $r = .314, p < .01$ ); and the FLCAS3 ( $r = .555, p < .01$ ), as shown in Table 7.

Table 6: Varimax Roated Loading for Factor Analysis of the Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale

| Item Number | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| (31) 1.     | .667     |          |          |
| ...         |          |          |          |
| (12) 21.    | .267     |          |          |
| (28) 22.    |          | -.683    |          |
| .....       |          |          | .743     |
| (22) 34.    |          | -.243    | .664     |
| (14) 35.    |          |          |          |
| (32) 36.    |          |          |          |

Note: Factor 1 (FLCAS1) = Fear of Negative Evaluation;  
Factor 2 (FLCAS2) = Communication Apprehension;

Factor 3 (FLCAS3) = Anxiety of Speaking to Native people (English)

The FLCAS1 significantly correlated positively with the two other subscales FLCAS2 ( $r=.974, p < .01$ ) and the FLCAS3 ( $r = .198, p < .01$ ), as did the FLCAS2 and the FLCAS3 ( $r = .634, p < .01$ ). Students with higher scores on one FLCAS subscale tended to score higher on other FLCAS subscales. Students who were more afraid of being negatively evaluated were also more apprehensive of and less confident in speaking English in front of others and were moderate anxious about speaking to native speakers of English.

Table 7: Correlations among the Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale and Its Subscales (N = 139)

| Measure | FLCAS  | FLCAS1 | FLCAS2 | FLCAS3 |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| FLCAS1  | .942** | 1      |        |        |
| FLCAS2  | .314** | .974** | 1      |        |
| FLCAS3  | .555** | .198*  | .634** | 1      |

Note: FLCAS = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale; FLCAS1 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 1; FLCAS2 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 2; FLCAS3 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 3.

\*\*  $p < .01$ .

#### ***General Tendency of the FLCAS and Its Subscales***

Assessing the general tendency of the students' FL classroom anxiety required the determination of the mean, standard deviation, median, mode, maximum, and minimum of the FLCAS and its subscales. The researchers adjusted the values assigned to different alternatives in a way similar to that used for the UCS. Items expressing confidence in speaking English had values inversely assigned to their alternatives. Consequently, the total score of the FLCAS revealed a respondent's anxiety in English classrooms; the higher the score, the more anxious the respondent reportedly felt.

Table 8: Statistical Analyses of the foreign language Class Anxiety Scale and Its Subscales (N=139).

| Measure | M     | SD    | Mdn | Mode | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------|-------|-------|-----|------|---------|---------|
| FLCAS   | 104   | 15.21 | 105 | 108  | 62      | 146     |
| FLCAS1  | 61.70 | 14.78 | 62  | 63   | 25      | 97      |
| FLCAS2  | 37.66 | 4.68  | 38  | 35   | 22      | 47      |
| FLCAS3  | 5.49  | 1.96  | 6   | 6    | 2       | 10      |

Note: FLCAS = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale; FLCAS1 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 1; FLCAS2 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 2; FLCAS3 = Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale 3.

According to the Table 8, within a possible range of 36 to 180, the actual range for the FLCAS for the present study was 62 to 146, with a mean of 104 ( $SD = 15.21$ ). This result, coupled with the

FLCAS median (105) and mode (108), which all get to near the average score of 108, indicates that approximately half of the students experienced anxiety in their English classrooms.

As Table 8 shows, the FLCAS1 had a score range of 25 to 97 (the possible range was 21 to 105), a mean of 61.70, a median of 62, and a mode of 63; the FLCAS2 had a range of 22 to 47 (the same as the possible range), a mean of 37.66, a median of 38, and a mode of 35; the FLCAS3 ranged from 2 to 10 (the same as the possible range), with a mean of 5.49, a median and a mode of 6. Generally speaking, all the subscale scores are almost the same as their means (63, 36, and 6 for the FLCAS1, the FLCAS2, and the FLCAS3, respectively). This finding further confirms the result of the FLCAS data that approximately half of the participants felt anxious in English class, feared being negatively evaluated, and were apprehensive about both speaking in the class and to native speakers.

### *The Difference in Communication Obstacles According to Gender*

Table 9: Statistical Analyses of the Unwillingness to Communicate, Language Class Risk-Taking, Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale and Language Class Sociability Scales compared with gender (N = 139)

| Measures | Gender | N  | Mean   |
|----------|--------|----|--------|
| FLCAS    | Female | 63 | 2,8814 |
|          | Male   | 76 | 2,9393 |
| LCS      | Female | 63 | 3,4683 |
|          | Male   | 76 | 3,4276 |
| UCS      | Female | 63 | 2,7746 |
|          | Male   | 76 | 2,8421 |
| LCR      | Female | 63 | 3,5820 |
|          | Male   | 76 | 3,3772 |

LCR=Language Class Risk-Taking scale;  
LCS=Language Class Sociability scale;  
UCS=Unwillingness to Communicate Scale;  
FLCAS= Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale

According to table 9, there is no deference between male and female in terms of unwilling to communicate in English language classrooms, experiencing anxiety in English language classrooms. Language Class Risk-Taking scale; LCS=Language Class Sociability scale are both indirectly related to unwillingness to communicate. If the score in both are high ,it means the respondents are willing to communicate As it is seen in table 9 , in terms of Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) females are a bit less anxiety, in terms of Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (UCS) male students are more unwillingness.

