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Abstract: The purpose of this mixed-methodology study was to investigate linguistic and affective outcomes of summer study abroad (SA) participation by 25 college French students. This investigation sought to determine if significant changes occurred in two linguistic factors, oral and listening French skills, and two affective factors, integrative motivation and language anxiety after SA. This research also examined whether pre-SA affective differences existed for SA participants versus non-SA peers. Results demonstrated that French linguistic skills improved significantly and that classroom and nonclassroom language anxiety after SA decreased significantly. Integrative motivation of the SA group was unchanged after the experience. Pre-SA affective differences did not exist between SA participants and non-SA peers. Analysis of interviews and program evaluations suggested that participants faced two sources of language anxiety while abroad: linguistic insecurity and cultural differences. Implications of this study include (1) the continued endorsement of summer SA programs to enhance communication skills, (2) the need for greater pre-SA emphasis on “nonacademic” factors to reduce foreign language anxiety, and (3) the importance of SA programs including contact with native speakers in class and during informal learning, in order to stimulate attitudinal changes as well as linguistic gains.

Introduction
Study abroad (SA) is an integral part of foreign language (FL) students’ academic experience, yet surprisingly little is known about its linguistic and affective ramifications. Freed (1995) defined SA as a period of residence in another country or province where the target language is spoken, combined with classroom-based language and/or content area study. A recent article on the expansion of SA reported that in school year 1999–2000, 143,590 college students went abroad: 61% more than did so five years earlier (Gilbert, 2002).

The potential advantages of SA are many. Through it, FL students may gain important cross-cultural skills and knowledge that are critical in a global community (Chieffo & Zipser, 2001; Laubscher, 1994). SA can stimulate world-mindedness, independence, tolerance for ambiguity, self-esteem, and empathy (Carlson & Widaman, 1988; Laubscher, 1994). Limited empirical findings suggest that participants make significant gains in language proficiency after their programs (Carlson, Burn, Useem, & Yachimowicz, 1990; Freed, 1995; Lafford, 1995; Matsumura, 2001; Yager, 1998).
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With the current trend of internationalization, the potential negative consequences of SA on FL learning have received less attention. However, reports questioning SA benefits do surface. Day (1987) reported that participants in shorter programs might have superficial contact with the host culture, inadequate language practice, a group orientation that may isolate them from the host culture, and a vacation mentality that works against an academic atmosphere. Some recent findings support the notion that students arrive in the host country with cultural and linguistic assumptions that may lead to less interaction in the FL and negative experiences with native speakers (Wilkinson, 1998, 2000). Wilkinson (2000) concluded that exposure to cultural differences during SA does not necessarily translate into cross-cultural understanding. Furthermore, SA could hinder rather than enhance language learning if participants suffer from feelings of anxiety (Krashen, 1985) or from low motivation to integrate into the target culture (Clément, Smythe, & Gardner, 1978; Gardner, 1985; Gardner, Day, & MacIntyre, 1992; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

To clarify the benefits of SA, there is a critical need for qualitative and quantitative research on factors contributing to successful experiences. This study focused on what happened to the language anxiety, integrative motivation, and listening and speaking skills of one group of university-level participants in a FL summer SA program in France, both in the formal classroom setting and in informal contacts with the target language community.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study examined significant linguistic and nonlinguistic changes for FL participants after a six-week, university-level SA program in France. The two linguistic components were oral and listening proficiency; the two affective components were language anxiety and integrative motivation. Previous empirical research on these factors in FL study abroad is scarce and produced mixed results. The current investigation addressed the following questions:

1. **Language Anxiety**
   a. Is there a change in classroom language anxiety after summer SA?
   b. Is there a change in French use anxiety (i.e., anxiety outside the classroom) after summer SA?
   c. Is there a change in state anxiety related to linguistic proficiency testing in the FL after summer SA?

2. **Is there a change in integrative motivation after summer SA?**

3. **Is there a change in oral French skills after participating in summer SA?**

4. **Is there a change in listening skills after participating in summer SA?**

5. **Was there a difference between integrative motivation and language anxiety levels between SA participants and non-participants, prior to SA?**

This study used a mixed-methodology design incorporating qualitative and quantitative approaches for a number of reasons. Previous research (Liskin-Gasparro, 1998) demonstrated that the complexity of language development in an immersion context may be impenetrable to a purely experimental approach. Qualitative data describes the perspective of the participants and their linguistic, social, and cultural settings. Moreover, to our knowledge, no studies have assessed, with the same group of participants, the effects of SA on the targeted factors.

**Background**

**Overview of Affect and Language Learning**

Affect is important in language learning because, self-identity is tied to language and communication (Gardner, 1985; Horwitz, 1995; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). Because of this, communicating in an unfamiliar language can be frustrating and anxiety-producing. Gardner (1985) cited the intermingling of the learner’s self-identity with language as a reason for language class being “an interesting if not traumatic experience” (p. 167). Horwitz et al. (1986) spoke of the difference between the learner’s “true” versus “limited” self: A learner’s self-perception of genuineness in presenting himself or herself to others may be threatened by the limited expression that can be communicated in the target language (p. 31).

**Foreign Language Anxiety**

Foreign language anxiety is defined as the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using another language (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; MacIntyre, 1999). A cyclical relationship is seen to function between aptitude, cognition, anxiety, and language learning behavior, whereby aptitude can influence anxiety; anxiety can influence performance, and performance can influence anxiety (MacIntyre, 1995). Horwitz et al. (1986) posited that FL anxiety is related to communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation. Speaking in the target language often tops the list (MacIntyre, 1999; Price, 1991). Gardner et al. (1992) found that anxiety correlated negatively with motivation, integrativeness, and positive attitudes toward the learning situation. They posited that there is “a tendency for subjects who are anxious about French to be less motivated to learn it than those who are not anxious” (p. 211).

