



Rural learners' communication apprehension and urban learners' fear of negative evaluation in speaking performance: What lies within?

Agung Ginanjar Anjaniputra^{✉1}

¹English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Received on 12 May
2020
Approved on 8
November 2021
Published on 24
November 2021

*Keywords: Urban and
rural learners; language
anxiety; speaking
performance; EFL*

Abstract

Anxiety-triggering conditions that can facilitate and debilitate learning must be made known to teachers. Besides, studies comparing foreign language anxiety in rural and urban areas are inconclusive and incongruous. Thus, this study is intended to explore learners' language anxiety in speaking performance at urban and rural high schools. The investigation of language anxiety particularly addresses the extent of language anxiety, the anxiety factors as well as the relationship among language anxiety, school sites, and speaking. This study utilized a questionnaire, a test, and a learner interview to collect data by involving urban and rural school. Quantitative data analysis was carried out through descriptive statistics to find out learners' language anxiety levels, and through Multiple Regression Correlation (MRC) to determine the relationship among the variables. Qualitative data analysis was conducted in relation to language anxiety sources by generating broad themes from the interview. The analysis revealed that (1) the extent of learners' language anxiety was distinct from one another and subject to certain circumstances and their anxiety sensitivity; (2) four factors causing language anxiety were discovered; and (3) a new insight into the correlation between urban and rural learners, language anxiety, and speaking was noticeable. These findings suggest that teachers recognize the circumstances leading to anxiety, which is a basis for successful language acquisition and learning.

[✉]Correspondence Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: anjaniputragi@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Language anxiety is considered to be a factor affecting language learning and acquisition (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Ellis, 1987; Aida, 1994; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 1999; Gass & Selinker, 2008). It is asserted that being capable of coping with anxiety can lead to the success of learning and acquiring second or foreign languages (Horwitz et al., 1986). Language anxiety may bring about reactions which prevent learners from performing well in a foreign language class (Horwitz et al., 1986; Aida, 1994; Horwitz, 2001). It has also been associated with the performance of language skills (see Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999; Cheng, Horwitz, & Schallert, 1999; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004). One of them is speaking which is believed to be affected by language anxiety (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; Woodrow, 2006; Suherdi, 2012). Speaking is also a problem faced by most EFL learners in Indonesia. Many secondary school learners do not seem to have sufficient ability to speak English (Widiati & Cahyono, 2006). Therefore, an exploration of language anxiety among urban and rural learners is necessary to be investigated.

Anxiety has long been associated with fear to be regarded as having “a powerful influence in contemporary life” (Spielberger, 1966, p.3). It was Freud, along with his psychoanalysis theory, that first shared the notion of anxiety as an unpleasant feeling reacting against dangerous situations, yet the vagueness of its source frequently exists (Feist & Feist, 2009; Schultz & Schultz, 2012). It is the vagueness that makes anxiety distinguishable from fear as objects related to fear are specific and apparent (Rachman, 2004), while anxiety itself is deemed as “a vague and unspecific apprehension” (May, 1950, p.51). It is further supported by Corey (2012) asserting that it is triggered by dealing with options with no clear guidelines and no knowledge of what the consequences are. Besides, it is related to individual susceptibility to threatening circumstances in which task performance is possibly distracted by intimidating-perceived situations (Eysenck & Byrne, 1992, p.798).

Concerning language performance, three categories of performance anxiety such as communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation are introduced by Horwitz et al. (1986). Besides, it is also stated that the components have to do with strong speaking anxiety (Puškar, 2010). In addition, they are mostly used as the basis for foreign language anxiety measurement (see Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999; Gregersen, 2005; Ezzi, 2012).

Communication apprehension is defined as “a type of shyness characterized by fear or anxiety about communicating with people” (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.127). It is further argued that anxiety in speaking emerges as a result of lack of confidence in linguistic knowledge (Arnold, 2000; Ewald, 2007). In this sense, speaking is regarded as an activity provoking anxiety in foreign language learning (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a, as cited in Chan & Wu, 2004), especially when performed in front of the class among other learners (Iizuka, 2010). It is in line with the manifestations of communication apprehension, as argued by Horwitz et al. (1986) and Puškar (2010), reflected in difficulties when speaking in groups or in public.

Test anxiety is a type of anxiety triggered by a fear of failure so that perfect performance is conceived as the only acceptable achievement (Horwitz et al., 1986). Besides, in language class, the pervasiveness of test anxiety is largely prevailing phenomena due to its continuous evaluative nature on performance (Tanveer, 2007). Two main factors of test anxiety encompass lack of preparation and worry (Birjandi & Alemi, 2010). Lack of preparation is characterized by learners who cram the night before the test, have indigent time and study management, and fail to process text information. Meanwhile, the second factor has something to do with worry about performance on past exams, the way classmates and other learners perform, and the negative consequence of failure.

Fear of negative evaluation deals with the feeling of apprehension about others' evaluation (Horwitz et al., 1986). In addition, to follow Lucas et al. (2011), it includes avoiding evaluations and negatively thinking too much about others' evaluation. Fear of negative evaluation differs from test anxiety in a way that it has broader scope, not limited to test situations (Horwitz et al. 1986). It may occur in circumstances such as group works, interview tasks, and other activities which have something to do with evaluation among peers, groups or even individuals. As a result, learners hardly speak voluntarily to initiate conversation and interaction, and the worst case of this is that learners skip class as a way to avoid evaluative situations causing the anxiety (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). The reason behind this, as stated by Hashemi (2011), is that learners have a fear leading to the shortfalls in positive self-image or self-identity when speaking in a foreign language. Any evaluations in social situations such as speaking in foreign language class where teachers and learners take part in evaluating the performance can cause the fear of negative evaluation (Chan & Wu, 2004). Lucas, et al. (2011) state fear of negative evaluation may also include the fear learners experience during

language class with the presence of peer pressure. As they further argue, the use of certain learning activities and methodology by the teacher leads to language learners' anxiety.

Anxiety may be associated with the areas in which individuals live as reported by McKenzie, Murray, & Booth (2013) that the urban-rural classification becomes an influential factor triggering mental health that is indicated by the prevalence of anxiety. The difference can also be caused by several demographic factors (see Ozer, Fernald, & Roberts, 2007; Lynham & Rapee, 2007; Abbo et al., 2013; Nair et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2013). It is shown in three Australian rural settings that the highest rates of anxiety are apparent in a 45-54 years-age group with no significant difference among three areas (Kilkkinen et al., 2007). Meanwhile, another result is somewhat distinguishable that the prevalence of anxiety is high among adolescents and children in a rural area of Uganda (Abbo et al., 2013). It corresponds to the symptomatic anxiety among youngest age group in a rural community in Kenya (Abbot and Klein, 1979). Several aspects contributing to the prevalence of anxiety in either urban or rural areas (see Hraba, McCutcheon, & Vecernik, 1999; Kilkkinen et al., 2007; Leeuwen, 2010; Stanley, 2010; Romans, Cohen & Forte, 2011; McKenzie, 2013; Florida, 2015), encompass diversity, education, access to public services, types of living environment, socioeconomic status, and values.

Research on language anxiety has long been conducted by many experts concerning both first and second/foreign language learning. Among others, two studies are conducted to investigate language anxiety and its relation to different forms of anxiety and to native and second language processing (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a), and to Input, Processing, and Output (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994). Moreover, it has also examined the relationship of Japanese learners' language anxiety to gender and their learning of Japanese (Aida, 1994), and to shed light on the correlation of anxiety and achievement in second language learning through the literature on language learning anxiety (Horwitz, 2001). Its relation to speaking has also been concerned, which provides novel insights into the association of language anxiety and oral performance (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002; Woodrow, 2006; Ewald, 2007; Hewitt & Stephenson, 2011). Furthermore, in oral presentations, non-verbal cues of anxious language learners are also examined (Gregersen, 2005 & 2009).