The limitations of selections: 1.00-1. 79= strongly disagree, 1.80 – 2.59 = Disagree, 2.60 – 3.39 = Partially agree/disagree, 3.40 – 4.19 = Agree, 4.20 – 5.00. = Strongly Agree.

***The Difference in Communication Obstacles According to the Disciplines***

A statistical analysis for FLCAS is significant at the level of  $p < .01$ , the other dimensions of survey are not at significant level. In order to understand the significant level of FLCAS obviously, a significance level of .05 Duncan' HSD pos hoc test was used (see Table 11).

Table 10: Duncan Pos Hoc test for Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale according to Disciplines

|              | Departments    | N  | Subset for alpha = .05 |        |
|--------------|----------------|----|------------------------|--------|
|              |                |    | 1                      | 2      |
| Duncan(a, b) | Math           |    |                        |        |
|              | Class Teacher  | 29 |                        |        |
|              | Science        | 67 | 2,7730                 |        |
|              | Social Science | 20 | 2,9034                 |        |
|              | Sig.           | 23 | 2,9583                 | 3,0785 |
|              |                |    | ,120                   | ,143   |

In Table 10, there are two subsets in the Duncan Pos Hoc test. This means that Social Science department is in second subset and the other majors are in first subset. Students in Social Science major are a little more anxious to communicate in foreign language classrooms than those in the other majors.

***The Difference in Communication Obstacles According to Self-Rated Overall English Proficiency***

Table 11: Statistical Analyses of self rated over all English Proficiency level (N = 139)

|       |           | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Valid |           |           |         |
|       | Very good | 10        | 7,2     |
|       | Good      | 39        | 28,1    |
|       | OK        | 43        | 30,9    |
|       | poor      | 47        | 33,8    |
|       | Total     | 139       | 100,0   |

33.8% of the participants stated that their English level is "poor". 30.9 1% percent stated that their English level is "ok". Only 7.3% percent stated that their level is very good.

There is a significant correlation between the self rated over all English level and Foreign Language Class Anxiety scale, Language Class Sociability scale. In order to understand the rotation of this significant relation, Duncan Pos Hoc test is used (see table 12).

In Table 12, Students who perceive their English level "poor" are more anxious to communicate in foreign language classrooms than the other students perceiving their English level as "Very Good, Good, Ok".

Table 12: Duncan Pos Hoc Test for Foreign Language Class Anxiety Scale

|              | Self-rated English proficiency level | overall N | Subset for alpha = .05 |        |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|--------|
|              |                                      |           | 1                      | 2      |
| Duncan(a, b) | Very good                            | 10        | 2,4889                 |        |
|              | Good                                 | 39        | 2,8390                 |        |
|              | OK                                   | 43        | 2,9141                 |        |
|              | Poor                                 | 47        |                        | 3,0638 |
|              | Sig.                                 |           | 1,000                  | ,072   |

In table 13, students who perceive their English level “Very Good and Good” are more sociable in foreign language classrooms than the other students perceiving their English level as “Poor, Ok”. Being sociable in foreign language classrooms means students enjoy interacting with others in foreign language.

Table 13: Duncan Pos Hoc Test for Language Class Sociability scale

|               | Self-rated English level | N  | Subset for alpha = .05 |        |
|---------------|--------------------------|----|------------------------|--------|
|               |                          |    | 1                      | 2      |
| Duncan (a, b) | Poor                     | 47 | 3,2713                 |        |
|               | OK                       | 43 | 3,2791                 |        |
|               | Good                     | 39 | 3,6859                 | 3,6859 |
|               | Very Good                | 10 |                        | 4,0500 |
|               | Sig.                     |    | ,101                   | ,127   |

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Several conclusions about the students’ communications obstacle were warranted from the results of this study. One of them is the unwillingness to communicate and the other one is FL anxiety.

First, the significantly high coefficients indicate that the subscales of the UCS (UCS1 and UCS2) and the FLCAS (FLCAS1, FLCAS2, and FLCAS3) yielded by factor analyses were important subcomponents. These subscales also significantly positively related to each other. For example, a learner who feared being negatively evaluated more (FLCAS1) tended to be more apprehensive about speaking (FLCAS2) and more anxious about speaking to native speakers (FLCAS3). The characteristic of FLCAS3 is different from the results warranted from the previous studies, for instance, Lui and Jackson’s research. However, the characteristic of FLCAS3 is consisted with study

of Woodrow (2006) and Aida (1994). Woodrow (2006) says that the most frequent source of anxiety was interacting with the native speakers.

