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ABSTRACT

English Language Learners (ELLs) who can write and read competently can fully participate in American schools, work environments and the society. However, ELLs face challenges while learning the English language. Anxiety is characterized as one of the issues impacting the learners’ accomplishment, which involves stages of communicative anxiety, fear of adverse assessment, test anxiety, and anxiety of English classroom. Moreover, anxiety is identified as being prevalent in the field of education and psychology as one factor that has negative influences in language acquisition (Hashemi, 2011). Studies have shown that there is a relationship between anxiety level and academic performance of ELLs. Factors such as language use, socioeconomic status, and parental education and their association with students’ performance on standardized tests are discussed. Theories and models that will allow students to build on previous encounters while acquiring new knowledge and applying skills to learn a second language are also discussed. This research is necessary to determine whether student’s anxiety level impacts performance in academics and learning English. The findings from this research could help teachers to decrease anxiety associated with learning a second language. Other researchers could use these findings to direct future investigations on challenges faced by ELLs. Overall, this research contributes to a better understanding of anxiety for counselors and other practitioners.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Language-minority students who cannot capably read and write English may not be able to participate fully in American education, work environments, or society (Martínez, Harris, & McClain, 2014). These students confront restricted job opportunities and access to services. Learning to read in English is difficult for students who are learning English as a second language, now referred to as English language learners (ELLs) (Martínez et al., 2014). To be successful as a student in the United States, especially in English-dominant public schools, ELLs must not only learn communicative English but must also master academic language. Academic success in the United States requires a command of the English language and mastery of reading in English (Martínez et al., 2014). ELLs who are being educated in the United States are required by law to be taught to read on grade level in English.

Nowadays, the fastest growing population in the U.S. public school system is children who are immigrants (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011). Half of those children do not speak English fluently and are labeled as English language learners. Even children from an English-speaking country experience difficulties, as there are different English dialects. For example, someone from Nigeria may be very knowledgeable or very familiar with the English language but may still have challenges with his or her grammar. This change has significantly impacted schools, particularly in their educational testing programs. The idea of abandoning the native language is very stressful for numerous learners who desire a sense of confidence in the involvement of learning a foreign language (Kavaliauskienė, Mažeikienė, & Valūnaitė-Oleškevičienė, 2010). Since individuals commonly express themselves in their native language this delay in practice may cause ELLs to face difficulties in learning the English language.

Although ELLs are the fastest-growing population of students in public schools, most of the United States’ educational system remains English. According to Kachchaf and Solano-Flore
(2012), if educators are serious about validity and fairness, including ELLs in large-scale testing, educators must gauge the quality of the scoring that we can realistically be expected with the linguistic resources currently available among teachers. Thus, simply hiring people categorized as “bilingual” as raters in large-scale testing programs may not serve to guarantee proper scoring of ELL student answers. Nearly three in four American classrooms now comprise no less than one English-language learner, and these students make up around one in 10 government-funded schools (Sparks, 2016). Both bilingual and sheltered individuals typically take three to five years to develop competency in oral English and five to seven years to develop competency in academic English. Students who become completely fluent in different languages usually perform better academically than either fluent monolingual students or students who are not completely proficient in more than one language (Sparks, 2016).

**Anxiety**

According to Mohammad Ali (2015), anxiety is characterized as the absence of ease that emerges from something that is compromising. Additionally, anxiety is defined as the pressure and fearfulness encountered by students in the foreign language classroom (Mohammad Ali, 2015). It has been found that anxiety is not generally irregular or abnormal; however, some individuals experience it so severely that it can be considered a type of mental irregularity (Mohammad Ali, 2015). The three types of anxiety: trait, situation, and state anxiety, change from steadiness to transient occurrences of anxiety provocation (Zheng & Cheng, 2018). Trait anxiety is a moderately steady personality trait, a progressively perpetual inclination to be anxious (Hashemi, 2011). State anxiety is a transient, a reaction to specific anxiety inciting stimulus. One example would be a significant test. Situation-specific anxiety alludes to the
tenacious and multi-faceted nature of certain anxieties, provoked by events such as exams, class discussions, and public speaking (Hashemi, 2011).

Hashemi (2011) stated that the interest in obtaining good communication capabilities in English had been expanded globally. Yet, a sentiment of stress, apprehension, or nervousness is expressed by English language learners while figuring out how to speak English in which they claim to experience a mental block. Anxiety that negatively impacts language acquisition, is considered more prevalent in the fields of psychology and education (Hashemi, 2011). Therefore, foreign language anxiety is the term used when experiencing anxiety while learning a second language. It has been demonstrated that components that prompt anxiety vary across language processes and language capabilities. Thus, with regards to the foreign language classroom, anxiety can have a negative impact on test-taking, complex learning, and effective thinking (Zheng & Cheng, 2018).

Various strategies have been utilized to reduce language anxiety when learning to communicate in a foreign language (Hashemi, 2011). Some studies have proposed various methods to adapt to this complex dilemma. It has been recommended to make the classroom environment more friendly and not so formal or rigid (Hashemi, 2011). By establishing an informal environment, students will feel more comfortable making mistakes and not be perceived as incompetent. Additionally, teachers need to consider the type of activities given to the students, promoting success instead of failure. Another approach is that students can be allowed to utilize drama-like role-play exercises to feel comfortable in an invented situation with an invented activity (Hashemi, 2011). Teachers should give learners constructive feedback disrupting and rectifying them, especially when they are speaking the English language. Hashemi (2011) believes that to adapt to language anxiety effectively, teachers should consider the
learner’s beliefs and self-related cognitions. Learners should be informed that it is normal to feel uncomfortable, nervous, and tense when communicating in English and ensured they work towards solutions that will decrease these feelings (Hashemi, 2011).

**Background of the Problem**

Bilingual instruction has been found to increase student’s self-esteem (Guglielmi, 2012). However, when observed in the context of the general self-esteem, specifically, achievement literature, the statement that bilingual instruction advances academic performance by raising ELLs’ self-esteem poses inconsistencies. According to Guglielmi (2012), worldwide self-esteem has been observed to be weakly connected to accomplishment in non-ELLs’ populations. ELLs are not students lacking language, but bilinguals with a collection that allows them to move several languages and settings in complex and dynamic ways (Flores, Kleyn, & Menken, 2015). Students have transnational sensibilities that can be at the same time advanced; however, these students have strong ties with their families’ countries of origin. One measure to combat this issue is to set guidelines to highlight a student’s quality of work. Moreover, cultural and linguistic elements should be considered to better understand the student’s cultural dynamic.

According to Hoover and Erickson (2015), one essential objective of a successful referral process for ELLs is to improve confidence that cultural and linguistic elements demonstrated in the instructional and assessment surroundings are not misjudged as pointers of a learning disability. This objective has been found to be very difficult for teachers over the past several decades, especially in rural schools (Hoover & Erickson, 2015). However, to achieve this outcome, the referral material should contain adequate and applicable data to help guide instructors in recognizing learning differences from disabilities (Hoover & Erickson, 2015). The acquisition of a second language is regularly seen as a procedure that varies from native
language acquisition (Kaushanskaya, Yoo, & Marian, 2011). It is often assumed that elements impacting one’s aptitude to acquire a second language do not play a part in native-language improvement.

Nonetheless, it is also well recognized that knowledge of a second language affects the capacity to grasp information in the native language. The extent of how the acquisition of a second language impacts the native language is underspecified and knowledge regarding the interactivity of two languages within a single cognitive system also poses the need for further evaluation (Kaushanskaya, Yoo, & Marian, 2011).

In the fields of education and psychology, teachers’ major concerns are the challenges faced with educating English learners (Hashemi, 2011). Teachers sometimes misinterpret immigrant families’ aptitude to contribute to their children’s school achievement. On the other hand, immigrant families often do not know how to help their children, particularly if they speak minimal English (Martínez et al., 2014). Some schools do not have the resources to provide instruction in each child’s native language. Yet, teaching in their native languages helps children build a cognitive foundation for pursuing education in English. Martínez et al. (2014) recognize three “Big Ideas” of powerful and collaborative practices that support ELL students’ English reading achievement. The first idea is to foster academic English at all phases of students’ second language achievement by explicitly teaching vocabulary, stressing cross-linguistic transfer techniques, and supporting ongoing oral language improvement. The second idea is to adopt a school-wide collaborative method to deal with recurrent formative reading assessments and utilize the information to drive education by giving accommodations that encourage English reading. The final idea is to actualize various grouping techniques to deliver reading education within a welcoming and sensitive learning atmosphere (Martínez et al., 2014).
Psychological Impact of Language

According to Oliden and Mujika Lizaso (2014), when a person speaks more than one language, language impacts the person’s psychological and educational assessment procedures. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of testing language in a society with two official languages. Reading competence was significantly higher in the monolingual group than the bilingual group (Oliden & Mujika Lizaso, 2014). The research shows the significance of psychometric, linguistic, and sociolinguistic elements in linguistically diverse assessment contexts. Cross-linguistic literature recommends that types of alphabetic orthographies, such as orthographic transparency, affect both the rate of literacy acquisition and cognitive techniques of reading and spelling in one’s native language (Dich, & Pedersen, 2013). Native language characteristics impact the ways spellers parse words when they type in their first language and when they learn to spell in English as a second language. These spellers assemble the symbols in similar ways as normally performed in their native language because the way words and sentences are constructed in a student’s native language may impact their way of learning English.