Research found that language anxiety is also influenced by residential locations. One relevant study was conducted by Piechurska-Kuciel (in Pawlak, 2012, pp.169-184) who investigated language anxiety levels of Polish secondary grammar school learners from urban, suburban, and rural areas. Another one was the research in Yemen by Ezzi (2012) who also found that residence contributed to the level of foreign language anxiety. However, the two studies came up with contradictory results, in line with several studies of urban-rural differences in psychiatric disorder rates (Romans et al., 2011). For these conflicting results, this study refines the association of language anxiety in speaking performances among rural and urban learners. Besides, the exploration of foreign language anxiety based on school locations by means of qualitative and quantitative inquiry is rarely conducted. Thus, this study is going to qualitatively and quantitatively explore foreign language anxiety experienced by learners from urban and rural schools.

Given the consideration that language anxiety can determine the success of learning as well as acquiring languages (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Ellis, 1987; Aida, 1994; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 1999; Gass & Selinker, 2008), affect speaking performance and may also be influenced by the areas in which learners live and study (see Ezzi, 2012; Pawlak, 2012; Romans et al., 2011), a concern of whether learners from rural and urban high schools experience language anxiety emerges. Hence, this study is conducted in urban and rural secondary schools in a district of West Java Province, Indonesia, to investigate learners' language anxiety: the extent to which learners are anxious, why they experience anxiety, and the relationship among school origins, their language anxiety and speaking performance in English classrooms.

METHODS

A mixed method design was deployed since the data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The data were collected by involving one senior high school located in urban area of Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia, and one located in its rural area. A total of 58 learners were taken as the sample. Qualitative data were gathered to address the extent to which learners are anxious and the causes of anxiety. Quantitative data were also collected to address the relationship between school origins (urban and rural secondary schools), language anxiety (measured scores), and speaking (measured scores). Such a relationship can be accommodated by using Multiple Regression Correlation or MRC (Lewis-Beck, 1980; Draper & Smith, 1998; Cohen et al., 2003; Kutner et al.,

2005). The pattern of relationship is in accordance with “model B two-variable redundancy” (Cohen et al., 2003, p.76), where school origins (X1), as represented by urban and rural secondary schools, might produce differences in language anxiety (X2) in a sample of school learner, and each is likely to cause differences in speaking scores (Y).

Techniques of collecting data in this study encompassed questionnaires, learner interview, and speaking tests. The questionnaire, adapted from Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope’s FLCAS (1986), was to gauge the learners’ language anxiety and to choose seven learners with the highest level of anxiety as participants of the interview. The selection of the FLCAS was based on a consideration that it is reported to be valid and reliable in addressing foreign language anxiety (Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999; Gregersen, 2005; Ezzi, 2012).

The questionnaire consisted of 33 closed-ended items based on three constructs: communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, test anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986; Lucas, Miraflores, & Go 2011). To preclude learners’ misunderstanding, it was translated into Bahasa Indonesia. The word “English” was used instead of “language” and “foreign language”. For example, the original version “I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class” was changed to become “I feel confident when I speak in English class”. To maintain the reliability, the questionnaire was piloted twice to a learner exclusive of the 58 participants. As a result of the first pilot, the researcher rephrased the term native speakers of English to become Englishmen. Besides, to ascertain the validity, all the participants were guided to answer each item.

Additionally, the learner interview was administered to enrich the data and to assure objectivity of the researcher to answer the problems. A semi-structured interview was also simultaneously carried out with audiotaping to be able to analyze interviewees’ statement thoroughly. The interview questions were developed based on the results of the questionnaire, in line with the components of speaking anxiety: Communication Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation, and Test Anxiety. As for ethical considerations, the researcher asked the participants if they were willingly involved in this study. Moreover, their consent to publish any data was obtained with confidentiality of their personal information.

In addition to the questionnaire and learner interview, a speaking test was done to 58 participants in this study. The participants in each school were assessed by the English classroom teachers and the researcher. This is suggested that speaking performances involve more than one person to rate or assess the skill (Douglas, 2010, p.110). The test was administered in the two classrooms, before the other students. In both classes, it was carried out in the morning so as to ensure the reliability. The speaking performance done by students was based on a topic, family, in which students were helped to speak up their ideas through several probing questions. The probing questions encompass *How big is your family? (How many people are in your family?, How many brothers and sisters do you have?), How old are your brothers and sisters?, How old are your parents?, What are the occupations of your family members? (What does your father do?, What's his job?, What does your mother do?, What do your brothers and/or sisters do?), What do you and your family like to do together?, and What do your parents do in their free time?.* The assessment of their speaking performance was based upon a speaking rubric adapted from Brown (2001).

For the qualitative data analysis, the data from the interview were reduced, displayed, and verified as well as concluded (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). In this regard, the factors were coded with LP for lack of preparation, TA for teaching activities, SH and LC for shyness and lack of confidence merged into learner personality (LY), and FM for fear of making mistakes. Then, the coded utterances and expressions from the interview were put into two tables of categorization. Once all the potential and relevant data from interview were presented, these were interpreted to generate the findings of what factors cause language anxiety. The result was finally interpreted in relation to previous theories and studies.

Quantitative data analysis included calculation of the results of the questionnaire and to measure the relationship among variables. It was carried out by emphasizing areas, sub-areas, and items of the questionnaire to discern the extent of the learners’ language anxiety.

In regard to the measurement of the relationship among variables, the data of three variables were first tested by basic assumptions of MRC, comprising residual normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and homoscedasticity (Caroll & Ruppert, 1988; Cohen et al., 2003; Chatterjee & Simonoff, 2013; Johnson & Wichern, 2014). Having been proven to pass the tests for the basic assumptions, the scores of learners’ language anxiety from urban and rural secondary schools were computed by using MRC to see its relationship to speaking performance, where urban and rural

secondary schools were coded by the value 1 and 0 consecutively. The computational analysis of MRC was completed by using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS version 18) with α value at .05, which was critically interpreted.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

language anxiety levels of learners at the urban secondary school

The portrayal of learners' language anxiety at urban secondary school is conveyed. Not only does it concern their language anxiety level, but also it deals with the extent of their language anxiety from the analysis of a questionnaire in accordance with the three constructing components and its sub-areas. Prior to the portrayal of learners' language anxiety from its components, each urban learner's language anxiety level is reflected in the table below.

Table 1. Overall language anxiety levels of the urban learners

Levels	Range	No. of Learners	Percentage	Total Score
Highly Relaxed	33-59	-	-	-
Relaxed	60-86	1	2.94%	73
Normal	87-113	16	47.06%	1623
Anxious	114-140	17	50%	2078
Highly Anxious	141-165	-	-	-
Sum		34	100%	3774
	Average			111

The table above shows that the language anxiety level of the urban learners is 111 in average. Of all the learners, their levels are categorized into three levels of language anxiety: relaxed, normal, and anxious level. It is worth noting that a half of the learners from the urban school are in anxious level. This contributes to the dominance of this level over other levels of anxiety. This denotes that the urban learners seem inclined to experience language anxiety more intensely. This may be caused by intolerance and individuality of the people (Huggins & Debies-Carl, 2014 cited in Florida, 2015).

The average score of 34 learners in the urban secondary school is also presented in Table 2, alongside a number of other scores of the areas of FLCAS. The scores range from 2.853 up to 3.949, signifying anxiety levels which are simply in two different levels: the normal level and the anxious level. In addition, the average score of each component also needs to be taken into account in order to see its contribution to language anxiety in general. The highest average score among the main components is fear of negative evaluation (3.419), resulting in the score included into the anxious level (3.401-4.200), followed by communication apprehension (3.385) and test anxiety (3.258) consecutively. The results indicate that the urban learners are mostly anxiety-prone to situations involving evaluations. The presence of fear of negative evaluation contributing to emergence of language anxiety is confirmed by Horwitz et al. (1986) that it deals with the feeling of apprehension about others' evaluation occurring in situations such as group works, interview tasks, and other activities which have to do with evaluation among peers, groups or even individuals.