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (Horwitz et al., 1986) provides a standard instrument to measure language anxiety. It contains 33 items scored on a Likert scale that address communication appre-
hension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the classroom (Horwitz, 1991; Horwitz et al., 1986).

Integrative Motivation
A social-psychological viewpoint dominates research on motivation (Dornyei, 2001; Oxford & Ehrman, 1993). Gardner and Lambert (1972) hypothesized that:

success in mastering a foreign language would depend not only on intellectual capacity and language aptitude but also on the learner’s perceptions of the other ethnolinguistic group involved, his attitudes toward representatives of that group, and his willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and nonlinguistic, that characterize that other group (p. 132).

According to Gardner (1985), who focused on integrative motivation, success in language learning involves the willingness of the student not only to acquire a new set of verbal habits, but also to adopt appropriate features of behavior that characterize members of another linguistic community. The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) contains integrative motivation as a primary component. This battery of questionnaires measures “the entire attitudinal domain … relevant to second language acquisition” with over 130 Likert, multiple-choice, and semantic-differential format items (Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Smythe, 1981, p. 512).

Research on integrative motivation found it to be a predictor of persistence in language study, classroom participation, and language proficiency (Clément, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977; Clément et al., 1978; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1991; Gardner & Smythe, 1981; Gliksman, Gardner, & Smythe, 1982; Svanes, 1987). Much integrative motivation research took place in second language contexts and addressed its role in the presence of other affective variables (e.g., attitudes, anxiety, ethnocentrism, and personality factors). Some researchers (Oxford & Shearin, 1994) have asserted that its role may be more important in second language learning contexts (the study of a second language in a community where that language is dominant) than in FL learning contexts (the study of a FL, generally within the learner’s home country in a community where the learner’s first language is dominant, and where group membership in the target culture is less of an immediate issue).

Affective and Linguistic Outcomes of Study Abroad
The study of a FL abroad appears to be an ideal setting for language acquisition. SA is consistent with Krashen’s beliefs that “real world input” is more valuable than language class input for advanced learners, and that natural, communicative situations best facilitate language acquisition (1983, 1985). Krashen hypothesized that input was not sufficient for language acquisition and needed to be accompanied by a “low affective filter” — Krashen’s metaphor for anxiety. This filter would be “down” when language learners were not preoccupied with failure, were learning in a low-anxiety situation, possessed self-confidence, and considered themselves to be members of the target language community (1983, 1985). He explained the relationship between motivation and acquisition (quoted by Young, 1992): “When you consider yourself to be a potential member of a group, you subconsciously acquire all the aspects of the group’s behavior that mark you as a member” (p. 167). Other theoreticians have supported the role of affective variables in SA. Yager (1998) posited that “Students’ attitudes toward the target language and culture, as well as their language learning expectations, may affect their language contact and how they benefit linguistically from that contact” (p. 898).

Empirical investigations of study in the target language community have focused on two contexts: immersion programs and SA experiences. Shapson, Kaufman, and Day (1981) defined immersion programs as “a concentrated period of formal study of the second language along with opportunities for extensive use of this language beyond the classroom” (p. 66). Research in SA has involved mainly college students, whereas immersion research has involved both high school and some college students. Immersion programs are typically a few weeks to a few months in length, whereas SA usually lasts from a semester to a year.

Research in Immersion Settings
In a study of a summer immersion program in French in Ontario, Gardner, Smythe, and Brunet (1977) concluded that the motivation to learn French, French proficiency, and feelings of ease with the language improved for secondary students. Although neither the participants’ attitudes toward French-Canadians nor their integrative orientation to learn French improved, they showed significant decreases in French classroom anxiety.

Clément (1979) compared two types of intensive summer language programs: immersion (living with students at school and having formal instruction and structured cultural activities in French) versus residence (living with a family and having no formal instruction or structured cultural activities in French). He found that both types of programs were successful in improving attitudes and decreasing language anxiety. Gardner (1983) interpreted the results of Clément’s study as suggesting that “[w]here attention is directed to building competence and confidence in language use, anxiety is reduced. Where, however, the focus is on social-emotional relations with the other community, attitudes toward that group improve” (p. 101).

In a study addressing French proficiency and knowledge of Franco-Canadian culture as well as the roles of atti-
tudes, motivation, and anxiety during four-week summer immersion programs in French- and English-speaking communities, Shapson et al. (1981) found that participation in both programs increased French proficiency, improved attitudes toward French-Canadians, and increased knowledge of Franco-Canadian culture. In addition, students' anxiety about speaking French was lowered.

Research in SA Settings
Research conducted on SA has been dominated by comparison studies of skill outcomes of SA participants versus non-SA peers studying the same language at the home institution, and by case studies of SA participants. Comparison studies have produced mixed results: Although many point to SA as a more effective way to develop linguistic competence, the results as to whether SA participation brings about significant change in motivation are not consistent.

In a comparison of 153 non-SA students and 148 SA participants, Carlson et al. (1990) found that of 20 possible variables, the most salient factor differentiating the two groups prior to SA was “Cultural Interest.” The investigators found no significant mean difference in self-efficacy levels between those who had studied abroad and those who had not (Carlson et al., 1990).

Freed (1995) compared two groups of French students: one studying in France (n = 15) and one in the United States (n = 15). There were no significant differences in motivation or anxiety between the groups and no correlation between the motivation and anxiety assessments and language gain during the semester. There also was no significant difference in global fluency between SA and non-SA groups. Students in the SA group, however, made slightly more oral progress and spoke both more and at a significantly faster rate than did those not going abroad.

On a more positive note, Matsumura (2001) found that the pragmatic language competence of SA participants learning English in Canada (n = 97) surpassed that of their non-SA peers (n = 102). Lafford (1995) reached similar conclusions in her comparison study of 28 SA participants and 13 non-SA peers studying Spanish: After a semester abroad, SA students had a broader repertoire of communicative strategies, produced more words in a conversational context, and had more self-repairs than repeats in their speech.