Among impacting language and literacy accomplishment elements, vocabulary knowledge plays a significant role in reading comprehension and academic performance. Vocabulary is important to reading comprehension in both monolingual and English language learners’ children, serving as a connection between oral and written language. Besides English vocabulary, knowledge has appeared to be a reliable proximal and distal indicator of reading comprehension, particularly for Spanish-speaking ELLs (Jackson, Schatschneider, Leacox, Schuele, & Davison, 2014). English learners originate from an assortment of financial
backgrounds. However, research results propose that young ELLs from low-SES families and who start school with low levels of English abilities are more likely to achieve below-average reading accomplishments than children from families with more assets. The factors influencing academic achievement as related to socioeconomic status, parental education, and language use were explored in this research proposal.

Research by Kaushanskaya, Blumenfeld, and Marian (2011) supports that knowledge of two languages may impact bilinguals’ vocabulary performance. The current study demonstrates that bilingual speakers may depend on short-term memory resources to support word recovery in their native language more than monolingual speakers.

The evaluation of ELL involves understanding how one language may influence the other and whether the interrelationships have positive and negative results for readers. After a period of teaching through the bilingual program, oral reading fluency in the first language was observed to be extremely predictive of reading fluency in the second language. This proposes that Spanish oral reading fluency may be significant to the development of English oral reading fluency. Another study demonstrated that some learners of English utilize the English non-generic definite article in which they apply with native-like accuracy. In contrast, others whose native language does not have articles (words used to modify a noun) have a greater tendency to omit articles in their oral production (Chrabaszcz & Jiang, 2014). This study offers valuable insights and helps uncover the fundamental reasons for article difficulty for learners from different native languages.

Farnia and Gerva (2013) support that previous research investigated the involvement of numerous components of word-level reading and oral language and cognitive processing abilities in the reading comprehension rate of development and result. The current study focuses on the
responsibility of individual contrasts in development in reading comprehension. It shows that some ELLs build up their reading comprehension abilities in a more challenging way. This pattern is associated with fundamental processing abilities such as phonological short-term memory and language skills such as syntactic knowledge. The outcomes underscore the significance of concentrating on upgrading grade-appropriate vocabulary, syntactic abilities, and listening comprehension abilities in students who appear fluent in communicative English but whose language abilities fall behind in subtle yet crucial methods behind their monolingual associates (Farnia, & Gerna, 2013). Although there is previous research on the difficulties foreign students encounter in learning English, further research is needed in this area due to the growing population of English learners.

Further research done by Kaushanskaya examines whether grammatical gender differences in the second language would impact native-language lexical processing in bilingual language learners. Grammatical gender would serve to assist learning in bilingual speakers of English and Spanish but not in monolingual speakers of English (Kaushanskaya, & Smith, 2016). The study’s outcomes remove gender-congruency consequences in emergent bilinguals, but only in the high exposure groups. The higher exposure group showed greater accuracy on the gender-congruent than on the gender-incongruent pairs. However, the monolingual and the low exposure groups showed equal levels of accuracy for gender-congruent and gender-incongruent.

Statement of the Problem

According to Wang (2017), some students found that language learning can be an upsetting encounter. It is entirely expected to witness students in language classrooms who are too anxious to consider performing effectively. Actions often associated with this anxiousness in the classroom include wiggling in their seats, attempting to avoid being called by the instructor,
and "freezing up" when addressing questions (Wang, 2017). When it comes to listening and reading knowledge, students may find it challenging to segregate sounds and structures. Even students who feel confident of the right answer end up getting it wrong because they are nervous. The feeling of pressure and worry can be considered the behaviors manifested in learning a foreign language (Wang, 2017). In the language classroom, the quantity of students who are anxious is found to be significant. Studies demonstrate that around 33% to 66% of ELLs revealed encountering anxiety, which varied from moderate to severe while learning a foreign language (Wang, 2017). Even though language teachers have been determined to create a low anxiety learner-centered atmosphere, in reality, the objective is a long way from being accomplished (Wang, 2017).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between student’s level of anxiety and its impact on performance in English learning. Additionally, this study will investigate whether there is any significant correlation between anxiety level and academic performance. English language learners are at a disadvantage compared to non-English language learners in academic performance. This present study serves to identify the relationship between a student’s anxiety level and their performance in English learning.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**Research Question 1**

Is there a correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety for ELLs?
**Null hypothesis 1**

There is no significant correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety among ELLs.

**Hypothesis 1**

There is a positive correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety among ELLs.

**Research Question 2**

Is there a correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance for ELLs?

**Null hypothesis 2**

There is no correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is a negative correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

**Research Question 3**

Is there a correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance for ELLs?

**Null hypothesis 3**

There is no correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.
Hypothesis 3

There is a negative correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

Limitations and Design Controls

Although the research reached its purpose, there were some unavoidable limitations. The first limitation was the participants of this study. The participants were only limited to one university setting, which is a public university located in Bowie, Maryland, with a total number of 5,337 students (BSU, n.d.). The second limitation was that participants were asked to record their answers, which could introduce potential bias, inflating or deflating mean scores (Burns et al., 2008). The third limitation of this study was the sample size, which might be limited by the number of eligible participants to make the study valid. One advantage of quantitative methods being used in this study is their —ability to use smaller sample sizes to make inferences about larger sample sizes that are not available in this study (Swanson & Holton, 2005). Therefore, this study’s quantitative research design allowed for collecting data generalization to large groups with a smaller sample size.

Definition of Terms

Throughout the study, the following terms are to be understood based on the definitions that follow:

Academic Performance: Scores as measured by a student’s grade point average.

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety: Scores as measured by the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale.

Cognitive Test Anxiety: Scores as measured by the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale.

English Learner: Students who are learning the English language.
Significance of the Study

This study expands the discussion of the relationship of a student’s native language and its possible impact on academic performance in an English-based curriculum. Given that there is little research that examines the relationship between the native language and the propensity of academic performance, this study will explore English language learners’ academic performance and the relationship to their performance in English language learning subjects. This study will expand the discussion and research on the relationship of the country of birth for non-English native speakers and their academic performance in English language learning subjects.

This research is likely to be helpful for researchers, counselors, and psychologists, and educators. For researchers, this study may provide a better understanding of the relationship between language anxiety and the academic performance of students and the use of academic data in correlating academic performance. For counselors and psychologists, this study may lead to an increased understanding of information that could be used to provide support to non-English native speakers in an academic setting to help reduce anxiety. As important for educators, the information gathered from this study can help educators design and implement programs to improve non-native English speakers’ academic performance in successfully navigating English language learning subjects. Overall, the study’s results may introduce the need for further study in the correlation between academic performance and other non-English native speakers and their anxiety level.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

The remaining of the paper was organized into four chapters. The second chapter provided a literature review of academic performance and English learners. Additionally, the second chapter attempted to describe the gaps in the literature that measure the academic
performance of college English language learners and their level of anxiety with their native English-speaking peers. The third chapter detailed the methodology to be used in performing this study. Chapter 4 outlined the results of the entire study. Finally, chapter five discussed the results from a broader perspective and a summary of the study.

Summary

With the increase of non-English native speaking students, the education and counseling community must design and implement programs to ensure their academic success. This study explored the correlation between academic performance and the language anxiety of a student. Research is necessary to determine whether English language learners’ anxiety levels impact students’ performance in English learning.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter serves as a review of related literature and explores the theoretical framework on which this research is based. Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) is used to direct this study, focusing on a student’s ability to enhance personal growth and development (Cornell, 2011). This theory can be applied to English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) students and the support services that can be provided for their academic achievement. Moreover, this chapter reviews literature related to this research in support of the proposed research questions. A definition of English language proficiency, its prevalence, various proficiency levels, and the testing/measuring tools will be discussed. The second language acquisition process will be defined in relation to Krashen’s model and its impact on second language acquisition teaching. The factors influencing academic achievement related to socioeconomic status, parental education, and language use will be explored. Similarly, a review of English language learners and their associated academic performance on standardized tests will be examined. Also, the metacognitive skills of students as related to executive functional skills will be reviewed. Finally, various studies that discuss these foundations are reviewed in relation to this study.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) is the theoretical approach that is utilized in this study. According to Cornell (2011), the purpose of SCT is to ensure that self-actualization is implemented to improve the adult learner’s personal growth and development. The expansive points of view of the SCT portray how an involvement that emphasizes test-taking methods is essential to students’ results. The meaning of test anxiety, academic performance, and anticipation is embedded in the social cognitive perspectives (Cornell, 2011). The SCT expected that conduct is the consequence of communication between the individual and the environment.
A critical factor in SCT is the prompted change in sentiments of viability when given a test-taking method that advances probability held by the individual faith in the capacity to achieve the ideal objectives (Cornell, 2011). Additionally, SCT help therapists or counselors gain insight into why students experience task failure and offer assistance to facilitate their learning success.