Second, analyses of the data revealed that most of the students were willing to participate in interpersonal conversations and like to risk using/speaking English in class. In addition, half of the participants felt anxious in their English language classrooms. They feared being negatively evaluated and were apprehensive of speech communication and speaking to native speakers.

The students' unwillingness to communicate was significantly positively correlated with their FL anxiety.

Reducing students' anxiety and enhancing their participation in English class to improve their learning of English may be possible if teachers discuss with their students in the very first lesson(s) the significance of speech communication in class and share with them the feeling of anxiety experienced by many people when they learn an FL. If aware of these two issues, students may consciously take steps to become more active and confident in their English class; they also may be more willing to risk using the language more.

In order to promote their students' willingness to use/speak the target language and reduce their anxiety in class, it may be necessary for EFL teachers to encourage the students to practice English and gain more exposure to the language. For Turkish EFL learners who have little contact with starting to learn the language late, large classes, English in their daily lives (for such reasons as and little contact with native speakers) and practice is essential. They need to practice using/speaking English both in and outside the classroom, with different people, and in a range of situations. This practice can help them become more confident and at ease when using and talking in English with others in various contexts.

It also may be advisable for EFL teachers to give even the most reticent students the opportunity to speak and build up their self-confidence in a positive, caring environment (e.g., by facilitating interactive group activities or calling on students in a non threatening manner). Feeling the concern of their teachers, the students should gradually become more willing to participate in speech communication.

Meanwhile, continuous practice can gradually build up or enhance their self-confidence, which, in turn, may result in more use of the target language. In a variety of academic situations from foreign language learning to test anxiety, researchers have found that frequently female students are more worried and anxious than male students are (Chang, 1997; Daly, Kreiser, & Rogharr, 1994; Felson & Trudeau, 1991; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley 1997). However, in this study the opposite result was yielded. There is no great significant difference between female and male in terms of anxious and unwillingness to communicate in English classrooms. When table 10 was examined it can

be said that females are less anxious and more willing to communicate in English classrooms than males by a nuance.

The students in Social Science department feel more anxious and are more unwilling to communicate in English classroom than the students in Math, Science and Class Teacher departments. The students in Math, Science are less anxious and willing to communicate; this is probably due to characteristics of discipline. For example, in Science more English words are used in subjects than in social science. In Turkey, Science and Math departments accept students with better quality and with more perfect background than the students in Social Science. The necessary grades to access to science and Math departments in Education faculty in universities are generally higher than those in Social Science departments.

Students who perceive their English “Poor” feel more anxious and are more unwilling to communicate in English classes than the other students perceiving their English level “ Very Good, Good and OK, “ this state is general situation for students who are bad at English .this an expected outcome for this study.

## REFERENCES

- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz and Cope's Construct of Foreign Language Anxiety: the Case of Students of Japanese, *Modern Language Journal* 78 (2): 155-167.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness-to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs*, 43, 60-69.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Koper, R. J. (1984). Nonverbal and relational communication associated with reticence. *Human Communication Research*, 10, 601-626.
- Chang, J. I. (1997, November). Contexts of adolescent worries: Impacts of ethnicity, gender, family structure, and socioeconomic status. Paper presented at the annual meeting of *NCFR Fatherhood and Motherhood in a Diverse and Changing World*, Arlington, VA.
- Daly, J. A., Kreiser, P. O., & Rogharr, L. A. (1994). Question-asking comfort: Explorations of the demography of communication in the eighth-grade classroom. *Communication Education*, 43, 27-41.
- Ely, C. M. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risk-taking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, 36, 1-25.
- Felson, R. B., & Trudeau, L. (1991). Gender differences in mathematics performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, (2) 113-126.
- Hilleson, M. (1996). I want to talk with them, but I don't want them to hear: *An introspective study of second language anxiety in an English-medium school*. In K. M. Bailey and D. Nunan, eds., *Voices from the Language Classroom*, pp. 248-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1995). Student affective reactions and the teaching and learning of foreign languages. *Journal of Educational Research*, 23, 569-652.

- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125–132.
- Jackson, J. (2002). Reticence in second language case discussions: Anxiety and aspirations. *System*, 30, 65–84.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 549–566.
- Liu, M. (2006). *Reticence, anxiety and performance of Chinese university students in oral English lessons and tests*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest Information and Learning Company, University of Michigan.
- Liu, M. Jackson, j. (2008) An Exploration of Chinese EFL Learners' Unwillingness to Communicate and Foreign language Anxiety, *the modern language Journal* 92,I.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. A. (2003). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, 84 *The Modern Language Journal* 92 (2008) and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students. *Language Learning*, 53, 137–165.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 283-305.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Noels, K. A., & Clément, R. (1997). Biases in self-ratings of second language proficiency: The role of language anxiety. *Language Learning*, 47, 265–287.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 16–25.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 20, 217–239.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daley, C. E. (1997, November). Foreign language anxiety among college students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Mid-South Educational Research Association, Memphis, TN*.
- Phillips, E. M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on students' oral test performance and attitudes. *Modern Language Journal*, 76, 14–26.
- Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate, and advanced level college students of Japan. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 239–251.
- Tsui, A. B. M., (1996). Reticence and Anxiety in Second Language Learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145–167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Q., & Ding, X. (2001). Language anxiety among ruralmiddle school students in west China. *Journal of Northwest Normal University*, 38, 68–73.
- Woodrow, L. (2006) Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second language. *RELC Journal*; 37;38.
- Yan, X., & Wang, P. (2001). The impact of language anxiety on students' Mandarin learning in Hong Kong. *Language Teaching and Research*, 6, 1–7.

## Appendix 1:

Table 3: Varimax Rotated Loadings for Factor Analysis  
of the Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (N = 139)

| Item Number | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|-------------|----------|----------|
| 64.         | -,712    |          |
| 58.         | ,705     |          |
| 63.         | -,677    |          |
| 59.         | -,623    |          |
| 66.         | ,559     |          |
| 61.         | -,559    |          |
| 60.         | ,553     |          |
| 57.         | ,400     |          |
| 65.         | ,356     |          |
| 48.         |          | ,804     |
| 47.         |          | ,687     |
| 49.         |          | -,680    |
| 53.         |          | ,649     |
| 54.         |          | ,544     |
| 52.         |          | -,537    |
| 56.         |          | ,454     |
| 50.         |          | -,412    |
| 51.         |          | ,280     |
| 55.         |          | -,262    |
| 62.         |          | ,164     |

Note. Factor 1 (UCS1) =Reward; Factor 2 (UCS2) = Approach–Avoidance

## APPENDIX 2:

## Survey on Language Learning

Directions: This survey aims to help better understand your language learning experiences. Please answer the following items by circling the letter of the alternative which appears most applicable to you. We would urge you to be as accurate as possible since the success of this investigation depends upon it.

Sex:..... Proficiency Level:....., Major:.....,

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking English in my class.
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in the English class.
3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in the English class.
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.
6. During my English class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am.
8. I am usually at ease during English tests in my class.
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in the English class.
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over English classes.
12. In the English class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.
14. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.
16. Even if I am well prepared for the English class, I feel anxious about it.

17. I often feel like not going to my English class.
18. I feel confident when I speak English in class.
19. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in the English class.
21. The more I study for an English test, the more confused I get.
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for the English class.
23. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.
25. The English class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes.
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in class.
28. When I'm on my way to the English class, I feel very sure and relaxed.
29. I get nervous when I don't understand every word the English teacher says.
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English.
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English.
33. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.
34. I get tense and nervous when talking to a person whose sex is opposite to mine.
35. I get tense and nervous when I have to discuss things unfamiliar to me in English.
36. I feel overwhelmed by the number of words I have to learn to speak in English.
37. I like to wait until I know exactly how to use an English word before using it.
38. I don't like trying out a difficult sentence in class. 2.86 1.00
39. At this point, I don't like trying to express complicated ideas in English in class.
40. I prefer to say what I want in English without worrying about the small details of grammar.
41. In class, I prefer to say a sentence to myself before I speak it. 2.64 0.99
42. I prefer to follow basic sentence models rather than risk misusing the language.
43. I think learning English in a group is more fun than learning on my own.
44. I enjoy talking with the teacher and other students in English.
45. I enjoy interacting with the other students in the English class.
46. I think it's important to have a strong group spirit in the English classroom.
47. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.
48. I talk less because I'm shy.
49. I talk a lot because I am not shy.
50. I like to get involved in group discussions.
51. I feel nervous when I have to speak to others.
52. I have no fears about expressing myself in a group.
53. I am afraid to express myself in a group.
54. I avoid group discussions.
55. During a conversation, I prefer to talk rather than listen.
56. I find it easy to make conversation with strangers.
57. I don't think my friends are honest in their communication with me.
58. My friends and family don't listen to my ideas and suggestions.
59. I think my friends are truthful with me.
60. I don't ask for advice from family or friends when I have to make decisions.
61. I believe my friends and family understand my feelings.
62. My family doesn't enjoy discussing my interests and activities with me.
63. My friends and family listen to my ideas and suggestions.
64. My friends seek my opinions and advice.
65. Other people are friendly only because they want something out of me.
66. Talking to other people is just a waste of time.