The role of informal and formal contacts with the target language community has also been explored. Results suggest that frequent and sustained interaction with native speakers facilitated overall language gain (see Huebner, 1995; Lapkin, Hart, & Swain, 1995; Regan, 1995; Yager, 1998).

Two studies by Wilkinson investigated communication and affective factors during SA. One study (1998) found that seven participants' experiences were marked by cultural, not linguistic, misunderstandings; in addition, these misunderstandings (not a lack of motivation) led to increased reliance on the other American students for support as well as discouragement. Another study (Wilkinson, 2000) identified communicating with members of a host family as a source of anxiety.

Two case studies demonstrated that SA students were more confident in their FL skills after the experience. Davie's (1996) study of 14 SA participants, who spent a semester to a year in Russia, revealed that all respondents felt that their overall knowledge of Russian had improved. They named listening as the most improved skill, followed by speaking. For 34 Japanese students on a five-week SA program to the United States, Kitao (1993) found that participants “perceived their English had improved, they had more motivation to study English, their image of the United States and of Americans was more positive, and they had more confidence in themselves” (p. 116).

It is apparent from the studies reviewed here that the relationship between SA participants' motivation, anxiety, and linguistic progress is complex. These factors were investigated in detail in the present study to gain a clearer understanding of how learners make the transition from studying a FL in the classroom within in the home country, to both learning and living abroad.

Methods and Procedures
Participants and Setting
The study participants were 25 university students (17 female, 8 male) enrolled in a 2001 summer SA program in Paris. Five were sophomores, 12 were juniors, and 8 were seniors. Four had 1 to 2 years of French study, 7 had 3 to 4 years, and 14 had studied French for more than 4 years. Students were required to select beforehand two or three courses (8 or 12 semester hours) in which they would be enrolled while in Paris. Course options were Intermediate French, Practical Conversation, French History, French Theater, and Introduction to International Business. Classes were held in a facility shared by other American university SA programs and met for one hour per day, five times per week, except when replaced by a group excursion (e.g. visits to museums, monuments, parks, and plays). Students chose to live during their SA period either with a French family or in a Pension de Famille with a graduate student from the students' home institution and other students.

It is important to note that the sample used in this study was a convenience sample composed of those students going abroad who were willing to participate in the research study (Johnson & Christensen, 2000). According to Dörnyei (2001), it is an acceptable practice to use convenience sampling when practical constraints preclude ran-
dom assignment, as long as one recognizes the limitations for making causal claims about other groups. Due to the impossibility of random selection, a limited control group was used to measure language anxiety and integrative motivation levels during the semester before the experimental group participated in SA. This group consisted of 21 elementary, intermediate, and advanced level French students, not enrolled in the SA program.

Other means of enhancing internal validity were standardization of research conditions and instrumentation and the collection and analysis of plentiful information about participants. Triangulation and multiple methods of data collection were used to provide a full and accurate account of how the SA experience influenced linguistic and nonlinguistic attributes, to answer questions about what happened to the participants in the SA setting and what their actions meant to the actors involved in them, and to strengthen reliability and internal validity (Merriam, 1998; Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). External validity was addressed through the use of a research assistant (RA), a graduate student accompanying the group. She functioned as a “naive observer,” unaware of the investigators’ hypotheses. In addition, all variables used in the study were operationally defined according to widely accepted convention (Bieger & Gerlach, 1996).

Instrumentation
The following instruments measured participants’ language anxiety, integrative motivation, and oral and listening French skills before and after SA:

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)
The FLCAS measured the degree of anxiety related to classroom study of a FL (Research Question 1a). This 33-item scale was used intact. It has been shown to be reliable and valid, with an alpha coefficient of .93 and an eight-week test–retest coefficient of .83 (Horwitz, 1991; Horwitz et al., 1986). Aida (1994) administered the FLCAS in a study of students learning Japanese and reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .94. Sample items are shown in Appendix A.

French Use Anxiety Scale (FUAS)
This scale measured the degree of anxiety felt when using the FL in everyday communicative situations (Research Question 1b); it does not pertain to classroom activities. This 10-item Likert scale was used intact. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) reported an internal consistency reliability coefficient of .92. Sample items are shown in Appendix A.

State Anxiety Questionnaire
This questionnaire measured the degree of anxiety experienced by participants in specific relation to the preceding task, that is, completing oral and listening tests in French (Research Question 1c). This 3-item questionnaire, created by the first author, was administered to each participant immediately after completion of the Oral and Listening Proficiency Tests. Two Likert-type items addressed the anxiety felt pertaining to each test. One open-ended item asked participants to describe briefly how they felt during those tests.

Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)
The AMTB measured the integrative motivation of participants (Research Question 2). The first author contacted its creator and secured permission and suggestions to modify the instrument, since it had been designed for use in a French Canadian context. The AMTB in this study included eight scales, of which two were semantic differential, two were multiple-choice, and four were Likert format. These scales measured Interest in Foreign Languages, Attitudes toward French People, Attitudes toward Learning French, Integrative Orientation, Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn French, Assessment of My French Teacher, and Assessment of My French Course. These scales have been shown to be reliable, with six-week test–retest coefficients between .68 and .86 (Gardner & Smythe, 1981). Sample items are shown in Appendix A.