Table 2 Language anxiety based on the FLCAS in the urban secondary school (N=34)

Areas and Sub-Areas of Foreign Language Anxiety	Mean	Level
COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION	3.385	N
Communication with others	3.235	N
Speaking in front of others	3.382	N
Receiver anxiety	3.539	A
TEST ANXIETY	3.258	N
Fear of failure	3.461	A
Self-preoccupation	3.441	A
Self-preparation	3.015	N
FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION	3.419	A
Avoidance of evaluative situations	2.853	N
Teaching styles and activities	3.596	A
Peer pressure	3.949	A
OVERALL	3.364	N

*HR (Highly Relaxed): 1.000-1.800; R (Relaxed): 1.801-2.600; N (Normal): 2.601-3.400
A (Anxious): 3.401-4.200; HA (Highly anxious): 4.201-5.000*

As shown in the table above, the highest average score among all the sub-areas of language anxiety is peer pressure (3.949). This sub-area is a part of the ‘fear of negative evaluation component’ that deals with items accounting for other learners’ superiority in English and speaking of English, worry about getting left behind, and fear of being laughed at by other learners. The most significant anxiety-provoking situations based upon the items in this sub-area are those concerning “*I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am*” and “*I always feel that the other students speak the foreign language better than I do*”. The two items generate remarkable scores, more than four points to include these in the anxious level. It appears that learners are extremely prone to language anxiety as a result of threats from their classmates. Regarding this, Horwitz et al. (1986) posit that severe proneness to peer evaluations causing language anxiety may be undergone by learners.

The results imply that there are still many learners anxious about learning or speaking English in urban school. It will be worsened if English teachers keep providing them with the learning activities provoking their anxiety without being aware of the affective factors, one of which is anxiety, in learning and acquiring the foreign language. Regarding this, the significance of anxiety is said to be influential in learning and acquiring languages (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986; Ellis, 1987; Aida, 1994; Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 1999; Gass & Selinker, 2008). It is further supported that the presence of language anxiety can trigger negative behavior of learners and inhibiting achievement (Suhardi, 2012; Gass & Selinker, 2012). Nevertheless, it does not necessarily mean that they are anxious in any situation they are exposed to when learning the language as explained above through comprehensive insight into the questionnaire items.

Language anxiety levels of learners at the rural secondary school

The extent to which rural school learners experience anxiety is portrayed in Table 3. The average of learners’ anxiety level is 110.1. Dispersal of their language anxiety levels is limited to three levels, similar to that of the urban learners. This denotes language anxiety experienced by the learners that is relatively equal regardless of the school origins. In detail, the dispersion of learners’ language anxiety level in three distinct levels is noticeable that 15 learners are in the normal level of language anxiety, followed by eight learners in the anxious level, and only one in the relaxed level. This dispersion of the learners occupying each language anxiety level is different from that of the urban learners that the number of the rural learners in the anxious level results in a smaller number of learners with only 33.33% of them.

The smaller number of anxious learners can be an indication of a lack of competitiveness among the learners so that they may not feel pressure. This is consistent with the theoretical position of Bailey (1983, as cited in Tóth, 2007) and May (1950), according to whom anxiety can be caused by competitiveness. This implies that the less competitive the class is, the less anxious the learners are. The lack of competitiveness can be caused by the community-held value that English may give no significance to themselves. Furthermore, rural areas can constitute convenience for the people. The convenience is related to the availability of green space in rural areas is predominant (Leeuwen, 2010; McKenzie, 2013). Besides, it is affirmed that there is less noise in rural society (Stanley, 2010). This circumstance, as further argued by McKenzie (2013), can be beneficial as a means for reducing stress. Therefore, to some extent language anxiety could be suppressed.

Table 3. Overall language anxiety levels of the rural learners

Levels	Range	No. of Learners	Percentage	Total Score
Highly Relaxed	33-59	-	-	-
Relaxed	60-86	1	4.17%	76
Normal	87-113	15	62.5%	1579
Anxious	114-140	8	33.33%	987
Highly Anxious	141-165	-	-	-
Sum		24	100%	2642
Average				110.1

In terms of its sub-areas, of 24 rural learners the overall average score for each item is 3.336 (see Table 4), slightly lower than the urban learners. In addition, all the scores denote a range of data dispersion from the lowest 2.650 up to the highest one 4.011. Besides, the inclusion of the scores in language anxiety levels shows uniformity with the urban learners that these scores among others are

in the normal level (2.601-3.400) and in the anxious level (3.401-4.200). A difference lies on the low-end point lower than and the high-end point higher than those points of urban learners. Moreover, in contrast to the result in the urban school, in the rural school the result yields a distinction in a way that the communication apprehension component generates the highest average score, before fear of negative evaluation and test anxiety component. It suggests that situations included in the 'communication apprehension' component will induce a higher sense of anxiety instead of 'fear of negative evaluation' and 'test anxiety' whose average scores are below it.

The score of communication apprehension (3.602) is nearly 0.3 higher than the score of the urban school learners. The sub-areas, 'communication with others' and 'receiver anxiety', are presumably related since their two scores are all categorized into the anxious level. In other words, the rural learners are anxious not only about producing utterances, but also about receiving them. It is in line with Horwitz et al. (1986) that 'communication apprehension' is manifested in speaking and listening. Hence, language anxiety is not only experienced in language output when producing utterances, but also in language input when trying to understand the language.

Table 4 Language anxiety based on the FLCAS in the rural secondary school (N=24)

Areas and Sub-Areas of Foreign Language Anxiety	Mean	Level
COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION	3.602	A
Communication with others	3.931	A
Speaking in front of others	3.442	A
Receiver anxiety	3.542	A
TEST ANXIETY	2.986	N
Fear of failure	3.319	N
Self-preoccupation	2.813	N
Self preparation	2.823	N
FEAR OF NEGATIVE EVALUATION	3.353	N
Avoidance of evaluative situations	2.650	N
Teaching styles and activities	3.573	A
Peer pressure	4.011	A
OVERALL	3.336	N

*HR (Highly Relaxed): 1.000-1.800; R (Relaxed): 1.801-2.600; N (Normal): 2.601-3.400
A (Anxious): 3.401-4.200; HA (Highly anxious): 4.201-5.000*

The result of communication apprehension as the highest score of the components has to be noted. It may be due to the lack of access to public services in rural areas (Kilkkinen et al., 2007). This can restrict the chance of the rural learners in developing their communication skills. Furthermore, it can be associated with the socioeconomic status of rural people that they generally receive a lower income than those in urban areas (Stanley 2010) where socioeconomic status can be crucial in order to provide learners with the best facilities for optimum learning development (Memon, Joubish, & Khurram, 2010).

Based upon Table 4, the highest score among all the sub-areas is of fear of negative evaluation component, namely peer pressure (4.011). The anxiety level of this sub-area among the rural learners is somewhat higher than the urban learners'. This indicates severe anxiety proneness to getting left behind among the rural learners. It denotes a difference from the urban learners who are extremely anxious when preoccupying their classmates' performance. This phenomenon shows that pressure from their peer has a considerable trigger for language anxiety. The reason for this can be their worry about looking awful in front of their friends. With regard to this, Brown (2001) states that self-image is highly crucial for teenagers since they are vulnerable to others' perceptions on themselves.

The second highest sub-area average score comes from the component of communication apprehension. The sub-area is 'communication with others' that is categorized into the anxious level with an average of 3.931. The item with the highest score concerns a situation where anxiety causes forgetting things, which is deemed highly anxious (4.25) for rural learners. This result confirms what is argued by Puškar (2010) that the impact of language anxiety on learners comprises the limitation of memory, being lost in concentration and creativity. This is also what is supported by Eysenck et al. (2007, p.337) that concurrent task processing is gradually obstructed by the worrisome thoughts triggering a deficit in the attentional quality of working memory.

The findings suggest that the rural learners might be convenient in the English class, but not in participating in the class. They are solely anxious about a certain situation in the class, which is

known as state anxiety (Pappamihel, 2002; Pawlak, 2012; Suherdi, 2012). Since the learners are not hindered by anxiety in any situations in class, it shows a chance for the learners to foster their English ability, particularly when exposed to non-anxiety-provoking situations. According to Gregersen & Horwitz (2002) to avoid evaluative situations that cause anxiety, learners hardly speak voluntarily to initiate conversation and interaction, and in the worst case, they skip class. However, the rural learners seem to barely avoid the evaluative situations in the class. The reason for this may be caused by their willingness to be relieved to pass such a situation at once so that they can focus on other subjects and to be eventually adaptive to the threatening situation, alongside for the sake of getting marks. This shows that anxiety does not have to be avoided since it can encourage people to take precisely appropriate actions (Ewen, 2010; Corey, 2012).