Cornell (2011) argued that analyzing what and how test anxiety might be a fundamental contributing issue to a learner's view of accomplishment or disappointment influences a learner's academic achievement. Additionally, the SCT clarified how the test anxiety conducts impact learning, accomplishment, and academic performance. Therefore, the social cognitive viewpoints of the social learning hypothesis depicted in what manner test-taking methods are essential to a learner’s results, to a learner’s faith in their capabilities, and in what manner these factors interchange with academic performance in light of test-taking methods mediation (Cornell, 2011). The researchers examined to establish the impacts of a study skill class in academic conduct. It has been demonstrated that at-risk learners tend to lack the determination to accomplish, or they may not have obtained the abilities to make the required changes to prosper (Cornell, 2011).

**Achievement Goal**

Koul et al. (2009) stated that achievement goal theory is considered a significant social cognitive theory of motivation, which postulates that a person has a universal focus or reason for accomplishment that inspires all the accomplishment’s objectives. This hypothesis portrays the distinctions in learners’ motivational goals and scholarly conduct regarding mastery and performance orientation. Mastery is propelled by an aspiration to acquire knowledge indicated by self-set guidelines, new abilities, enhanced competence, and the achievement of difficult tasks (Koul et al., 2009). On the other hand, performance orientation is propelled by how a person’s
competence will be considered based on others’ opinions, the longing to be seen as the best in the group, the longing to evade judgments of low capability or ineptitude, and a longing for a public acknowledgment (Koul et al., 2009). Therefore, students encounter higher academic success when utilizing the combination of performance and master orientation instead of using a signal objective method. According to Dull, Schleifer, and McMillan (2015), the achievement goal theory incorporates approach and avoidance concepts for every original main goal orientation. The outcomes of the four-goal orientations are mastery-approach (expectation of enhancing knowledge or competence), mastery-avoidance (expectation to prevent an absence of competence), performance-approach (attempting to show accomplishment to other people), and performance-avoidance (attempting to prevent a presence of failure) (Dull et al., 2015).

A connection between a learner’s achievement goal orientation and a test score or course score is not, in every case, immediate or noticeable (Dull et al., 2015). Yet, there is a possible existence of positive perspectives or desirable results related to achievement goals. If a learner is interested in the subject rather than achieving good grades, that learner may acquire, yet not utilize the methods expected to get good grades (Dull et al., 2015). Hence, good grades would be a desirable result, as would increased interest. Results could be noticeable, in the effect, the technique utilizes the performance and subsequent motivation and desirable outcomes such as greater adequacy, task value, determination and perseverance, the utilization of more cognitive and metacognitive methods, and better performance (Dull et al., 2015). Undesirable outcomes involve test anxiety, shame, diminished assistance for requesting help, sabotaging one’s success, cheating, and reject any of the desirable outcomes mentioned above (Dull et al., 2015).
**Zone of Proximal Development**

The authors outline Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (ZPD) as the student’s ability to learn better under the supervision or the guidance of an adult or teacher (Mogro-Wilson et al., 2015). The ZPD shows the potential that students need to learn inside a social setting. Thus, an instructor’s most significant work is to produce a ZPD by actualizing successful scaffolding or utilizing flexible structures and supports proposed by a mentor or teacher to ease learning. Consequently, based on this theory, the role of the teacher is important to student learning. The teacher’s role is to facilitate the active transformation of knowledge and support the student’s construction of new skills and competencies. This proposed study is based on ZPD in which students learn independently and with assistance from teachers and administrators who deliver English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) support services.

Mogro-Wilson, Reeves, and Charter (2015) reported that Vygotsky’s ZPD framework recommends no less than two significant instructive components. The first one is that students should be evaluated by their perspective for learning and demonstrated knowledge. The second one, also known as a fundamental assignment of education, is to make growth opportunities through constant participation characterized by collaboration. One of the tasks is to create an environment of support, in which scaffolding can be created to support students to learn within their ZPD. Extra techniques that functioned to expand comfort for students involved introducing material to the students with humor, sharing stories about academic experiences, and persuading questions related to the course and academic life (Mogro-Wilson et al., 2015).

**Background of English Language Learners**

English Language Learners (ELLs) are among the quickest developing populations within the United States (Snyder, Witmer & Schmitt, 2017). According to Sheng, Sheng, and
Anderson (2011), English language learners are students who are from another country where English is not their native language. Moreover, Snyder et al. (2007) describe ELLs as a group of students who specifically have distinctive necessities due to cultural and language differences. In addition, the difference between ELLs and non-ELLs is that ELLs need to learn grade-level content besides obtaining the language utilized for education. York (2008) stated that learning a new language is not easy for some students. Furthermore, individuals who have to learn other languages are aware of the effort and time necessary to gain proficiency in a new language. Yet, English can be a more difficult language with an enormous vocabulary and sounds than other languages. Therefore, non-ELLs need to spend years learning to read, spell, pronounce, and write English (York, 2008). According to Sandberg and Reschly (2011), students who recently immigrated to the United States are faced with a lack of ability with the English language. ELLs are at high risk for low accomplishment, poor educational results, and inadequate financial opportunities due to the family’s low educational achievement and socioeconomic status. This proposed study will investigate ELL’s educational (academic) achievement with potential use for developing programs and providing support to increase ELLs achievement levels.

Various minority students are not native English speakers, and a great percentage of these students experience difficulties with the English language (Sheng, Sheng, & Anderson, 2011). In addition, many minority students are presently attending U.S. public schools. It is expected that this growth will continue in the following years because of increased immigration and birth rates among this population. Sheng et al. (2011) found that of 53 million students between the ages of 5 and 17, 11 million or 20.3% spoke a language besides English at home, and three million or 5% had trouble speaking English. Immigrant students’ previous educational experiences play a significant part in their educational accomplishment in the United States (Lee, 2012). Some of
the students have encountered an interruption in formal education in their home countries. As a result, these students are most likely two or more years behind their classmates, and most of them are not proficient in their native language. Consequently, they are often positioned into ELL classes that concentrate strictly on obtaining proficiency in English while excluding academic content needed to increase academic achievement (Lee, 2012).

In the United States, ELLs represent a significant type of diversity and the fastest-growing population. According to Turgut, Sahin, and Huerta (2016), ELLs have varying proficiency levels in English, which can be categorized from none at all to being fluent in the English language. Country of origin, native language, proficiency in their native language, and quality of their former educational involvements are some determining factors associated with ELLs (Cunningham & Crawford, 2016). Acquiring a second language can be a lengthy process, and ELLs may struggle with particular content areas. This proposed study will review the academic achievement outcomes in students who are placed into ELL classes to provide evidence-based research to include more academic content.

**English Language Proficiency**

According to Smyk et al. (2013), language proficiency (LP) is the ability to speak and comprehend other languages on a continuum from non-proficient to native-like proficiency. Language proficiency evaluation remains a disputable zone in language acquisition and testing because of continuous discussions about the concept’s theoretical framework and meaning. Murray (2013) also defines proficiency as a common communicative ability in language that empowers its users to express and comprehend significance accurately, fluently, and properly according to context. Additionally, an emphasis on grammar, phonology, listening abilities, vocabulary advancement, reading and writing abilities, communication approaches, fluency, and
the pragmatics of communication and related apprehensions with politeness, along with implication, is reflected in acquiring proficiency (Murray, 2013). These characterize a broad ability with language, which are fundamentals to creating academic literacy and professional communication abilities. Their significance to academic achievement is well acknowledged and will be investigated in this proposed study.

Palacios and Kibler (2016) found that there is considerable inconsistency in the time essential to accomplish oral language proficiency when ELLs begin formal schooling. The reading achievement trajectories appear similar to comparable proficiency levels during the elementary school period between ELLS and their non-ELLS peers. However, ELLs with non-comparable stages of proficiency lag in reading success compared to their non-ELLSs. Admission to institution-based language services may be a significant confounding aspect linked to both timings of English oral language proficiency and English language achievement. However, the timing of English oral language proficiency is linked to English language accomplishment. For example, ELLs who attend institution-based language may decrease the time to English oral proficiency and increase reading results. Schools must settle on choices about the kind of services accessible that are equivalent to ELLs’ requirements for literacy education as ELLs enter schools with different oral language proficiency stages.

Hodge (2012) reports that the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which orders that all public schools accomplish proficiency on state academic accomplishment principles, was able to identify challenges related to educating ELLs. In addition, schools are obligated to test students every year to obtain improvement toward proficiency goals. To guarantee that each group attains proficiency, key demographic types such as race/ethnicity, class, and restricted English proficiency must be categorized in test outcomes. Residing in low-income conditions, absence of
English proficiency, and poorer stages of parental education are factors that may put immigrant children at bigger risk for poorer stages of early literacy and school readiness (Palacios & Kibler, 2016). The results of this proposed study will outline the deficiencies in the academic achievement of ELLs and provide insight into how schools may address the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Beckhusen, Florax, Graaff, Poot, and Waldorf (2013) explained that the language(s) individuals of an immigrant’s house speak would affect their English proficiency, which also depends on the kind of relationship and the ages of the other individuals residing in the house. If a house member is a translator, it decreases the probability for an individual to learn English since communication is easier without acquiring the new language. However, if a house has a teacher who can teach English, it increases the probability of an individual learning the host country’s language (Beckhusen et al., 2013).