French Oral Proficiency Test
This test (Research Question 3) consisted of two oral activities modeled upon procedures used by Lafford (1995) and Herron, Morris, Secules, and Curtis (1995). The first activity, a picture description, was based on a portion of the oral proficiency test published by Herron et al. (1993). Each participant described the same image (a restaurant scene) in French for up to five minutes; this was recorded on an audiocassette. The second activity, a role-play situation, was based on a portion of the well-known OPI and was administered using the protocol found in Lafford’s (1995) study of language proficiency in SA. Each participant asked the interviewer a series of questions in French during a guided conversation: The activity was recorded. The role-play situation was the same for each participant, as follows: Oral Role Play: The Museum
You are a visitor in the capital city and you need some information for your trip to the museum. You talk to the hotel clerk and ask:

a. the best way to get from the hotel to the museum.
b. how long it takes to get there.
c. what time the museum opens.
d. what time the museum closes.
e. whether there is a good restaurant near the museum.

French Listening Proficiency Test
This test (Research Question 4) consisted of 14 multiple-choice questions about a short series of three scenes select-
ed from an authentic French police TV drama. The scenes, provided individually to students on a DVD-ROM, were each viewed two times with the assistance of an interviewer. Before the initial viewing, the student received a written brief introduction and multiple-choice questions, both in English, about each scene. During the first viewing, all three scenes were shown without interruption; the student was told not to answer the questions, but to just watch and try to understand. During the second viewing, the interviewer stopped the DVD after the first scene and gave the student a few moments to respond to the questions that corresponded to that scene (Questions 1–7). Then the student watched the second and third scenes and responded to the questions that correspond to those scenes (Questions 8–14). Appendix A provides the introductory statements and sample questions.

**Demographic/Language Contact Profile**
This questionnaire obtained information about participants’ reasons for studying abroad, language and travel histories, and contact with the FL. The profile administered after SA contained additional items to investigate participants’ postprogram opinions.

**Study Abroad Interview Protocol**
This interview, conducted with eight primary informants, consisted of open-ended questions on three topics: living in France, eating in France, and communicating with Parisians. Its purpose was to obtain firsthand information from the students’ points of view.

**Data Collection**
Data was collected in three stages: prestudy abroad, study abroad, and poststudy abroad. The qualitative data collection took place during study abroad only, and was conducted by the RA. The first author in this study had no previous contact with the participants before the study. The second author, Director of the SA program, was in direct contact with the group of participants during SA but had limited contact prior to SA.

**Prestudy Abroad Data Collection**
To assess French oral and listening performance, 20-minute interviews were conducted during the final two weeks of the semester prior to departure for France. Each participant was randomly assigned to be interviewed by either the first author or the RA. During each interview, the participant completed the French Oral Proficiency Test and the French Listening Proficiency Test. Immediately after these tests, the participant completed the State Anxiety Questionnaire.

At the final orientation meeting before SA, the first author administered the Attitudes/Motivation Test Battery, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, and the Demographic/Language Contact Profile to the SA group. Because the participants in this study could not be randomly sampled from the population of university-level foreign language students, we provided information on the foreign language anxiety and integrative motivation levels of a limited control group of French students who were enrolled at the same university as the SA participants, but who were not in a SA program (n = 21). Three levels of French students (advanced beginners, intermediate, and advanced) were administered the Attitudes/Motivation Test Battery and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Research Question 5). Questionnaires were completed by each of the three groups of non-SA participants in their respective French classes with the first author present.

**Study Abroad Data Collection**
During SA, the RA collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data included four administrations of the French Use Anxiety Scale. During group excursions, each participant completed this 10-question scale approximately every 10 days over the 40 days of the SA program. The RA also collected qualitative data in the form of audio-recorded interviews and observations. Three recorded, semistructured interviews were conducted with students at the pension approximately every two weeks during the six-week program. For these interviews, the RA asked open-ended questions about cultural topics such as food, communication, and lifestyles in France. The RA also observed the whole group, recording behavior/conversations in a notebook.

**Poststudy Abroad Data Collection**
During the final week of SA, the first author traveled to France to participate in the last stage of data collection. Each of the measures administered before SA was readministered. The first author and the RA conducted 20-minute interviews to assess postprogram levels of French Oral and Listening Proficiency; these tests were followed immediately by the completion of the State Anxiety Questionnaire. Each participant who had been interviewed by the first author before SA was interviewed by the RA this time; likewise, each participant interviewed by the RA before SA was interviewed by the first author. The Attitudes/Motivation Test Battery, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, and the Demographic/Language Contact Profile also were readministered.

Following the completion of the SA program, four participants not living in the pension indicated their willingness to share their insights and opinions of living, eating, and communicating in France. In total, 8 of the 25 SA participants were interviewed. These were five females and three males, of whom four lived with French families during the program and four lived in the pension with the RA.
The last data source was the postprogram evaluation. Although not designed as a component of this study, it contained a number of items relevant to the investigation regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Twenty of the 25 participants completed these anonymous evaluations on the final class day.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were conducted on measures before SA. Inferential statistics addressed the following research questions:

1. A t-test for paired samples was used to assess whether a significant change occurred in FL classroom anxiety after participating in the SA experience (Research Question 1a).
2. A one-way, repeated-measure, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to assess changes in level of French use anxiety over time during the SA experience. Specific patterns and/or pairs of means were explored in a post hoc fashion. The French Use Anxiety Scale was used for this analysis (Research Question 1b).
3. A t-test for paired samples was used to assess if a significant change had occurred in state anxiety related to evaluation of French oral and listening skills after participating in a SA experience (Research Question 1c).
4. T-tests for paired samples for the total Attitudes/Motivation Test Battery score and for each subscale were used to determine if changes occurred in integrative motivation after the SA experience (Research Question 2).
5. A t-test for paired samples was used to determine if changes in French oral skills occurred after SA (Research Question 3). The French Oral Skills Test was scored by two nonnative speakers of French with native-like fluency and trained by the researchers. The scoring protocol was that of Linder (1977). Each of the two oral tasks was scored on the following criteria: fluency, comprehensibility, amount of communication, and quality of communication.
6. A t-test for paired samples was used to determine if changes in French listening skills had occurred after the SA experience (Research Question 4).
7. T-tests for independent samples for the total Attitude/Motivation Test Battery and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale scores determined if SA participants possessed different levels of integrative motivation and/or initial language anxiety than did non-SA participants (Research Question 5).