From the findings, it is found that the urban and rural learners have the average individual scores of anxiety which are relatively the same, 110.1 among the rural learners and 111 among the urban learners. Moreover, seen from language anxiety constructs and their sub-areas, both the learner groups merely lie in two anxiety level categories comprising the normal, and the anxious levels, despite the emergence of some items included in the relaxed and highly anxious level. However, it merely covers an interpretation of the scores based upon descriptive data. Notwithstanding this similarity, the differences are discernible in and dependent upon the situations they are exposed to. For instance, the urban learners are mostly anxious about the teacher's correction, meanwhile, the rural learners are anxious about getting left behind in the class. These differences account for anxiety sensitivity (AS) denoting individual differences in the anxiety (Taylor, 1999). Therefore, inferential statistical calculation is operated in this study to provide a holistically illuminating discussion of the phenomenon and its relation to speaking performance and school regions.

The causes of language anxiety about speaking performance experienced by learners from urban and rural secondary schools

This section concerns the second research question on why the urban and rural learners undergo language anxiety in speaking performance. The reasons for their language anxiety are reported to result from several factors associated with lack of preparation (see Woodrow, 2006; Liu, 2007), teaching activities (see Marwan, 2007; Tanveer, 2007), memory disassociation (see Liu, 2007; Nuranifar, 2014), shyness (see Liu, 2007; Indrianty, 2012), lack of confidence (see Marwan, 2007; 2008;), fear of making mistakes (see Jackson, 2002; Guanyu and Wei, 2006; Liu, 2007; Indrianty, 2012), and lack of vocabulary (see Pappamihel, 2002; Liu, 2007). Through analysis of interview to the learners in both the urban and rural secondary schools, this study slightly modifies the categorization of these causes of language anxiety which entails teaching activities that are found to relate to memory disassociation, learner personality that includes shyness and lack of confidence, and fear of making mistakes that is associated with the lack of vocabulary.

Lack of preparation

The prominence of lack of preparation as one of the factors causing language anxiety among learners is in accordance with what is found by Woodrow (2006) and Liu (2007). It triggers language anxiety, as expressed by the urban learners, if there is an unexpected speaking test (see extract 1). In other words, being informed of what will be done in the class in advance can allow the learners to have time for preparation. This finding confirms the previous research that lack of preparation has been mentioned to result in test anxiety among learners (Birjandi & Alemi, 2010). Finally, to ascertain that she feels anxious because of lacking preparation, a confirmation question was delivered and once again this emerges as one of the factor affecting language anxiety.

In relation to this finding, the significance of preparation is prevailing since it was found in previous research that some learners experienced a less anxious state of affairs and an enhanced self-confidence for preparation, and avoided speaking performance without preparation beforehand (Liu, 2007). It is further asserted that learners' confidence in speaking English could be enhanced through preparation (Ibid.). The enhancement of self-confidence through preparation denotes the merits of preparation for learners experiencing language anxiety. This is in line with the notion that sufficient preparation is likely to lower language anxiety undergone by learners (Chan & Wu, 2004). Hence, having prepared materials before coming to class or performing oral skills, learners are expected to have a sense of readiness which ensures their ability.

I: in your opinion what makes you anxious when speaking English or in English class?

US13: if for example there is an unexpected speaking test, that makes me anxious, yes today I lacked preparation in my home.

...

I: just then what else? That makes you anxious, what else?

US13: if, yes, lacking preparation. (Extract 1, LP#1)

Concerning lack of preparation, the rural learner expresses his laziness in preparing the materials before the class. His laziness is known to result from language learning experience when he was in junior high school, “*if I don’t like the teacher, I must be slothful ... But when I was in SMP there was a teacher I didn’t like*”. In this regard, it is affirmed that building rapport with learners is of importance in learning languages (Worde, 1998, as cited in Marwan, 2007). If not, it can cause a negative attitude detrimental to language learning since according to Ellis (1997), it can affect the degree of learners’ struggle to learn a language. Besides, the attitude towards a language has a significantly negative correlation with the level of foreign language anxiety (Dewaele, 2005).

Teaching activities

The identification of this factor is in line with what is found in the previous research (see Marwan, 2007; Tanveer, 2007). Teaching activities triggering language anxiety comprise speaking before others, direct oral questions from the teacher, and fear of their teachers’ anger. This shows that anxiety is probably experienced when living as an autonomous individual, leaving immediate positions of security or breaking the habits (May, 1950). The situation may be conceived as a threat by the learner because anxiety itself is “a response to a situation or stimulus perceived to be threatening or dangerous” (Spielberger, 2004, p.139). Hence, inviting learners to perform before others in the class, regardless of urban or rural learners, needs to be undertaken very carefully so that it is not deemed stimulus threatening to their state of safety.

I: how often do you experience anxiety?

RS25: often when going to follow a test, before the class as well as when asked to perform in front of the class.

...

I: if only learning as usual, do you feel anxious?

RS25: when being asked indeed if I do not pay attention, then being asked, I usually experience it.

(Extract 2, TA#9)

As depicted in the extract above, the rural learner also feels anxious especially when being pointed out to answer unexpected questions. This finding confirms the previous result in China conducted by Liu (2007), affirming that being singled out by the teacher brings about a situation that is deemed the most anxious by the learners. In addition, based upon a study by Guanyu & Wei (2006), pointing out learners randomly is caused by teachers’ intolerance of silence in classroom so that teaching activities can run smoothly regardless of learners’ emotion.

The finding denotes the activities provoking language anxiety including being called on to utter personal responses and giving a whole-class presentation, a performance of speaking and a large group discussion (Tanveer, 2007, p.18). Such anxiety has to do with communication apprehension, defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977, p.78). Concerning this, the teachers’ roles suggested is to provide learners with a truly communicative approach to allow them to practice their speaking skills, and to encourage learners’ feeling of success and satisfaction when speaking English by means of scaffolding appropriate lessons (Hashemi & Abbasi, 2013).

In addition, one of the urban learners feels anxious about speaking performance due to the provision of activities by the teacher. As further stated by the learner, the teacher looks angry when having the learner participate in the lesson. Furthermore, it is revealed that such pressure and anxiety are to some extent discouraging so that the learner becomes reluctant to learn; “*yes, it does if the teacher mmmh seems to be mmmh angry so it leads to unwillingness to learn*”. This rare occurrence, specifically prevalent in the urban school, may denote that the teacher’s high expectation of the

learners in the urban area because of the school status as the most favorite school in town so that the learners are supposed to attain remarkable targets.

The situation underwent by the learner can be categorized as debilitating anxiety because of the learner's unwillingness to learn. It is stated that debilitating anxiety constitutes anxiety resulting in negative trigger in learning and inhibiting achievement (Humphries, 2011; Gass & Selinker, 2012; Suherdi, 2012). This is supported by Gregersen (2009) that foreign-language anxiety is deemed a debilitating emotion particularly related to the language-learning environment. According to Worde (1998, as cited in Marwan, 2007) this can be caused by inappropriate teaching procedures by teachers and their limitation to build rapport with learners. It can be seen in the finding that the teacher seems to be unsupportive by showing her anger to force the learner to participate in class activities. Hence, it is important to provide learners with sincere supports and interests to reduce language anxiety as suggested by Horwitz (2001).