According to Bekdas (2015), a scale of English language proficiency is used to measure the level of a person’s connection in the fields of economy, society, business, politics, and education. There are various choices to measure the language proficiency level of ELLs. Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and International English Language Testing System (IELTS) are some of the proficiency standardized tests that measure someone’s ability to utilize language skills in reading, listening, writing, and speaking (Bekdas, 2015). In addition, when applying to English-medium universities, ELLs may take these tests to approve their English proficiency and utilize the tests’ scores to apply to college. Therefore, some universities acknowledge a general score for the tests while some feature the scores for every aptitude students should accomplish to seek their education in English-medium universities.
The Identification of Cognates

According to Rosselli, Ardila, Jurado, and Salvaatierra (2014), a cognate is characterized as a word in one language that is comparative in form and definition to a word in another language because these two languages are connected (e.g., English flower, Spanish flor). Moreover, cognates can share phonological and orthographic forms and normally are connected semantically. However, they are not generally translation equivalents, which share similar meanings and often appear and sound different in both languages. D’Angelo, Hipfner-Boucher, and Xi (2017) also describe cognate as are words in various languages that share a mutual historical origin, are alike in articulation and spelling, and share the same definition. The French word salade and the English word salad are cognates that can be used as an example. Rosseli et al. (2014) found that words that are phonologically similar and orthographically identical such as the English word “dental” and the Spanish word “dental” and also words that are phonologically identical but orthographically different such as the English word “minute” and the Spanish word “minute” are considered as the two kinds of true cognates. However, false cognates were also identified, which are words that are phonologically and orthographically different such as “exito,” meaning success in Spanish and English “exit” (Rosselli, Ardila, Jurado, & Salvaatierra, 2014).

Cognate awareness is the capacity to identify cognate-related connections between words in two languages. It originates from the fact that the capacity to identify words as cognates necessitates one to reflect on the connections between lexical items in two languages (D’Angelo, Hipfner-Boucher, & Xi, 2017). In addition, past research uncovers that the identification of cognates is a significant ability for bilingual students since awareness of words and word definitions in one language can ease vocabulary learning in the other. Furthermore, the research
found that cognates impact various sets of languages, including Spanish-English, French-English, and more. D’Angelo et al. (2017) discovered that there are more than 20,000 French-English cognates; thus, it is logical to anticipate that cognate awareness may encourage French immersion student’s vocabulary improvement in both English and French. Furthermore, the similarities in word formation and the vast number of cognates that exist in French and English, the authors believe that cognates knowledge should play a part in encouraging learning in French immersion students. Hernández et al. (2016) also found that a wide range of words in the English language comprises cognates. There are more than 20,000 Spanish–English cognates, of which the majority are academic vocabulary words.

As shown above, cognates are words in one language that look or sound like the same word in another language. Allen and Conklin (2014) showed that most of the research had examined the processing of European languages, which include languages such as English, French, and Spanish. Therefore, it was discovered that words had form and meaning overlap because the modern words had a common historical root. Cognate acknowledgment helps students see associations between European languages through connected origins and morphological parallels. Students can utilize cognate awareness to eliminate the vocabulary gap. Furthermore, studies that were investigated on first and second language acquisition have discovered that students gain advantage from cognate awareness (D'Angelo, Hipfner-Boucher, & Xi, 2017).

**Metacognitive Skills**

Metacognitive skills assume a significant role in learners’ cognitive activities that can cause them to become self-managed students (Listiana, Susilo, Suwono, & Suarsini, 2016). These students can learn independently while determining the best ways to acquire certain
information and complete certain tasks. Moreover, these skills can help the students with evaluating their learning and thought processes. According to Veenman and Van Cleef (2019), task orientation, preparation, monitoring, assessment, summarization, and reflection are generally metacognitive skills indicators. What to do, when, why, and how throughout assignment performance are the sequences of self-guidelines one should endorse (Veenman & Cleef, 2019). Bae and Kwon (2019) argued that the utilization of metacognition happens to be linked with academic accomplishment and improved learning results. Therefore, students need to be encouraged to partake in cautiously designed educational exercises to engage in metacognitive exercises (Bae & Kwon, 2019).

According to Bae and Kwon (2019), better learning implementations were demonstrated by learners who have been educated on metacognitive skills than those who were not. Furthermore, it has been proven that learners who can think about more complicated problems are prone to develop better metacognitive skills. Therefore, teachers should structure ways to create methods that keep track of and control their thinking (Bae & Kwon, 2019). Metacognition can be expanded through the pattern of these three progressing stages, which are the pre-planning, the planning, and the post-planning stages. In the pre-planning stage, the learner’s thought process, present assignment, and the previous methods that were either effective or ineffective are emphasized. In the planning stage, learners can create and apply their plans. In the post-planning stage, the plan’s application is evaluated, and a request for revision and re-assessment of the plan care is considered. The stages mentioned above can urge learners to comprehend how they acquire and build up the aptitudes to make arrangements, control the process, and make changes (Bae & Kwon, 2019).
Little (2017) stated that executive function skills are often portrayed as the air traffic control arrangement of the mind where judgments and instincts moving through the brain are arranged and managed. These skills assist people in concentrating on and enduring objectives, which are both significant parts of scholarly. Working memory, cognitive flexibility, and inhibitory control are the three different factors that establish executive functions, which are considered the building blocks for a scope of higher requests ideas. Bryce, Whitebread, and Szücs (2015) argued that both executive functions and metacognitive skills are significant for educational accomplishment. Seemingly, executive functions provide children with the aptitude to utilize their metacognitive skills correctly, which adds to their academic accomplishment (Bryce et al., 2015). Executive functions have been thought about carefully as essential for normal functioning. The absence of them has demonstrated some developmental disorders such as autism and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (Bryce et al., 2015). Nevertheless, metacognitive skill is an increasingly fluid notion in which an individual’s tendency to utilize these aptitudes in ordinary circumstances.

**Krashen’s Monitor Model – Second Language Acquisition Process**

Lai and Wei (2019) stated that numerous researchers had directed investigations in the second language acquisition zone in the previous three decades, and various models have been proposed. Since the 1980s, Krashen’s Monitor Model has been demonstrated to impact the field of second language acquisition teaching. It has been that demonstrated that Chomsky's Universal Grammar impacts Krashen's Monitor Model. In addition, the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, the Monitor Hypothesis, the Natural Order Hypothesis, the Input Hypothesis, and the Affective Filter Hypothesis are the five interconnected hypotheses that compose the core parts of Krashen’s Monitor Model (Lai & Wei, 2019). Most importantly, this proposed study’s results
using the Krashen Monitor Model’s techniques may be incorporated by educators, therapists, and counselors to facilitate effective teaching for ELLs. Bollinger (2017) documented that second language learning was essentially negatively linked to anxiety. For example, a recent study utilized Krashen’s theory for music learning with language in which language acquisition with music was supported. This study demonstrated that students encounter less anxiety when music is utilized to improve language acquisition.

**The Acquisition-learning Hypothesis**

Krashen identified two different and independent methods of creating competence in a second language in this hypothesis (Lai & Wei, 2019). Learning, which is the first method, is a sub-conscious and implied method to create a reaction towards the language utilized by emphasizing the real communication of implications that is comparable to acquiring the child’s first language (Lai & Wei, 2019). Acquisition, the second method, is a cognizant and precise method and alludes to the knowledge about language, guidelines, or grammar with cognizant practice and memory. Learning cannot become acquisition because they are two different procedures, which have no interface.

**The Monitor Hypothesis**

According to Patrick (2019), the precise measure of self-consciousness, which is the internal monitor, can help people improve skill sets, notice their methods for connecting with people around them, secure themselves, and the greatest chances. Simultaneously, interference with the aforementioned things can occur when there is too much self-consciousness (Patrick, 2019). In the monitor hypothesis, there is a close connection to the acquisition-learning hypothesis, which attempts to uncover how learning and acquisition are utilized and represent the inborn connection between the two (Lai & Wei, 2019). From the goal to portray normal speech,
observation will give attention to what has been made, making it conceivable to verify, either previously or after articulation, for the successive oversights, linguistic mistakes, social infelicities, and different deviations. It has been demonstrated that only the acquisition system can straightforwardly advance the improvement of second language aptitude and can be utilized as the creation instrument for language utilization (Lai & Wei, 2019). However, the learning system can be considered as the consequence of cognizant knowing about the language structure. It must be utilized as screen jobs in language use, yet not as a feature of language skill (Lai & Wei, 2019).

**The Natural Order Hypothesis**

According to Patrick (2019), it has been shown that individuals acquire a language in a certain order which can be distinct for different languages. However, that order is not known for some languages. The only way for a student to acquire a language feature is when he or she is ready. Therefore, teachers should emphasize providing a more logical input to students. In this hypothesis, it has also been shown that some language structures will be learned previously than others (Lai & Wei, 2019). For example, the present tense of a verb, and nouns, tend to be learned earlier than the past tense of a second language. In addition, a sequence of morphemes in an expected order is acquired in one’s first language, which can hold true for the second language learning (Lai & Wei, 2019).