All t-tests were two-tailed and a significance level of .05 was used for all inferential statistics with the exception of those used to answer Research Question 2. Because that question involved numerous planned comparisons, the probability was greater for making a type I error. To correct for this, a Bonferroni correction was used to adjust the significance level (Keppel, 1991).

Qualitative data analysis was used for the audio-recorded interviews, the contents of the researcher notebook, and the written program evaluations. The interviews were transcribed by the first author and coded with a simple scheme to identify themes illustrated by incidents or quotes (Merriam, 1998). The contents of the RAs notebook also were incorporated into this coding scheme, and the quotes and incidents recorded were organized into themes. Comments made by participants in the written program evaluations were combined with the other sources of qualitative data to provide support for responses to Research Questions 1 through 5. Written interpretations and analysis based on these sources were sent to participants as a form of member checking to ensure validity.

Results

Language Anxiety

Classroom Language Anxiety

A paired samples t-test was calculated to compare the mean pre-SA FLCAS score with the mean post-SA FLCAS score. The mean on the pretest was 91.08 (SD = 19.61) and the mean on the posttest was 77.56 (SD = 18.27). A significant decrease from pretest to posttest was found, t(24) = 4.856, p < .001.

The effect size for this analysis was η² = .50.

French Use Anxiety

A one-way, repeated-measure ANOVA was calculated comparing the FUAS scores of SA participants at four different times during the 41-day program: Day 2, Day 13, Day 27, and Day 41. A significant effect was found, F(3,66) = 29.22, p < .001, effect size = .66. Follow-up protected t-tests revealed that FUAS scores decreased significantly from Day 13 (M = 25.13, SD = 6.22) to Day 27 (M = 22.43, SD = 5.88) and again from Day 27 to Day 41 (M = 19.48, SD = 4.86). No significant difference existed between Day 2 (M = 26.65, SD = 6.93) and Day 13.

State Anxiety

Paired samples t-tests were calculated to compare mean pre-SA state anxiety scores in relation to (1) the French Oral Skills Test and (2) the French Listening Skills Test with post-SA state anxiety scores in relation to both tests. For state anxiety related to the French Oral Skills Test, the pretest mean was 3.61 (SD = 2.21) and the posttest mean...
was 2.52 (SD = 1.53). A significant decrease from pretest to posttest was found, \( t(22) = 2.114, p < .05, \) effect size = .17. For state anxiety related to the French Listening Skills Test, the pretest mean was 5.74 (SD = 2.58) and the posttest mean was 2.65 (SD = 1.37). A significant decrease from pretest to posttest was found, \( t(22) = 5.527, p < .001, \) effect size = .58.

In addition to the two Likert-type items addressing state anxiety experienced in relation to the two skills tests, the State Anxiety Questionnaire also contained a third open-ended item that asked the participant to “describe in a few words how you felt during the interview.” The pre-SA responses to this item were, on the whole, negative. The 21 participants who completed this questionnaire (two did not) described feeling “anxious,” “distraught,” “embarrassed,” “like an idiot,” “nervous,” “not very competent,” “out of practice,” and “silly.” However, post-SA responses were much more positive: only 6 participants used negative terms, while 17 participants chose to compare the pre-SA and post-SA experience or used positive terms. Typical post-SA responses included “calm and confident,” “more at ease than last time,” “okay,” “pleased with my progress,” “relaxed and comfortable,” and “still a little nervous.”

Comparison of Classroom Language Anxiety for SA and Non-SA Participants

An independent t-test was calculated comparing the mean FLCAS scores of SA participants prior to the program (\( n = 25 \)) to those of non-SA participants also studying French at the same level (\( n = 21 \)). The mean for SA participants (\( M = 91.08, SD = 19.61 \)) was not significantly different from that of non-SA participants (\( M = 90.95, SD = 18.55 \)), \( t(44) = .023, p > .05, \) effect size = .001.

Sources and Manifestation of Language Anxiety During SA

Qualitative data gathered from participants’ post-SA Demographic/Language Contact Profile and interviews with primary informants pointed to two primary sources of language anxiety experienced during SA: linguistic incompetence and cultural differences. SA placed students in an unfamiliar environment that challenged them and sometimes aroused anxieties on both linguistic and cultural levels. Anthony summarized this fear, stating, “I have never really gotten anxious speaking French until I came to France.” Descriptions of informants’ “worst thing that happened during SA” point to significant challenges related to linguistic insecurities and cultural differences. Consider Bill’s laundromat experience:

The first time I went to the laundromat, I could not figure it out. Had no clue … I’m like, where do I put the coin in? I finally figured it out, got it, and I got the washer going. I didn’t know where to put the soap and it was already going. I had to close the washer, but water starts spewing everywhere. This French guy is like “Oh la la!” and runs over and shuts it. It was a disaster, an absolute disaster. Of course, then finally it’s all going, I sit down to try to relax, and I look up and there is [sic] English instructions. I had no clue. I felt like the biggest idiot.

This situation illustrates the anxiety felt by a student facing an unfamiliar situation. Frustration and embarrassment can further discourage attempts to use the target language. Carrie recalled a similar experience: “I tried to get Nyquil at the pharmacy but it’s behind the counter. You have to explain your illness to the man. So I just came home.”

The participants’ “worst thing that happened during SA” were overwhelmingly cultural in nature. For example, Vanessa and Laurie reported feeling uncomfortable with explaining their dietary habits or vegetarian requirements to their French hosts. Three other students described being “ridiculed,” “bashed,” and “criticized” for being American. Others, like Anthony and Beth, displayed negative opinions about Parisians, calling them impolite and cold.