Unanticipated teaching activities demanding learners' participation tend to cause language anxiety since these bring about bewilderment among them. It is as supported by Corey (2012) that anxiety is triggered by dealing with options with no clear guidelines and no knowledge of what the consequences are. In addition, these can cause learners to become perplexed as stated "*if suddenly singled out, I got blank*". This occurs to the learner even if she knows the answer. According to Liu (2007), this condition refers to memory disassociation that deals with the situation where learners are nervous or anxious because of forgetting what they have to say. Forgetting occurs due to reparations of a close association between anxiety and memory which is blacked out of consciousness (Nuranifar, 2014). In addition, according to Liu (ibid.), learners' language anxiety could cause inability to remember what they have learned, bringing about a greater anxious state of affairs. Moreover, some experts posit a number of manifestations of language anxiety in relation to memory disassociation such as going blank prior to tests (Horwitz et al., 1986), reduced word production (de Bot et al., 2005), and the limitation of memory (Puškar, 2010). Furthermore, the occurrence of memory disassociation affects mental processing in all three stages of input, processing, and output (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Therefore, it implies that the difficulties of anxious learners digesting language input lead to the problem of processing the input which in turn distracts language output or production.

Learner personality

This factor stems from two specific themes that encompass shyness and lack of confidence. The prevalence of shyness is in accordance with a finding that, according to Liu (2007) and Indrianty (2012), shyness is one of the factors causing foreign language anxiety. In addition, the association of confidence and language anxiety is reported that lack of confidence induces language anxiety about speaking performance among learners (Marwan, 2007; 2008).

Among the urban learners, the learner personality that is associated with the emergence of language anxiety is solely about lack of confidence, as shown in Extract 3. According to Arnold (2000) and Ewald (2007), anxiety in speaking emerges as a result of a lack of confidence in linguistic knowledge. Moreover, it is worthy of note that the learner does not express shyness in performing her speaking skills. This may be because of the characteristic of people in urban areas that, as stated by Jayapalan (2013), are diverse in terms of cultural, ethnic, and social backgrounds of its people. Therefore, the learners are accustomed to encountering people with distinct backgrounds so that they are not shy of others in the class.

I: what do you feel when speaking English in the class?

US1: I'm not confident (Extract 3, LC#1)

Meanwhile, data from the rural learners show that Lack of confidence and shyness are likely to be interrelated as depicted in Extract 4. This is further argued by Nickdaw (2014) that shyness of people to some extent is initiated by lack of trust in them. Shyness is closely associated with communication apprehension which means "a type of shyness characterized by fear or anxiety about communicating with people" (Horwitz et al., 1986, p.127). Shyness can be detrimental for learners because shyness leading to anxiety regularly prevents learners from participation and engagement in the classroom. According to Gregerson & Horwitz (2002), not only do anxious learners commit themselves to avoidance and procrastination in their language learning, but they

become reluctant to comment on their performance, fear to be evaluated by their peers, and concern over their errors. As the learner further mentions, this situation is influential to her confidence.

I: you were anxious just now, why does it, speaking in front of the class, make you feel anxious?

RS21: mmhh I lack confident

I: what causes you to feel lack of confidence?

RS21: mmhh the cause is, perhaps confronting many people.

I: confronting other learners?

RS21:yes, mmh I have mousy personality. (Extract 4, SH#3)

The interrelation between shyness and lack of confidence is also confirmed by another rural student, “*perhaps lack of confidence. The main reason is lack of confidence and I am mousy, shy of being the center of attention*”. Regarding this, the emerging sense of anxiety among language learners has been argued to depend upon their self-confidence (Park & Lee, 2005). This is in contrast to Puškar (2010) affirming that it is language anxiety that affects learners negatively including lowered self-esteem and self-confidence.

Lacking confidence when speaking in front of others conforms to the inconsistency of self-confidence (see Osboe, Fujimura, & Hirschel, 2007). This inconsistency refers to confidence enhanced when working in pairs and small groups, yet diminished when performing in whole-class situations (ibid.). Therefore, the presence of confidence in language learning is essential. Brown (2001, p.62) contends that belief possessed by learners in accomplishing an activity partially facilitates their eventual success to complete the task. In the same vein, Huang (2014) states that self-confidence is important in alleviating language anxiety by means of affecting learners’ attitudes and motivations towards the language being learnt. Nevertheless, the shortcoming of self-confidence is still prevalent among learners especially those with lower intermediate achievement due to their inadequacy of mastering the foreign language (Marwan, 2008).

Fear of making mistakes

The emergence of this factor is in line with what is found by Jackson (2002), Guanyu & Wei, (2006), Liu (2007) and Indrianty (2012). It is found that fear of making mistakes also leads to low voice production, presumably intended to avoid laughter from others (see Extracts 5 & 6). This is in line that learners with anxiety frequently associate their mistakes to the possibility of negative evaluations by others (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002). This finding may be associated with what May (1950) asserts that cultural standards of success and competitive ambition lead to anxiety. In relation to this finding, the learners are studying in an environment whose individuals judge mistakes by laughter.

The avoidance of being laughed at, similar to previous research by Jackson (2002) and Liu (2007), is manifested in fear of making mistakes leading to anxiety. Such anxiety deals with reality anxiety, referring to a reaction to tangible dangers in the real world (May, 1950; Feist & Feist, 2009; Ewen, 2010; Schultz & Schultz, 2012). The function of reality anxiety to have a person prepared for the actual upcoming events or occurrences, namely ‘anxious readiness’ (May, 1950, p.114). Besides, it is argued that prior experiences build one’s perception on surrounding subjects whether or not these are perceived as threat (Ewen, 2010; Schultz & Schultz, 2012). Therefore, fear of making mistakes can be initiated by recurring anxious experiences in speaking performance such as being laughed at or embarrassed.

I: well, when you are speaking English in the class, there may be times that you may feel anxious about it, like just now, mayn’t there?

US26: yes, because of fear of making mistakes so I like to lower my voice. If the voice is heard, I fear that it is wrong. (Extract 5, FM#8)

The fear of making mistakes is also found to have been caused by several underlying factors, one of which is lack of vocabulary in relation to pronunciation as expressed by a learner from the urban school, “*fear of making mistakes in pronouncing words*”. This reason is common since Harmer (2007a) avows that pronunciation and its spelling makes English considered difficult by learners. This finding to some extent confirms previous research identifying that lack of vocabulary is a factor causing foreign language anxiety (Pappamihel, 2002; Liu, 2007). Close relation between vocabulary

and pronunciation is argued by Linse (2005) that vocabulary mastery constitutes the collection of words that an individual knows. Instead, vocabulary mastery is not only about knowing words, but also most importantly using the words in accordance with grammatical structure (Harmer, 2007b), which is apparent in the extract below.

I: how often do you experience the language anxiety?

RS7: (laughing) in each English class, because of fear, when asked, fear of mistaking the answer, fear of arranging the words incorrectly fear of being laughed at by my friends, fear of being the topic of discussion among friends afterwards. (Extract 6, FM#14)

The learner states that he has fear of making mistakes in arranging the words into correct grammatical structures, which is according to Harmer (ibid.) a part of vocabulary mastery. Therefore, from the two extracts, fear of making mistakes results from lack of vocabulary not only in terms of pronunciation but also in relation to grammar. This finding highlights the importance of grammar which is why it should be taught in English classrooms (Richards & Renandya, 2002). In addition, Thornbury (2005) also posits that it is crucial to have an access to the sources of the language's grammar in order to be able to produce a much more sophisticated range of meanings. As the findings suggest, this situation may jeopardize the learners' learning development since, to follow Tanveer (2007), lacking vocabulary in speaking foreign languages creates a hindrance for learners. Moreover, vocabulary is one of the aspects which initiates lack of confidence and a sense of anxiety (Thornbury, 2005; Tanveer, 2007; Liu, 2007; Indrianty, 2012).

The presence of fear of making mistakes indicates learners who are not accustomed to being exposed to using English (Marwan, 2007). It can also be due to fear of losing face in front of other learners since learners have a fear of losing one's positive self-image or self-identity when speaking in a foreign language (Hashemi, 2011). For facilitating learners to be used to English, classroom environment which is less-burdening, non-threatening, and supportive as well as friendly can be provided (Liu, 2007; Hashemi & Abbasi, 2013). Nonetheless, it does not mean to let mistakes as they are without being corrected. Feedbacks and correction should be delivered properly to ascertain that learners are not demotivated (Brown, 2001; Thornbury, 2005; Harmer, 2007b).