**The Input Hypothesis**

As stated by Patrick (2019), reading and listening are the methods of language input. Studies have shown that even though both input methods are vital for acquisition, reading is considered the most effective method (Patrick, 2019). Lai and Wei (2019) explained that the Input Hypothesis attempts to resolve the issue of how language is acquired. The best way for one
to acquire language is to either understand messages or receive feedback that can be somewhat more advanced than the learner’s present language competence. This allows the learner to grasp the meaning or the information instead of the forms to achieve acquisition (Lai & Wei, 2019).

**The Affective Filter Hypothesis**

The Affective Hypothesis holds that adequate logical information is not adequate for learning a specific language because several affecting factors can impact the outcome of learning that language (Lai & Wei, 2019). To decide the amount of information that the learners get, the affective factors assume the job of filters as the inability to recall specific things. In the Affective Filter hypothesis, emotional states directly impact one’s ability to acquire a language, either helping or delaying the acquisition (Patrick, 2019).

In conclusion, Krashen’s Monitor Model has played an important part in second language acquisition (Lai & Wei, 2019). Some hypotheses of his theory have been found difficult to be proven due to the lack of empirical evidence, which prompts researchers to investigate better ways to resolve the issues found (Lai & Wei, 2019). However, his theory contributed to both second language teaching and acquisition.

**Factors Influencing Academic Achievement**

Dixon, Zhao, Quiroz, and Shin (2012) stated that vocabulary knowledge is fundamental in comprehension and utilizing language. In addition, attributes such as oral capability, reading capacity, reading comprehension, and school accomplishment are parts of vocabulary knowledge. It has been found that certain factors have an impact on children’s vocabularies. Gathercole, Kennedy, and Thomas (2016) discussed various factors that additionally impact language acquisition in bilingual children on the timing and rate of language acquisition in bilingual children. Socioeconomic, parental education level, and language use are the factors that
have shown correlations with academic performance (Dixon et al., 2012). Data collected from this proposed study may show the correlation of these factors in ELL and ESOL learners’ academic achievement.

**Socioeconomic Status**

According to Gonzalez (2001), socioeconomic status (SES) impacts minority children’s growth importantly. Gathercole et al. (2016) argued that low SES involves inadequate access to nutritional, health care, housing, and thought-provoking resources. Based on the evidence, these authors also demonstrated that household SES is related to the extent of cognitive ability. Dixon et al. (2012) discussed that children whose parents have high SES tend to have lower native language proficiency. Moreover, those children are more proficient in English because their parents tend to communicate in English. Although SES has proven to have a relation to student’s academic achievement, D’Angiulli, Siegel, and Maggi (2004) argued that the best option is to provide educational support when children begin school instead of focusing on the improvement or stabilization of SES.

**Parental Education**

Parental education is one factor impacting academic accomplishment, specifically with linguistic and cognitive abilities in children (Gathercole et al., 2016). Furthermore, behavior problems were connected with parent education level, strongly associated with enhancements in conduct for children whose parents spoke their native language in the home (Winsler et al., 2014). Dixon et al. (2012) showed that parents with a high level of education provide their children with resources to succeed academically. In addition, those parents encourage their children to improve their vocabulary in both languages because they believe that bilingualism is valuable.
Language Use

Dixon et al. (2012) stated that it is essential for children to maintain communication in their native language to promote their growth. Studies have shown that children whose parents utilized their native language for communicating in the home tend to communicate in the same language. This contributes to improving the children’s vocabulary in their parent’s native language, but does not influence their English vocabulary. Palacios and Kibler (2016) asserted that the utilization of native language in the home contributes to a decreased possibility of accomplishing more complex mastering reading stages.

In conclusion, the research reviewed above suggests that factors such as socioeconomic, parental education level, and language utilization are correlated to academic achievement in bilingual children. Winsler et al. (2014) stated, ELL children who communicate in English at home tend to have a higher parental education, higher SES, and higher English proficiency. Yet, children who speak both English and their native language in the home were classified as middle class and those who only speak their native language as the lower class. As important, this proposed study’s results will further support Winsler et al. (2014) assertion and reveal how these factors affect academic achievement.

Anxiety and Second Language Acquisition

According to Teimouri, Goetze, and Plonsky (2019), anxiety has been theorized and assessed as a trait, state, or situation-specific build in second language acquisition (SLA). As related to the foreign language classroom, anxiety is characterized by a particular type of circumstance, for example communicating in a foreign language (Zheng & Cheng, 2018). Naser Oteir and Nijr Al-Otaibi (2019) argued that anxiety linked with foreign language negatively impacts foreign language learning. These authors classified five principal impacts. The first
impact is academically related, where students who experienced foreign language anxiety tend to have a poor level of academic accomplishment based on the level of language competence (Naser Oteir & Nijr Al-Otaibi, 2019).

Additionally, students with a higher anxiety level are more likely to drop out than those with a low anxiety level. The second impact is socially related, where students with a higher level of anxiety do not show interest in communication with other people in the English language (Naser Oteir & Nijr Al-Otaibi, 2019). The third impact is cognitively related, where foreign language anxiety can be an effective filter that rejects information from reaching a student's cognitive processing method. The fourth impact is emotionally related, where foreign language anxiety can have a negative effect on emotional factors such as motivation and attitude (Naser Oteir & Nijr Al-Otaibi, 2019). The fifth impact is personally related where students with a higher level of anxiety might become distracted, worried, unhappy, and such different indications (Naser Oteir & Nijr Al-Otaibi, 2019).

Moreover, language anxiety is defined as a type of situational anxiety led by learning or utilizing a foreign language. Based on early discovery, second language (L2) is characterized as either a moderately steady character trait across different circumstances or as a permanent emotional state, showing itself in a specific instant in time. Studies have shown that students who are anxious appeared more engaged in non-relevant cognitive processing than those who are not anxious (Zheng & Cheng, 2018). Additionally, students who are anxious tend to be easily distracted, which can negatively impact their cognitions threshold in learning. According to Naser Oteir and Nijr Al-Otaibi (2019), language anxiety can be arranged into two different categories, which are debilitating (unsafe) anxiety and facilitating (supportive) anxiety. Debilitating anxiety harms students and negatively affects their performance. These effects
include the lack of class participation, frustration, worry, and fear. However, facilitating anxiety assists students in a precise manner that encourages great performance in the language (Naser Oteir & Nijr Al-Otaibi, 2019). Facilitating anxiety can also assist the students in conquering their anxiety.

According to Zheng and Cheng (2018), test anxiety is a series of phenomenological, physiological, and conduct reactions that worry about possible negative outcomes or disappointment on a test or comparative evaluative circumstance. In testing circumstances, test anxiety may speak to an inclination that hides a student’s actual potential (Zheng & Cheng, 2018). Test anxiety comprises two subjectively different aspects: emotionality and worry (Thomas, Cassady, & Finch, 2018). Emotionality portrays the large number of physiological reactions usually encountered by test-anxious students during evaluative circumstances. In fact, these students tend to exhibit physical symptoms such as nervousness, repulsion, wooziness, and raised heart when taking tests (Thomas et al., 2018). Worry, also known as cognitive test anxiety, alludes to test anxiety levels that involve cognitive learning and arranging tasks. These encounters go from meddling thoughts identified with performance to just having lower levels of ability in the conduct of the average study, association, and understanding. (Thomas et al., 2018).

Pate, Neely, Malcom, Daugherty, Zagar, and Medina (2021) stated that test anxiety involves two general areas: emotionality and worry. In this specific circumstance, worry is likewise named cognitive test anxiety and has numerous theoretical models to clarify its possible influence on one’s performance in assessing circumstances, incorporating the cognitive interference model and the information-processing model (Pate et al., 2021). The cognitive interference model recognizes that cognitive test anxiety is associated with task-insignificant cognitions that inhibit prompt recovery of information during evaluations leading to damaged
working memory (Pate et al., 2021). The information-processing model associated cognitive test anxiety with deficits of simply recovery and handling damages throughout an examination. It could also comprise problematic processing and ineffectiveness in other aspects, involving study abilities, essential organization activities, and knowledge. This proposes that students with serious test anxiety face difficulties not only within the examination scenario but in areas critically connected to the groundwork for examinations (Pate et al., 2021).

Teimouri et al. (2019) argued that anxiety happens reliably over time within a given circumstance, for example, being exposed to various L2 environments. Therefore, researchers have to a great extent ascribed a negative part to anxiety in the L2 learning process, arguing it weakens L2 learners’ language accomplishment, motivation, and eagerness to converse in a second language. In addition, findings have shown that anxiety has a moderate, adverse relationship with accomplishment based on the level of education and the language in question (Teimouri et al., 2019). Foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA) is described as a different complex of self-discernments, principles, emotions. It conducts connected to classroom language learning emerging from the distinctiveness of the language learning method. According to Zheng and Cheng (2018), FLCA contributes to possible reasons such as personality variables, stressful classroom encounters, and the degree of challenges in certain foreign language classes.