Some of the reported “worst things” demonstrated a lack of practical information about the host culture or about how to handle daily life in a big city. Anthony and Matt described being “tricked and swindled” in a cabaret after unknowingly wandering in for a drink. Three other students called being stranded late at night without public transportation their most difficult moment. An element common to all of these instances is that they demand both cultural knowledge and linguistic skills to successfully negotiate the situation.

Some informants pointed to their limited French abilities as a cause of anxiety. Beth, who had only studied French for two semesters prior to SA, recollected that “people just shove me off the sidewalk and don’t say sorry. If they see you coming behind them and you’re trying to walk faster, they don’t move. I guess maybe it’s because I can’t speak the language.” She was not the only student who expressed a lack of confidence in her language skills. Lera lamented to the program assistant that “I’ve forgotten everything.” On separate occasions involving group activities, Anthony and Catherine wanted the assistant to ask for something for them because they claimed they would not be able to express themselves in French. In a similar instance, Curtis complained to his roommate, “You are going to have to do all the talking to our French family.” All of these statements clearly reflect participants’ anxiety in situations that require communication in the target language to meet day-to-day needs.

Anxiety was also aroused in situations where a native speaker directly raised an issue and caused the participant...
to feel criticized. Consider Missie’s encounter with her French host when he entered her room and said “Missie, I need to talk to you. Your hair is long. You take long showers. Maybe you could turn the water off while you wash your hair.” In the kitchen, he pointed out the water heater and said, “It gets very hot, and we are afraid you are going to burn the house down.” In her postprogram evaluation, Missie summarized her opinion of her hosts as “very accommodating and very friendly, but they will always tell you exactly what is on their minds.” Jessie described what she called “one of the most embarrassing moments” when she did not know the French word for something cooked by her hostess. In response to Jessie’s confusion, her hostess inquired, “Don’t you eat this in the United States? Don’t you know your animals?”

Students living together in the pension also described being scolded for forgetting to turn off the bathroom light or for failing to eat everything on the dinner plate. Bill described the following incident involving eating barefoot at the table: “I was eating in here one time, and I didn’t have my shoes on. [The hostess] was like ‘We don’t do that in France. You walk all over the house with your shoes off, then you put them on the couch, then you eat dinner with no shoes on.’” He also explained that his hostess was not angry with him, but she had rules that sometimes caught him off guard. These types of situations aggravated the already-heightened anxiety experienced while communicating in the target language.

Although these findings indicate that SA participants faced substantial obstacles in terms of anxiety when communicating with native speakers and trying to understand how to behave in a foreign culture, the participants also provided encouraging information on their most notable accomplishments during the experience. When asked to identify the “biggest challenge I successfully overcame” during SA, all 25 participants named an episode related to communicating in the target language. Table 1 displays the categories mentioned and the number of students who reported each category.

It is notable that these categories reflect “victories” that are largely linguistic and involve goods and services, wants and needs, and communication with native speakers. Tim related an episode he called “really difficult” when he successfully discussed how to set up his computer with a native speaker providing technology support. It appears that participants’ biggest challenges were not scholastic (e.g., tests, grading) but linguistic and cultural. Although all of them reported notable linguistic progress during the program, there was not widespread agreement in terms of enhanced understanding of culture.

Integrative Motivation

A paired samples t-test was calculated to compare the mean pre-SA AMTB score with the mean post-SA AMTB score. The pretest mean was 294.17
SD = 28.46) and the posttest mean was 302.38 (SD = 37.16). No significant decrease of integrative motivation was found, \( t(23) = -0.102, p > .05, \) effect size = .05. In addition to measuring integrative motivation, the AMTB measured eight related, lower-order concepts. No significant mean differences occurred after SA in any of these attitudes (see Table 2). It should be noted that all standard deviations increased after SA, with the greatest variability in AMTB scores prior to and after SA in the category of Attitudes toward French people. These results indicated that participants had more uniform attitudes about the target culture and language prior to SA, and that participants had a wide variety of attitudes/experiences in France. (The AMTB results of one SA participant were not used in this analysis, because the student skipped numerous items on the posttest.)

### Comparison of Integrative Motivation for SA and Non-SA Participants

An independent \( t \)-test was calculated comparing the mean AMTB scores of SA participants prior to the program \( (n = 24) \) with the mean AMTB scores of students studying French at the same level \( (n = 21) \). The mean integrative motivation level of the SA participants \( (M = 294.17, SD = 28.46) \) was not significantly different from that of non-SA participants \( (M = 290.19, SD = 24.88) \), \( t(43) = .495, p > .05 \), effect size = .01.

### Sources and Manifestations of Integrative Motivation During SA

Analysis of qualitative data gathered from the Demographic/Language Contact Profile and during interviews with primary informants revealed that the majority of reported reasons for participating in SA (7 out of 12) were integrative (see Table 3).

There is a clear relationship between reported motivations for SA participation recorded before the program's start and the participants' written descriptions at the program's end of their personal “best thing that happened during SA.” These descriptions revealed two dominant categories of SA bests: relationship building and experiences with travel and culture. These two categories support earlier SA research, which concluded that students perceived personal interactions and travel as significant sources of out-of-class learning during SA (Laubscher, 1994). For Jessie, the best part of the SA experience was her family sit-

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having new experiences(^a)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting different kinds of people(^a)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a chance to live abroad in another country(^a)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing France, the scenery(^a)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying in France(^b)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know the French(^a)</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding out how people live(^a)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining family members</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing from my country</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting training in my field(^b)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting a degree(^b)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = not at all important; 3 = somewhat important; 5 = very important  
\(^a\)Integrative reasons  
\(^b\)Instrumental reasons

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking to Americans</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to French people</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with non-French/non-American people</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 = extensively; 3 = occasionally; 5 = not at all.