Appropriate feedbacks delivered to learners will be beneficial and helpful for them if they are provided after learners' performance and without revealing individual errors (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2007b; Bailey, 2005; Linse, 2005; Thornbury, 2005; Nation and Newton, 2009). If not, the learners who are fearful of making mistakes will be overwhelmed by their fear, presumably leading to motivation degradation in learning English. Without motivation, their chance to successfully learn and acquire English is at stake as motivation constitutes the crucial aspect in the process of foreign language learning (Harmer, 2007a, 2007b; Johnson, 2008; Murray, Gao & Lamb, 2011; Pawlak, 2012).

The relationship between school origins and learners' language anxiety to their speaking performance

Hypothesizing that there is no correlation between school origins, language anxiety and speaking performance, this section presents the data in descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptively, as shown in Table 5, the average scores of language anxiety among the urban and rural learners seem to indicate similarity that the scores have only a slight difference, 111 for 34 urban learners and 110.1 for 24 rural learners. Meanwhile, speaking scores among the learners show that the average of the urban learners (64.1) is higher than that of the rural learners (59.8). The urban learners having the higher average of language anxiety score higher in the average of speaking test, while the rural learners having the lower average of language anxiety results in lower average of speaking performance.

In addition to the means, standard deviation (SD) for each score both anxiety and speaking of the urban and rural learners denotes different data dispersal. Firstly, the standard deviation of the urban learners' anxiety score is 14.056, which is higher than that of the rural learners' resulting in 12.991 standard deviation. This suggests that the urban learners' anxiety is highly varied when compared to the rural learners', having a long range of anxiety. Secondly, while the anxiety scores result in dispersed distribution of the urban learners, the speaking scores generate distinguished result where high dispersal of data is possessed by the rural learners. It can be seen in the standard

deviation among them that is 14.565, almost six points higher than that among the urban learners (9.105).

Table 5. Descriptive statistical data

	Learners' Anxiety		Learners' Speaking Scores	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Means	111	110.083	64.118	59.833
Standard Deviation	14.056	9.105	12.991	14.565

Partial correlation is required prior to the MRC analysis. Since there are two independent variables, school origins and language anxiety, and one dependent variable of speaking, the correlation will be emphasized first on the relationship between school origins and speaking, language anxiety and speaking, as well as school origins and language anxiety. The relationships among the variables are shown in the table below.

Table 6. Correlations among the variables

		Speaking	school origins	language anxiety
Pearson Correlation	Speaking	1.000	.243	-.491
	school origins	.243	1.000	.034
	language anxiety	-.491	-.034	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Speaking	.	.033	.000
	school origins	.033	.	.401
	language anxiety	.000	.401	.
N	Speaking	58	58	58
	school origins	58	58	58
	language anxiety	58	58	58

The correlation between school origins and speaking results in $r = .243$ and in the significance of $p\text{-value} = .033 < .05$, meaning that there is a significantly low positive correlation between school origins and speaking performance. It can also imply that perhaps urban school learners achieve higher speaking scores. In addition, the relationship between language anxiety and speaking results in $r = -.491$ and the significance of $p\text{-value} = .000 < .05$. This denotes a significantly moderate negative correlation that the higher the anxiety is, the lower the speaking performance can be. Meanwhile, no significant correlation is found between school origins and language anxiety ($r = .034$) with the $p\text{-value} = .401$ higher than $.05$.

In addition, the correlation between the origin of the school and language anxiety, and speaking is shown in Table 7. The data result in $R = .556$ and $R^2 = .309$. R signifies the coefficient of multiple regression of the independent variables: school origins and language anxiety, and the dependent variable: speaking performance, and R^2 indicates the magnitude of the effect of the independent variables simultaneously on the dependent variable, namely coefficient of determination. The result denotes the medium correlation between the independent variables (school origins and language anxiety) and the dependent variable (speaking performance). There is also $.309$ coefficient of determination meaning that only 30.9% can account for this relationship. In this regard, the rest, 69.1% of information concerning speaking performance, cannot be explained or predicted by the independent variables, likely to be influenced by other variables not included in this study.

Table 7. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.556 ^a	.309	.284	.01045409

a. Predictors: (Constant), language anxiety, school origins

b. Dependent Variable: speaking

The coefficient correlation gets bigger as school origins is involved (.556), previously only -.491. It implies that the presence of school origins of the learners, whether it is urban or rural school, to some extent generates the difference on speaking performance alongside the presence of language anxiety among learners. The result (.556) signifies that the urban learners coded by the higher

number of “1” have a tendency to score higher in language anxiety and higher as well in speaking performance.

In addition, Table 8 is used to see whether or not the independent variables simultaneously are influential to the dependent variable. The presence of F obtained and its significance can be an indicator of the regression model which is used to predict the dependent variable. As shown in the table below, the result denotes F which is 12.310, and the significance of .000. It is found that F-table for $df=1$ and $df_2=55$ at $\alpha = .05$ is 2.773 which is lower than the obtained F. Besides, the significance in the table also tends to be significant since .000 is lower than .05. From this finding, it suggests that school origins of the learners and their language anxiety simultaneously have a significant effect on speaking performance.

Table 8. ANOVA

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.003	2	.001	12.310	.000 ^a
	Residual	.006	55	.000		
	Total	.009	57			

a. Predictors: (Constant), language anxiety, school origins

b. Dependent Variable: speaking

In general, there is a significantly moderate correlation ($R=.556$) between the independent variables: school origins and language anxiety, and the dependent variable: speaking performance. Regardless of learners' school origins, language anxiety itself has a negative correlation to speaking performance, which is further determined that the effect of this independent variable is significant. This is in line with what is reported that language anxiety affects speaking performance (Horwitz, et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; Woodrow, 2006; Puškar, 2010). The significance is also apparent in another independent variable accounting for urban and rural school where this has a significant effect on speaking performance, t obtained $=2.321 > 2.004$, and causes a higher correlation coefficient compared to the coefficient of language anxiety variable alone.

Despite its significance on speaking performance, school origins of the learners seem not to account for the difference in language anxiety as the partial correlation between school origins and language anxiety indicates no significance. This is in contrast to previous studies yielding the significant difference of language anxiety among learners from different areas which is higher among rural learners (Puškar, 2010; Piechurska-Kuciel, 2012, as cited in Pawlak, 2012, pp.169-184) and higher among urban learners (Ezzi, 2012). Moreover, although all the learners involved in this study are adolescents, this study results in a distinctively novel output from other studies concerning the prevalence of anxiety among rural communities where those denote higher anxiety among the rural youngsters in rural north-eastern Uganda (Abbo et al., 2013) and in a rural community in Kenya (Abbot & Klein, 1979, p.177).

The result of this study that school origins and language anxiety have a significantly moderate correlation with speaking performance can be accounted for by three reasons. The first one is related to the notion that language anxiety causes poor speaking performance (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991a; Woodrow, 2006; Puškar, 2010). This implies that the higher the anxiety is, the lower the speaking performance becomes. The second reason deals with three main components of the questionnaire to measure language anxiety, including Communication Apprehension, Test Anxiety, and Fear of Negative Evaluation. According to Puškar (2010), the components have to do with strong speaking anxiety, which is why they are correlated. The last logic behind the result has to do with the disparity of urban and rural areas. It is stated that urban populations are more educated than rural populations (Hraba et al, 1999). Given being more educated, urban populations presumably plan the best for their children in order to compete in and contribute to the society by, for instance, enrolling their children in language courses. This in turn can be fairly instrumental to the urban learners' speaking skills.

CONCLUSION

The average scores of the learners in urban and rural high schools were in the normal level of anxiety, except some of the components and its sub-areas which were in the considerable levels of anxiety. While the urban learners mostly concern the fear of negative evaluation, the rural learners have high communication apprehension. In regard to the reasons for their language anxiety, four factors triggering language anxiety in speaking performance among the learners were lack of

preparation (LP), teaching styles and activities (TA), learner personality (LY), and fear of making mistakes (FM). LP happened to be a result of inappropriate teaching and learning instructions. TA is concerned with speaking before the class and being singled out directly by the teacher. Moreover, LY was caused by shyness and low confidence, whereas FM has to do with a lack of vocabulary and grammar. These findings denote language anxiety leading to both facilitating and debilitating anxiety. Thus, preserving the anxiety among the learners should be seriously considered in order to suppress debilitating anxiety, in turn facilitating learners' language learning and acquisition.