As stated by Chen (2018), it appears that there is no agreement concerning the best proper diagnosis for individuals who encounter foreign language anxiety (FLA) to a level that hinders their functioning. Performance Anxiety Disorder has been identified as the most relevant diagnosis related to FLA. Performance Anxiety Disorder, classified under Social Anxiety Disorder, pertains to individuals who encounter anxiety only in circumstances that include either performing or communicating in public (Chen, 2018). The key element that separates social
anxiety appears to be a suitable diagnosis for people who encounter FLA to a level that weakens their functioning. Factors and behaviors such as apprehension, trouble concentrating, current palpitations, skipping class, preventing eye contact in class, sitting in the back row, and delaying schoolwork is displayed in students facing FLA (Chen, 2018).

Zheng and Cheng (2018) stated that six possible language anxiety foundations were identified within the three parts of arousal, the learner, the teacher, and the educational practice. These sources that result from anxiety are identified as: the students’ personal and interpersonal anxiety, the students’ principles about language learning, the teachers’ principles about language instructing, teacher-student interactions, classroom measures, and the testing of language (Zheng & Cheng, 2018). Therefore, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) is a 33-item tool with a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire developed to assess FLCA during L2 learning (Teimouri et al., 2019). In addition, Zheng and Cheng (2018) also argued that this scale is a self-report tool designed to evaluate communication anxiety, test anxiety, and fear of negative assessment linked with language anxiety. Foreign language classroom anxiety is caused by possible factors such as students’ personal views of their language ability, personality aspects including perfectionism, and worrying classroom encounters. Therefore, this tool has shown that language anxiety has an incapacitating role in the L2 classroom in various settings (Zheng & Cheng, 2018).

Studies have demonstrated that one’s anxiety levels are connected to demographic, social, or cultural backgrounds, proficiency levels, and foreign language learning experience (Jin & Dewaele, 2018). For instance, some learners have experienced foreign language engagement learning in target language nations, directly impacting foreign language anxiety levels (Jin & Dewaele, 2018). Jin and Dewaele (2018) argued that foreign language anxiety might have a
negative impact on students’ academic performance, cognitive and social effects. Thus, anxiety impedes students’ skill growth and causes a decline in their self-confidence in the foreign language. Consequently, it fortifies anxiety, making a dangerous circle (Jin & Dewaele, 2018). Due to the growing of non-relevant tasks of self-cognition, unified cognitive activities linked with learning and performance may be hindered as anxiety arises. Hence, students who are anxious may try to prevent conversing with others for fear of having their accent or their proficiency level of the foreign language being judged (Jin & Dewaele, 2018). Moreover, foreign language anxiety can damage the teachers’ best aims and make appealing materials insufficient.

**English Language Learners and Academic Performance**

Even though ELLs are one of the fastest-growing student populations in the United States, ELLs’ academic achievement shows an unpromising image compared to their native English-speaking classmates (Turgut, Sahin, & Huerta, 2016). ELLs tend to exhibit poor academic accomplishment and report psychological issues while encountering low academic performance. Diaz, Cochran, and Karlin (2016) discovered that when ELLs find that little is anticipated of them, they perform at lower levels. A shared misapprehension is that great instruction for native English speakers is great instruction for ELLs. Moreover, many instructors believe that ELLs are to be proficient in English with two years of enrolling in school (Diaz et al., 2016). Therefore, they have to accept poor academic accomplishment until they improve their English. The misapprehension is a direct result of teachers not having enough expertise with second language learning. Standardized tests are measures of academic accomplishment utilized to discover all students’ college and vocation preparedness in various states (Marin & Daves, 2015). However, these researchers also found that the standardized tests failed to consider ELLs’ different English language proficiency levels when determining subject area content.
Although the United States is considered a country of immigrants, English proficiency at the listening, speaking, and writing level is anticipated and projected along with awareness of culture and societal guidelines. Therefore, inaccuracy was found when looking at the underperformance of ELLs on standardized tests. Marin and Daves (2015) also discovered that adequate time had not been given for ELLs to gain proficiency in the English language, which causes them to not perform at higher levels. Previous studies have found that ELLs need between five to ten years to develop proficiency in the academic English language (Marin & Daves, 2015). Thus, standardized tests are utilized to determine ELLs’ academic achievement.

Turgut et al. (2016) found that academic language, which is necessary to be scholastically successful, is greatly required and highly considered compared to the everyday language used for communication in English. In addition, ELLs who are obtaining proficiency in English must also demonstrate proficiency in academic language. The authors also found that instructors should utilize effective methods and encourage academic English in the classroom to help. According to Sandberg and Reschly (2011), instructors across the United States have difficulties creating a proper assessment, valuable, instructive practices, and effective interventions to improve the accomplishment gap among ELLs and non-ELLs and prevent the misidentification of ELLs into special instruction services. Moreover, the authors discover that ELLs with informal conversational proficiency, yet not academic language proficiency, achieve low on standardized tests. While test-takers may have the capacity to achieve the tasks of reasoning and problem solving needed to respond to the questions, various ELLs are not able to achieve success due to the language barrier (Sandberg & Reschly, 2011).

Furthermore, to acquire an accurate image of an ELLs’ performance, the determination of both the level of English and native language proficiency must be demonstrated before testing.
Students may be concentrated by area or appear more fluent than they are. Therefore, a better image of functioning can be discovered if ELLs are tested English and the native language (Sandberg & Reschly, 2011). Research by Marin and Daves (2015) illustrated that a more complete approach to determine ELLs’ academic accomplishment would be to compare English proficiency tests and standardized test scores. As a result, this measure of ELLs’ academic accomplishment gives more realistic outcomes, which address English language proficiency and subject area in its entirety (Marin & Daves, 2015).

The standardized test is the instrument used to measure non-ELLs’ and ELLs’ academic accomplishment in the educational system. Nevertheless, the methods to measure a student’s academic performance and demonstrate school and district responsibility differ across states (Marin & Daves, 2015). The language used on standardized tests is the main source of difficulty for ELLs. Therefore, the standardized test may not correctly reflect ELLs' improvement, either in the English language or at the academic level.

**Summary**

Many studies of English language proficiency and academic achievement in ELLs and ESOLs have been conducted. There are also a wealth of theories and concepts focused on second language acquisition and factors that influence academic achievement. However, few empirical studies have been performed that measure whether a student’s anxiety level impacts performance in English learning, and whether anxious students have a disadvantage compared to non-anxious students. This leaves a major gap in the counseling and education body of literature.

This literature review began by providing a theoretical framework associated with the study, including social cognitive theory. Additional information was provided regarding the factors and problems associated with academic achievement. The literature shows that strategies
exist that can improve ELL and ESOL academic performance, especially in accomplishing the No Child Left Behind Act. More research is necessary to determine the effects of these academic achievement goals and which students would most benefit from additional academic programming. This literature will help to emphasize the recent importance of this topic. Therefore, this proposed study will contribute to the body of knowledge and provide information that could help reduce the poor academic achievement in anxious ELLs and ESOLs.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

U.S. public schools have an increased population of immigrants (Calderón, Slavin, & Sánchez, 2011). Learning a second language can open up new doors in life. English language learners (ELLs) who can write and read competently can fully participate in American schools, work environments, and society. However, ELLs face challenges while learning the English language. In addition, professional development for teachers working with English learners from different backgrounds is limited. The proposed study will identify whether students’ anxiety level impacts performance in English learning. Furthermore, this section will include the proposed methodology for this study, including the proposed research design, research questions, hypotheses, independent and dependent variables, procedures, description and selection of the study population/sample, instrumentation/data collection, and data analysis. Finally, validity aspects will also be reviewed.

Quantitative Research Design

This research is based on quantitative research methods. Some researchers use the quantitative research design to determine what is the relationship, if any, between measured variables (Swanson & Holton, 2005). Quantitative techniques examine groups of people and draft generalizations from a sample to broader groups beyond smaller samples. Quantitative research uses measurable data to articulate facts and discover patterns in research. One advantage of quantitative methods “is their ability to use smaller groups of people (samples) to make inferences about larger groups (populations) that would be too expensive to study” (Swanson & Holton, 2005, p. 33). Therefore, the quantitative research design is suitable for this research study because it permits collecting data generalization of data to larger groups using a smaller sample size. In addition, the researcher used a correlational research design for this study. A
correlational research design helped to determine if there is a relationship between anxiety and academic performance and evaluate that relationship. The method sampling that was used in the study is stratified sampling to obtain a more scientific result that could be used to represent the entirety of the population (Swanson & Holton, 2005).

Research Questions

Several specific research questions and issues surfaced in the course of developing the research design. The research study will intend to address the following research questions:

1. Is there a correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety for ELLs?
2. Is there a correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance for ELLs?
3. Is there a correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance for ELLs?

Research Hypotheses

Based on the research gathered from the literature review, the following are this study’s hypotheses:

\[ H_{01} : \text{There is no significant correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety among ELLs.} \]

\[ H_{A1} : \text{There is a positive correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety among ELLs.} \]

\[ H_{02} : \text{There is no significant correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.} \]
HA2: There is a negative correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

H03: There is no correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

HA3: There is a negative correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance among ELLs.