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Pre-SA M (SD)</th>
<th>Post-SA M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture Narration</td>
<td>13.44 (3.08)</td>
<td>17.24 (2.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Play</td>
<td>12.96 (3.80)</td>
<td>18.00 (2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.40 (6.22)</td>
<td>35.24 (4.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum picture narration score = 24; maximum role play score = 24
uation. She explained, “The woman I live with had had nine formal dinner parties. I have had the occasion to meet all different French people.” Ellen praised her family relationship, too: “Our mom took a lot of pride in all the food she cooked,” she recalled. “We asked her one time if she could teach us, and she went and got out all of these recipe books. She talked for like an hour!”

This emphasis on relationship building and communication is also reflected in participants’ reported preference for interacting to obtain information rather than gathering information from more passive sources such as magazines, the Internet, newspapers, radio, and books (see Table 4).

**French Oral Skills**

A paired samples t-test was calculated to compare mean pre-SA and post-SA French Oral Skills scores. The pretest mean was 26.4 (SD = 6.22) and the posttest mean was 35.24 (SD = 4.76). A significant increase from pretest to posttest was found, $t(24) = -9.156$, $p < .001$, effect size = .78. Table 5 displays mean scores for both parts of the test (picture narration and role-play activity).

The French Oral Skills Tests was scored by two judges.

---

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Picture Narration</th>
<th>Role Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-SA</td>
<td>Post-SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of communication</td>
<td>3.32 (.95)</td>
<td>4.48 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>4.04 (.93)</td>
<td>5.12 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>2.56 (.82)</td>
<td>3.56 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication</td>
<td>3.52 (.82)</td>
<td>4.08 (.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: maximum picture narration score = 24; maximum role play score = 24

---

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Task</th>
<th>No. of Pre-SA Yes Responses</th>
<th>No. of Post-SA Yes Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count to 10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say day of week</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give full current date</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order simple meal in restaurant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for directions on the street</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy clothes in a department store</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce yourself in social situations and take leave</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give simple biographical information about yourself</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about your favorite hobby at length</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your current job or studies in detail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell what you plan to be doing in five years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your country’s educational system in some detail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and support with examples a position on a controversial topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your country’s government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these tasks are presented in descending order from simple to complicated.
(interrater reliability = .92) on the following four criteria: amount of communication, comprehensibility, fluency, and quality of communication. Each criterion was given a score of one to six, with six being the strongest score for both activities that comprised the test. Table 6 displays the mean scores for each criterion. The scores improved for each criterion in both activities.

**Participants’ Self-Reports of French Oral Abilities**

Analysis of 14 questionnaire items directing participants to check off specific speaking tasks they “can do easily” revealed that all but one of the 25 participants reported gains in the ability to perform speaking tasks. Table 7 displays the 14 speaking tasks queried, and their accompanying responses. In many cases, the number of participants who reported they “could do” the more complicated oral tasks more than doubled. It appears that the students not only made empirical gains in their oral French skills, they also felt more confident in their ability to perform specific oral tasks.

**French Listening Skills**

A paired samples t-test was calculated to compare the mean pre-SA and post-SA French Listening Skills scores. The pretest mean was 8.88 (SD = 2.05) and the posttest mean was 11.28 (SD = 1.43). A significant increase from pretest to posttest was found, \( t(24) = -6.000, p < .001, \) effect size = .60.

**Participants’ Self-Reports of French Listening Abilities**

Analysis of 11 questionnaire items directing participants to check off specific comprehension tasks they “can do easily” contributes to the finding that, in addition to reporting progress in relation to oral tasks, students also had gains in tasks like understanding native speakers during face-to-face encounters or understanding radio news reports. Table 8 displays the 11 listening tasks participants were queried about, and their responses.

In comparison with the gains made after SA in the more complicated oral tasks (see Table 7), participants did not report as many gains in complicated listening tasks, such as understanding native speakers talking at a natural rate of speed or understanding sports or song lyrics on the radio. However, gains in one or more listening task(s) were reported by over three fourths of the group, demonstrating a higher level of confidence in the ability to perform specific listening tasks.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening Task</th>
<th>No. of Pre-SA Yes Responses</th>
<th>No. of Post-SA Yes Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand very simple conversations in French</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In face-to-face conversation, understand a native speaker (NS) who is speaking slowly and carefully</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the telephone, understand NS speaking slowly, tell whether NS is referring to the past, present, or future</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In face-to-face conversation with NS speaking slowly, tell whether NS is referring to past, present, or future</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In face-to-face conversation, understand NS speaking as quickly and colloquially as he/she would to another NS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand movies without subtitles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand news broadcasts on the radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand words to a popular song on radio the first time you hear it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand play-by-play sports on the radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand two NSs talking rapidly to each other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the telephone, understand NS talking as quickly and colloquially as he/she would with another NS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These tasks are presented in descending order from simple to complicated.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate linguistic and affective changes after participation in a six-week SA program by university students and to answer the question, “Does SA make a difference?” For the 25 SA participants in this study, the answer is yes and no. After participation in SA, they were more at ease (less anxious) in speaking French both in and out of the classroom, and they made significant improvements in both oral and listening skills. However, their integrative motivation and attitudes toward learning French and French people were unchanged as a group.

Affective Outcomes After SA Participation

The FLAS and FUAS were helpful in determining that significant mean decreases occurred in classroom and non-classroom language anxiety after SA, and that communication apprehension during interactions with native speakers was an important source of language anxiety. Our findings support a view of language anxiety during SA as situational and based in linguistic insecurity and cultural differences. Anecdotal accounts of language anxiety suggested that a major component was the worry and negative emotional reaction aroused when using the target language. Similar findings have been described in the literature (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; MacIntyre, 1999; Price, 1991). Every experience of language anxiety related by participants involved native speakers and communication apprehension; many experiences also involved fear of negative evaluation. These situations bring to mind Horwitz et al.’s dichotomy (1986) of the “true” versus “limited” self. Moreover, linguistic insecurities were often exaggerated by cultural differences. The types of persistent questions that Levy (2000) described as recurrent during SA (such as “What exactly are the rules of behavior and interpersonal relationships?” and “Did I really understand that conversation?”) were confirmed by this study.