It is also worthy of note that the relationship between school origins, language anxiety, and speaking performance shows a significantly medium correlation where school origins and language anxiety simultaneously are related to speaking performance ($R=.556$). However, school origins of the learners seem not to account for the difference in language anxiety, suggesting they are equal and of the same potential. Notwithstanding the fact, the school origin variable happened to generate a higher correlation coefficient to predict speaking performance as merged with the language anxiety variable. Furthermore, Significant effects of these two independent variables both simultaneously or partially on learners' speaking performance were noticeable. In other words, the variables, school origins and language anxiety, can predict speaking performance.

REFERENCES

- Abbo, C., Kinyanda, E., Kizza, R. B., Levin, J., Ndyabangi, S., & Stein, D. J. (2013). Prevalence, Comorbidity and Predictors of Anxiety Disorders in Children and Adolescents in Rural North-Eastern Uganda. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 7(21), pp.1-11. DOI:10.1186/1753-2000-7-21
- Abbot, S., & Klein, R. (1979). Depression and Anxiety among Rural Kikuyu in Kenya. *Ethos*, 7(2), pp.161-188. DOI:10.1525/eth.1979.7.2.02a00050
- Aida, Y. (1994). Examination of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's Construct of Foreign Language Anxiety: The Case of Students of Japanese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), pp.155-168. DOI:10.1111/1540-4781.1994.tb02026.x
- Arnold, J. (2000) *Speak Easy: How to Ease Students into Oral Production*. Pilgrims Ltd. Retrieved March 23, 2015 from, www.hltmag.co.uk/mar03/martmar035.rtf
- Bailey, K. M. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: McGraw Hill.
- Birjandi, P., & Alemi, P. (2010). The Impact of Test Anxiety on Test Performance among Iranian EFL Learners. *Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 1(4), pp.44-58.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, 2nd ed.. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, inc.
- Carroll, R. J., & Ruppert, D. (1988). *Transformation and Weighting in Regression*. New York: Springer-Science+Business Media Dordrecht.
- Chan, D. Y., & Wu, G. (2004). A Study of Foreign Language Anxiety of EFL Elementary School Students in Taipei County. *Journal of National Taipei Teachers College*, 17(2), pp.287-320.
- Chatterjee, S., & Simonoff, J. S. (2013). *Handbook of Regression Analysis*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language Anxiety: Differentiating Writing and Speaking Components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), pp.417-446. DOI:10.1111/0023-8333.00095
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation: Analysis for the Behavioral Science*, 3rd ed.. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Corey, G. (2012). *Student Manual for Theory and Practice of Counselling and Psychotherapy*, 9th ed.. Belmont: Brooks/Cole.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W. & Verspoor, M. (2005). *Second Language Acquisition: an Advance Resource Book*. New York: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Material*. California: SAGE Publications inc.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2005). Sociodemographic, Psychological and Politocultural Correlates in Flemish Students' Attitudes towards French and English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 26(2), pp.118-137. DOI:10.1080/01434630508668400
- Douglas, D. (2010). *Understanding Language Testing*. London: Hodder Education.
- Draper, N. R., & Smith, H. (1998). *Applied Regression Analysis*, 3rd ed.. New York: John Wiley & Sons,inc.

- Ellis, R. (1987). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ewald, J., D. (2007). Foreign Language Learning Anxiety in Upper-Level Classes: Involving Students as Researchers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 4(1), pp.122-142. DOI:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02857.x
- Ewen, R. B. (2010). *An Introduction to Theories of Personality, 7th ed.*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Byrne, A. (1992). Anxiety and Susceptibility to Distraction. *Personal Individual Differences*, 13(7), pp.193-798. DOI:10.1016/0191-8869(92)90052-Q
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and Cognitive Performance: Attentional Control Theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), pp.336–353. DOI:10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336
- Ezzi, N. A. A. (2012). The Impact of Gender on the Foreign Language Anxiety of the Yemeni University Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 1(2), pp.65-75. DOI:10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.2p.65
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2009). *Theories of Personality, 7th ed.*. New York: The McGraw-Hills Companies inc.
- Florida, R. (2015). *Tolerance and Intolerance in the City: a New Study Tries to Determine What a "Tolerant" City Looks Like*. Retrieved August 4, 2015 from <http://www.citylab.com/housing/2015/05/tolerance-and-intolerance-in-the-city/394385/>
- Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: an Introductory Course*, New York: Routledge.
- Gregersen, T. S. (2005). Non Verbal Cues: Clues to the Detection of Foreign Language Anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(3), pp.388-400. DOI:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02225.x
- Gregersen, T. (2009). Recognizing Visual and Auditory Cues in the Detection of Foreign-Language Anxiety. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 26(2), pp.46-64. Retrieved September 26, 2014 from <http://www.teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/article/view/414/244>
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language Learning and Perfectionism: Anxious and Nonanxious Learners' Reactions to Their Own Oral Performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), pp.562-570. DOI:10.1111/1540-4781.00161
- Guanyu, W., & Wei, Z. (2006). Options in Coping with Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *CELEA Journal*, 29(3), pp.29-44.
- Harmer, J. (2007a). *The Practice of English Language Teaching, 2nd ed.* UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Harmer, J. (2007b). *How to Teach English, 2nd ed.* UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hashemi, M. (2011). Language Stress and Anxiety among the English Language Learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, pp.1811-1816. DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.349
- Hashemi, M., & Abbasi, M. (2013). The Role of the Teacher in Alleviating Anxiety in Language Classes. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(30), pp.640-646. Retrieved August 24, 2015 from http://www.irjabs.com/files_site/paperlist/r_726_130328102911.pdf
- Hewitt, E., & Stephenson, J. (2011). Foreign Language Anxiety and Oral Exam Performance: A Replication of Phillips's MLJ Study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 11, pp.170-189. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01174.x
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language Anxiety and Achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21 (7), pp.112-126. DOI:10.1017/S0267190501000071
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B. & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), pp.125-132. Retrieved November 19, 2013 from <http://hyxy.nankai.edu.cn/jingpinke/buchongyuedu/foreign%20language%20classroom%20anxiety.pdf>
- Hraba, J., McCutcheon, A. L., & Vecernik, J. (1999). Rural and Urban Differences in Economic Experiences, Anxiety and Support for the Post-Communist Reforms in the Czech and Slovak Republics. *Rural Sociology*, 64(3), pp.439-463.
- Huang, Y. W. (2014). Self and Language Anxiety. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 4(2), pp.66-77. DOI:10.5539/ells.v4n2p66
- Humphries, R. (2011). Language Anxiety in International Students: How Can It Be Overcome?. *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication* 4 (1/2), pp.65-77. retrieved July 7, 2015 from