Participants Sample

Participants were recruited from a public university in the Eastern region of the United States. The total number of students is 5,337 students, where 29 countries are represented (Bowie State University, n.d.). The target population of interest for this study was college students whose second language is English. Consequently, the sample population was chosen using the purposive sampling (judgment sampling) method that involves “judgment sampling occurs when a researcher selects sample members to conform to some criterion” (Cooper & Schindler, 2006, p. 424).

Power Analysis

The sample size should be determined where alpha is defined as 0.05 (5% chance of making a Type I error or a false positive) and a power value of 80% (1-B) or (20% chance of committing a Type II error or false-negative; Triola, 2011). To ensure 80% power of detecting a difference, the appropriate sample size was computed using a two-tailed test with a .50 Cohen’s effect size (medium), 0.05 alpha level, and 0.8 statistical power. These calculations indicated a total sample size of 100 participants using a statistical power analysis calculator (G*Power 3.1.9.7) (Faul et al., 2009).
Recruitment

Participants were recruited from ELL students at a public university. The proposed research plan was provided to each department’s chairperson: the college of arts and sciences, the college of business, and the college of professional studies. Professors who teach introductory English (ESOL) were also be informed about the study so that they can spread the word to their students from undergraduate studies, starting from second-semester freshman, sophomore to senior year. For the study, ELL students were recruited from classes within all departments.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

The sample population must meet the following criteria: 1) Non-native English speakers, 2) English learners, 3) must be at least 18 years of age, and 4) be a second-semester freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior student at public university. The criteria for exclusion in the study is as follows: 1) Students who are not 18 years old or older, 2) Native English-speaking students, 3) Students not attending a public university, and 4) First-semester freshman students because they will not have a GPA.

Procedures

Participant Screening

To begin the screening process, the researcher did as follows: 1) Contacted the chairperson of each department (the college of arts and sciences, the college of business, and the college of professional studies) to present the research study’s purpose; 2) Obtained approval from the chairperson of each department listed above; 3) Contacted the International Student Services to obtain information on all classes that ELL students are enrolled in, and; 4) Contacted the professors to ensure that the study is shared via email with their students in which the Cadet
Language Background Survey questionnaire, the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale, and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was accessible to them. In addition, the possibility of professors awarding extra credit to the students was discussed. However, participants who did not meet the criteria based on the demographic survey questionnaire could not move forward with the study. In other words, participants only responded to the FLCA and the CTA if they met the criteria.

**Consent for Treatment**

Since all of the participants were over the age of 18, they were given consent to participate through SurveyMonkey electronically by consenting to partake in the study. No personal information will be collected from any of the surveys that will be provided. Prior to making the surveys accessible, a brief summary and the purpose of the study were reiterated, and the procedures and the type of data that would be collected. Moreover, details were provided on the advantages of participation and potential risks, the limits of confidentiality, and the language background survey. Throughout the survey, the participants were reminded that they were not obligated to participate, nor would it impact their grades. The participants were informed that the information collected would be kept on a password-protected file. All data would be then destroyed after three years.

**Data Collection**

The participants completed a demographic survey. This tool was designed to collect data to determine the difference in the outcome variable by these demographic variables. The Cadet Language Background Survey (CLBS) (see Appendix) consisted of identifying ten items such as ethnicity, gender, grade level, age, nationality, and the number of years spent in the United States. The grade point average (GPA) was collected from the students. In other words, this data
will be self-reported. The purpose of gathering the participants’ current overall GPA was to measure their academic performance in all classes because they are taught in English. This would show how well the participants perform in these classes taught in English. These items listed above would determine if a relationship exists between the participants’ background and their performance in classes taught in English.

The participants completed a language anxiety tool. According to Zheng and Cheng (2018), the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) is a 33-item tool that measures one’s anxiety levels in the classroom on a 5-point Likert scale with reactions varying from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Scores range from 33 to 165 with a reliability coefficient of .93. Therefore, the higher the scores, the higher one’s level of language anxiety. Park (2014) stated that the FLCAS items were created through a few techniques involving learner’s self-reports, clinical experience, and a survey of associated tools with respect to communication fear, test anxiety, and dread of adverse assessment. Thus, this tool has been utilized to explore the reliability and validity of the outcomes of evaluating foreign language anxiety in the classroom and also to investigate the likely impact of anxiety on second language anxiety (Park, 2014). Therefore, this tool will determine whether there is a relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance.

In addition, to assess test anxiety, this research adopted the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale (CTAS). According to Franklin (2016), the CTAS is a 27-item tool with a 4-point Likert scale questionnaire, created to center only on test anxiety’s cognitive element. Cognitive Test Anxiety (CTA) has been connected to adverse results among college students. These adverse results incorporate lower educational performance, weakened critical thinking capacity, declined self-adequacy, and harmed feelings of self-esteem (Ne’Eman-Haviv & Bonny-Noach, 2019).
Research has demonstrated that a connection between elevated test anxiety and performance exists. Therefore, elevated levels of test anxiety are related to academic challenges, low academic accomplishments, and expanded probabilities of dropping out of college (Ne’Eman-Haviv & Bonny-Noach, 2019).

### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RQ1</th>
<th>RQ2</th>
<th>RQ3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variable</strong></td>
<td>Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety</td>
<td>Cognitive Test Anxiety</td>
<td>Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td>Cognitive Test Anxiety</td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is this assessed?</strong></td>
<td>Positive Correlation between FLCA and CTA assessments</td>
<td>Negative Correlation between CTA and academic performance (GPA)</td>
<td>Negative Correlation between FLCA and academic performance (GPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Validity

**Internal Validity**

The investigation was coordinated in a non-laboratory center and will have potential dangers to validity because of the lack of control in gathering data. An additional possible danger to validity to be protected against could be the researcher’s desires. Causality and generalizability were constrained because of factors that cannot be controlled may arise. Therefore, correlations among dependent and independent variables had the option to be resolved.
As stated by Zhao (2009), sources such as the survey officer, participants, questionnaires, and data collection method can be considered threats to the internal validity of survey research. For instance, race and gender guidelines provided to the participants might impact the participants’ reaction to survey items.

**External Validity**

The general investigation relies upon external validity rather than internal validity because of the survey tool provided in a non-laboratory setting. Yet, due to the assessment, danger to external validation might arise. Participants might respond to these in ways that would change the results by getting apparent expectation outcomes. Homogeneity of the sample expands validity; however, it would reduce generalizability and the significance of the discoveries’ real-life part.

Another marker of the external validity of survey research is the response rate (Zhao, 2009). It is likely for the external validity to be impacted when the response rate is low and when participants fail to respond appropriately to the survey questionnaire and the biases of the data collection.

**Data Analysis**

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is the software used to analyze the data collected from the survey. Descriptive analyses were used to summarize the demographic variables: age, income, education level among this sample. The independent variables for this research are Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety and Cognitive Test Anxiety. The dependent variable is academic performance as measured by grade point average. A linear regression analysis was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3: $H_{A1}$: There is a positive correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety among ELLs. $H_{A2}$: There
is a negative correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance among ELLs. $H_{A3}$: There is a negative correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance among ELLs. Regression analysis is a theoretically basic technique for exploring relationships between variables (Chatterjee & Hadi, 2012).

Moreover, regression analysis can evaluate the strength of the relationship among variables and illustrate the future relationship between them. The analysis aims is to determine if there is a correlation between anxiety and academic performance. In addition, this study will contribute to the promotion of positive social change locally and across the nation within the field of education.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this research was to investigate the existence of relationships between different approaches to measure students’ anxiety and academic performance. An overview of the analysis included a description of the demographic characteristics of the study participants and a listing of the regression analysis performed with the results. The first part focused on the demographic characteristic description of participants, while the second part focused on the degree of anxiety, which is measured by the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and the Cognitive Test Anxiety scale. The values of these two scales were compared with each other. Subsequently, both scales were compared with the study results of students, which were measured by a cumulative GPA. All data were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Software (SPSS) version 21 to perform the statistical analysis. Prior to analysis, the data were screened for missing data and out-of-range values. This chapter displays data screening, demographic information, descriptive statistics, and explorations of demographic differences on the main variables of interest, and finally, analysis of each research question and hypothesis.

Data Screening

The participants in this study were originally 103 English Language Learners’ college students at a public university. However, six participants were excluded for not reporting their GPA (including two with illogical values of “0” and 11.5), and one additional participant was excluded for missing all of the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale and part of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety scale. There was some missing information on demographic questions and small numbers of questions missed by some participants on the two anxiety scales, but these were not used as an exclusion criterion (specifically, on the Foreign Language Classroom
Anxiety Scale 10, participants missed a single question, and one each missed two and three questions; on the Cognitive Test Anxiety scale eight participants missed a single question. Therefore, the final sample was 96 participants.

**Demographics of Participants**

As seen in the demographics in Table 1, the highest percentage of participants were between the age of 25-34 years old; 77.1% of the sample was under age 35; the majority were female, and the most common grades in the sample were seniors followed by sophomores.