Our analysis of qualitative data supports Wilkinson’s findings that SA and living with host families can produce negative experiences and cause cultural misunderstandings (1998, 2000). Yet, whereas Wilkinson (2000) questioned the family as the “most beneficial living arrangement” (p. 39), 18 of 20 participants in the present study interpreted this contact as a direct linguistic or cultural advantage, and 9 felt that speaking with family members was a significant factor in improving their spoken French. Our findings support Knight and Schmidt-Rinehart’s recommendations that SA host families should engage in ongoing discussions with SA programs about the role of homestay and strategies to optimize interaction between SA participants and their hosts (2002).

Regarding integrative motivation, AMTB scores displayed that neither integrative motivation nor attitudes related to the target culture or study of French changed after SA. Qualitative data provided possible reasons for this result. Whereas participants called “Getting to know the French” an important motivation for SA participation, they did not appear to invest great amounts of out-of-class time in establishing contacts with target culture members. After SA, a fourth of the participants indicated disappointment over not meeting French young people. Self-reports of how participants spent their out-of-class time demonstrated that interactive contact with Americans and French people was favored over noninteractive contact with the target culture (e.g., reading authentic newspapers, watching television, listening to the radio). The results of this study do not support previous studies that found that immersion programs improved attitudes toward members of the target language community (Clément, 1979; Shapson et al., 1981). However, they are consistent with Gardner et al.’s (1977) study of an intensive summer immersion program, which concluded that, although participants’ French classroom anxiety decreased after the program, neither attitudes toward French-Canadians nor integrative orientation to learn French improved.

Linguistic Outcomes after SA Participation

We found that participants made significant improvements in both oral and listening French skills after SA. With regards to oral French skills, significant improvements occurred in each of the four areas measured: amount of communication, comprehensibility, fluency, and quality of communication. The most improved quality was comprehensibility — the ability to make oneself understood and to convey meaning. The least improved quality was grammatical correctness of speech. Comprehensibility is indeed an important quality for SA learners to develop, as it represents the ability to respond appropriately to target language input. Participants’ self-evaluations of specific oral and listening tasks they could perform easily demonstrated that their self-confidence with French was enhanced after SA. Complicated oral tasks were mastered more than were complicated listening tasks involving native speakers; this is consistent with other affective findings regarding interactions with native speakers as a potential source of language anxiety and students’ regret over not spending more time with native speakers their own age.

Limitations

Because SA participants in this study had self-selected, random assignment was not possible. Therefore, the parameters and results of this study must be weighed carefully before ascribing its findings to other SA programs. Furthermore, the present study investigated only two linguistic variables (listening and oral skills); reading and writing skills were not addressed. However, because SA is
an opportunity for immersion in the target culture and learning takes place in the community as well as in the classroom, listening and speaking are critical skills for interacting abroad (Davie, 1996). In addition, this study investigated only two nonlinguistic factors, language anxiety and integrative motivation. The researchers targeted these factors because evidence supports their impact on language learning.

**Recommendations**

Future research should build on current and previous studies in several areas. Researchers could investigate whether linguistic and affective outcomes are maintained after SA. Also, a control-group design could study differences between linguistic and affective outcomes for SA participants versus non-SA participants. Although the present study contributes to our understanding of the SA phenomena, it represents one program during one six-week semester. Future research should include other foreign languages and other types of SA programs.

One half of the respondents to the postprogram evaluation in this study indicated a need for more preprogram orientation. Suggestions to offset this critique would be to: (1) exploit the Internet for FL resources, (2) engage students with the target culture through orientation activities with an emphasis on potential linguistic or cultural conflicts, (3) advise students during SA to pursue social pursuits they enjoy at home, by taking part in sports, religious activities, or other hobbies with target language members, and (4) assign projects that will necessitate cross-cultural contact (e.g., interview a family member, write and share a movie review with classmates). By deepening cultural learning both before and during SA, participants may develop attitudes that welcome newness and difference in the target culture (González, 2001).

This SA program provided students an opportunity to deepen their cultural understanding of the target country and to improve linguistically. This experience produced significant findings on why SA should remain a part of the curriculum, and documented what happened when students actually studied abroad.
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Appendix A

Sample Questions of Some Test Instruments Used in The Study

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my French class.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in French class.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree

French Use Anxiety Scale (FUAS)

1. I would get nervous if I had to speak French to someone in a store.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree
2. When called upon to use my French, I feel very much at ease.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree

Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)

1. If I were visiting a foreign country I would like to be able to speak the language of the people.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree
2. I think that learning French is dull.
   - strongly disagree  disagree  no opinion  agree  strongly agree

French Listening Proficiency Test

Introduction to Part 1, AT THE OFFICE: In this scene, a police officer (“le commissaire”) and a young man named Aziz are talking together in the office of the police officer.

Introduction to Part 2, AT THE BAR: In this scene, two young men, a barman and a client in the café are talking together.

Introduction to Part 3, AT THE HOUSE: In this scene, a child and his nanny are seen in the child's home.

Sample Listening Proficiency Test Items for Part 1, AT THE OFFICE:

1. How is Aziz doing today?
   - a. very well
   - b. well
   - c. so-so
   - d. not well
   - e. terrible

2. What does the police officer want to share with Aziz?
   - a. good news
   - b. bad news
   - c. a problem
   - d. a meal
   - e. money