- http://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/384061/Humphries-language-anxiety.pdf
- Iizuka, K. (2010). Learner Coping Strategies for Foreign Language Anxiety. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings*, pp.103-112. Tokyo: JALT.
- Indrianty, S. (2012). *Students' Anxiety in Speaking English: a Case Study in Hospitality and Tourism College in Bandung*. (Thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, 2012, Tidak diterbitkan).
- Jackson, J. (2002). Reticence in Second Language Case Discussions: Anxiety and Aspirations. *System*, 30(1), pp.65-84. DOI: 10.1016/s0346-251x(01)00051-3
- Jayapalan, N. (2013). *Urban Sociology*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Dist.
- Johnson, K. (2008). *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching, 2nd ed.*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
- Johnson, R., & Wichern, D. (2014). *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis, 6th ed.*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Kilkkinen, A., Philpot, A. K., O'Neil, A., Philpot, B., Reddy, P., Bunker, S. et al. (2007). Prevalence of Psychological Distress, Anxiety and Depression in Rural Communities in Australia. *Aust. J. Rural Health*, 15, pp.114–119. DOI:10.1111/j.1440-1584.2007.00863.x
- Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., Neter, J., & Li, W. (2005). *Applied Linear Statistical Models, 5th ed.*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Leeuwen, E. V. (2010). *Urban and Rural Interactions: Towns as Focus Points in Rural Development*. London: Psysica-Verlag.
- Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied Regression: an Introduction*. Iowa: Sage Publications.
- Linse, C. T. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners*, in Nunan, David (ed.). Ney York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Liu, M. (2007). Anxiety in Oral English Classrooms: a Case Study in China Indonesian. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), pp.119-137. Retrieved September 14, 2013 from http://idci.dikti.go.id/pdf/JURNAL/JURNAL%20INDONESIAN%20JELT/VOL%203%20ED.1%20MEI%202007/__20111014_022739_393.pdf
- Lucas, R. I., Miraflores, E., & Go, D. (2011). English Language Learning Anxiety among Foreign Language Learners in the Philippines. *Philippine ESL Journal, Vol. 7*, pp.94-119.
- Lyneham, H. J., & Rapee, R. M. (2007). Childhood Anxiety in Rural and Urban Areas: Presentation, Impact and Help-Seeking. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 59(2), pp.108-118. DOI:10.1080/00049530701317082
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Language Anxiety: Its Relationship to Other Anxieties and to Processing in Native and Second Languages. *Language Learning*, 41(4), 513-534. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1991.tb00691.x
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), pp.283–305. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x
- Marwan, A. (2007). Investigating Students' Foreign Language Anxiety. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, Vol. 3*, pp. 37-55. Retrieved September 15, 2013 from www.melta.org.my/modules/tinycontent/Dos/ardi_2_09012008.pdf
- Marwan, A. (2008). The Exploration of Factors Triggering Foreign Language Anxiety: Learners' Voice. *TEFLIN*, 19(2), pp.119-126. Retrieved September 15, 2015 from <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/teflin/article/viewfile/5/3>
- Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and Predictors of Performance in the Foreign Language Classroom. *System*, 32(1), pp.21-36. DOI:10.1016/j.system.2003.08.002
- May, R. (1950). *The Meaning of Anxiety*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral Communication Apprehension: a Summary of Recent Theory and Research. *Human Communication Research*, 4(1), pp.78-96. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00599.x
- McKenzie, K., Murray, A., & Booth, T. (2013). Do Urban Environments Increase the Risk of Anxiety, Depression and Psychosis? an Epidemiological Study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 150 (2013), pp.1019–1024. DOI:10.1016/j.jad.2013.05.032
- Memon, G. R., Joubish, M. F., & Khurram, M. A. (2010). Impact of Parental Socio-Economic Status on Students' Educational Achievements at Secondary Schools of District Malir,

- Karachi. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 6 (6), pp.678-687. Retrieved August 4, 2015 from [http://www.idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr6\(6\)/23.pdf](http://www.idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr6(6)/23.pdf)
- Murray, G., Gao, X. A. & Lamb, T. (2011). *Identity, Motivation and Autonomy in Language Learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Nair, M. K. C., Russell, P. S. S., Subramaniam, V. S., Nazeema, S., Sequeira, A. Z., Chembagam, N. et al. (2013). ADad 6: The Predictive Factors for Anxiety Disorders among Adolescents in a Rural Community Population in India. *Indian J Pediatr*, 80(2), pp.160–164. DOI:10.1007/s12098-013-1231-4
- Nation, I. S. P., and Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Nickdaw. (2014). *Shy Learners*. Retrieved July 3, 2015, from <https://nickdaw.wordpress.com/2014/05/14/shy-learners/>
- Nuranifar, Y. (2014). Strategies to Cope with Second Language Learning Anxiety: the Case of Iranian Pre-University Students. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, 3, pp.1493-1502. Retrieved Mei 12, 2015 from <http://jnasci.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/1493-1502.pdf>
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P. & Daley, C. E. (1999). Factors Associated with Foreign Language Anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 20(2), 217-239. Retrieved September 14, 2013 from http://journals.cambridge.org/article_S0142716499002039
- Osboe, S., Fujimura, T., & Hirschel, R. (2007). Student Confidence and Anxiety in L2 Speaking Activities. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Association 2007 Japan Conference: Exploring theory, enhancing practice: Autonomy across the disciplines*. Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan. Retrieved Mei 5, 2014 from www.independentlearning.org/uploads/100836/ILA2007_032.pdf
- Ozer, E. J., Fernald, L. C. H., & Roberts, S. C. (2007). Anxiety Symptoms in Rural Mexican Adolescents. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*, 43(2008), pp.1014–1023. DOI:10.1007/s00127-008-0473-3
- Pappamihel, N. E. (2002). English as a Second Language Students and English Language Anxiety: Issues in the Mainstream Classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, pp.327-355. Retrieved Mei 5, 2015 from <https://uclinks.ucsd.edu/xmca/attachments/282/RT0363English.pdf>
- Park, H., & Lee, R. A. (2005). *L2 Learners' Anxiety, Self-Confidence and Oral Performance*. The 10th Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics (PAAL) Japan proceedings. Retrieved Mei 5, 2015 from www.paaljapan.org/resources/proceedings/PAAL10/pdfs/hyesook.pdf
- Pawlak, M. (eds.). (2012). *New Perspective on Individual Differences in Language Teaching and Learning*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Puškar, K. (2010). *A Comparative Study of Foreign Language Anxiety among Majors of English and German*. (PhD thesis, University of Zagreb, 2010) retrieved November 26, 2013 from http://www.unizg.hr/rektorova/upload_2010/Pu%C5%A1kar_POREDBENO%20ISTRA%C5%BDIVANJE%20STRAHA%20OD%20STRANOG%20JEZIKAfinalna%20verzija_01.doc
- Rachman, S. J. (2004). *Anxiety, 2nd ed.*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (eds.). (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Romans, S., Cohen, M., & Forte, T. (2011). Rates of Depression and Anxiety in Urban and Rural Canada. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 46(7), pp.567–575. DOI:10.1007/s00127-010-0222-2
- Saito, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Garza, T. J. (1999). Foreign Language Reading Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), pp.202–218. DOI:10.1111/0026-7902.00016
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2012). *Theories of Personality, 10th ed.*. Belmont: Cengage Learning.
- Spielberger, C. D. (eds.). (1966). *Anxiety and Behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Spielberger, C. D. (eds.). (2004). *Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology, Vol. 1*. Oxford: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Stanley. (2010). *10 Differences between Rural Society and Urban Society*. Retrieved July 31, 2015 from <http://s1p331yuanxinranstanley.blogspot.com/2010/05/10-differences-between-rural-society.html>
- Suherdi, D. (2012). *Rekonstruksi Pendidikan Bahasa: Sebuah Keniscayaan bagi Keunggulan Bangsa*. Bandung: CELTICS Press.

- Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation of the Factor that Cause Language Anxiety for ESL/EFL Learners in Learning Speaking Skills and the Influence It Casts on Communication in the Target Language*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Glasgow, Unpublished) retrieved November 27, 2013 from http://asian-efl-journal.com/thesis_M_Tanveer.pdf
- Taylor, S. (eds.). (1999). *Anxiety Sensitivity: Theory, Research, and Treatment of the Fear of Anxiety*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. England: Pearson Educational Limited.
- Tóth, Z. (2007). Predictors of Foreign-Language Anxiety: Examining the Relationship between Anxiety and Other Individual Learner Variables. In J. Horváth & M. Nikolov (Eds.), *UPRT 2007: Empirical Studies in English Applied Linguistics* (pp.123-148). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The teaching of efl speaking in the indonesian context: The state of the art. *BAHASA DAN SENI*, 34(2), pp.269-292.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and Speaking English as a Second Language. *Regional Language Center Journal*, 37(3), pp.308-328. DOI:10.1177/0033688206071315
- Zhao, X., Chen, J., Chen, M. C., Lv, X. L., Jiang, Y. H., & Sun, Y. H. (2013). Left-Behind Children in Rural China Experience Higher Levels of Anxiety and Poorer Living Conditions. *Acta Paediatrica*, 103, pp.665–670. DOI:10.1111/apa.12602