**Table 1**

*Demographics of Age, Gender, and Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman (Second Semester)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 2, almost three quarters (72.9%) of the participants (n = 70) were born in another country, whereas more than one quarter (27.1%, n = 26) of the participants were born in the United States. Countries with less than three respondents in this sample were grouped together into broader regions. Although the sample had widely varying countries of birth, the
vast majority of participants have lived in the United States for at least 5 years (94.7%), and most of the participants (n = 55) have lived in the United States for at least 17 years (57.3%).

Table 2

*Country of Birth and Time in the United States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas/Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Africa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in the United States (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 17 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 3, the most common primary language is English, but 74% had a primary language other than English, with many selecting French and Spanish. The remaining participants (n = 37) wrote in another language, such as Creole (Caribbean creole which does not have any English component) or Twi, and languages with less than three respondents in this sample were grouped together as other. Despite only 26% reporting English as their primary language, 41.7% of the participants report English as their language at home. However, 58.3% of the participants speak another language in the home, most commonly Spanish, Twi, and French, and again languages with less than four respondents in the sample were grouped into other. Only
4.2% of the participants \((n = 4)\) can be considered as beginners in terms of their length of English study. On the contrary, most participants have been speaking the English language for more than 16 years.

**Table 3**

*Languages of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Language</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Language at home | \(n\) | %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoruba</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Length of time speaking English (years) | \(n\) | %
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 16 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis and Descriptive Statistics**

Measurements based on the Likert scale require all items (questions) to be in the same direction before combining them into a single scale score. This means that, for example, a score of 5 always corresponds to the highest level of anxiety, while a score of 1 corresponds to a lower
level of anxiety towards foreign language. For the foreign language classroom anxiety scale, questions 8, 12, and 28 had to be reverse coded as agreement with them indicated lower anxiety. Similarly, there were nine items on the cognitive test anxiety scale that had to be reverse-coded. In addition, scales should be examined for reliability in terms of Cronbach's alpha to express how much each item is consistent with the other item, with values greater than .70 indicating the consistency and reliability of items is considered sufficient. The foreign language classroom anxiety scale had 33 items on a 1-5 scale of agreement, and Cronbach's alpha was an excellent .934. The cognitive test anxiety scale had 27 items on the 1-4 scale of how typical the items were of them, and Cronbach's alpha was a good .861.

Each of these scales used the sum of items to represent a single scale score. Foreign language classroom anxiety has possible values from 33 to 165, with greater scores indicating greater anxiety, but the sample had scored from 40 to 147. As seen in Table 4, the sample had an average of 109.29, a bit above a neutral midpoint of the scale, with a moderately negatively skewed distribution. The cognitive test anxiety sum takes possible values from 27 to 108, with greater scores indicating greater levels of anxiety, but the sample had scored from 34 to 102. The sample had an average of 65.75 with a roughly normal distribution.

The other primary measure of interest was GPA, and one student reported a GPA of 4.4, but this was recoded as 4.0. As also seen in Table 4, the cumulative GPA of the participant ranges from 2.24 (although the next highest value was 2.60) and 4.0 (with 10 participants at this maximum possible value). The average was 3.39, and other than the participants at the minimums and maximums, the distribution was roughly normally distributed.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety</th>
<th>Cognitive Test Anxiety</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>109.28</td>
<td>65.75</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skew (SE = .25)</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In exploratory analyses, there were no differences between certain demographic groups on these three main variables of interest. Specifically, although women were slightly higher on each, based on independent samples t-tests men and women did not significantly differ in their foreign language classroom anxiety (women $M = 111.3$, $SD = 23.4$, men $M = 106.7$, $SD = 17.1$, $t(94) = -1.08$, $p = .283$), cognitive test anxiety (women $M = 67.3$, $SD = 11.6$, men $M = 63.7$, $SD = 11.8$, $t(94) = -1.49$, $p = .139$), nor GPA (women $M = 3.40$, $SD = .43$, men $M = 3.38$, $SD = .39$, $t(94) = -.18$, $p = .858$). Based on Spearman’s rho for the ordinal grouping variables, there was also no significant relationship between these three measures and participants’ age group nor their grade level. Specifically, there were some trends that younger people had more cognitive test anxiety and those in higher grade levels had more cognitive test anxiety, but age group was not significantly related to foreign language classroom anxiety $r_s(94) = -.090$, $p = .381$, cognitive test anxiety $r_s(94) = -.178$, $p = .082$, nor GPA $r_s(94) = -.045$, $p = .666$, and participants grade level in school was not significantly related to foreign language classroom anxiety $r_s(94) = -.072$, $p = .490$, cognitive test anxiety $r_s(94) = .190$, $p = .066$, nor GPA $r_s(94) = .016$, $p = .881$. 
In terms of the impact of the language background of participants, there was no
difference between those whose language at home is English and those whose language at home
is any other language in terms of their foreign language classroom anxiety (English $M = 113.0,$
$SD = 21.8,$ not English $M = 106.8,$ $SD = 20.2,$ $t(94) = -1.42,$ $p = .160$), cognitive test anxiety
(English $M = 65.6,$ $SD = 10.2,$ not English $M = 65.9,$ $SD = 12.7,$ $t(94) = .13,$ $p = .895$), nor GPA
(English $M = 3.42,$ $SD = .41,$ not English $M = 3.37,$ $SD = .41,$ $t(94) = -.50,$ $p = .621$). In addition,
there was also no significant relationship between participants’ length of time speaking English
and their foreign language classroom anxiety $r(94) = .011,$ $p = .915,$ cognitive test anxiety $r(94)
= .122,$ $p = .235,$ nor GPA $r(94) = -.054,$ $p = .603.$ In addition, there was also no significant
relationship between length of time speaking English and any of these three variables when
considering only the 71 people who indicated a primary language other than English.

Before addressing the research questions, the assumptions of Pearson’s correlations were
examined for the three main variables. Although the variables were not quite normally
distributed, foreign language anxiety had only a moderate negative skew and GPA only a mild
negative skew. More importantly, all the relationships of these variables met the assumptions of
linear relationships with no extreme bivariate outliers, based on scatterplots.

**Hypothesis Testing**

**Research Question One**

The first research question was: Is there a correlation between the level of foreign
language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety for ELLs? This was tested using Pearson’s
correlation coefficient, and as seen in Table 5, there is a moderate, positive, significant linear
relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety, $r(94) = .370,$
\( p < .001\), indicating that participants with greater anxiety on one scale also tended to have greater anxiety on the other scale.

**Table 5**

*Correlations of Anxiety Scales and GPA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety</th>
<th>Cognitive Test Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Test Anxiety</td>
<td>( r(94) = .370, ) ( p &lt; .001 )</td>
<td>( r(94) = -.193, ) ( p = .059 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>( r(94) = -.193, ) ( p = .365 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Two**

The second research question was: Is there a correlation between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance for ELLs? As also seen in Table 5, there was no significant relationship between the level of cognitive test anxiety and cumulative GPA, \( r(94) = - .093, p = .365 \), thus greater or lesser cognitive test anxiety was not related to any differences in GPA.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question asked: Is there a correlation between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance for ELLs? As also seen in Table 5, there was a small, negative, but not significant relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and GPA, \( r(94) = -.193, p = .059 \). The relationship was consistent with those with greater foreign language classroom anxiety having lower GPA and could arguably be called marginally significant but was not statistically significant.
Summary

In chapter 4, the researcher first explained missing data and exclusion criteria. The demographics of the sample were presented, and most were older than traditional university students. They were a diverse sample in terms of country of origin and primary languages, although most had been speaking English for a while. The descriptive of the primary study variables of foreign language classroom anxiety, cognitive test anxiety, and GPA were presented, and the sample had moderate levels on both anxiety scales and average GPAs around a B+. An exploratory analysis noted that a number of demographic variables (gender, age, primary English speakers vs. primary other languages, length of time speaking English) were not related to foreign language classroom anxiety, cognitive test anxiety, or GPA. After noting that assumptions of Pearson's correlation were met, the hypothesis testing section addressed each of the three research questions in turn. There was a moderate, positive, significant relationship such that higher foreign language classroom anxiety level respondents tend to suffer from higher cognitive test anxiety levels. There was no evidence of a significant relationship between GPA and either cognitive test anxiety or foreign language classroom anxiety. However, the relationship between foreign classroom anxiety and GPA had a small effect size and was marginally significant, indicating that greater foreign language classroom anxiety may be associated with a lower GPA.

Chapter 5 presents the discussion on the literature related to the research problem, the summary and discussion of the results, the limitations and recommendations for future studies, and the implications for practice.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation, SCT emphasizes that self-actualization is applied to boost students’ personal growth and development. SCT can help therapists and/or counselors in being knowledgeable about the reason students encounter task failure. Therapists and counselors can also provide aid that can accelerate the student’s learning success. Thus, the current study focused on whether anxiety predicted any differences in academic performance. Additionally, SCT explained how test anxiety impacts learning, accomplishment, and academic performance. Therefore, in testing situations, it is argued that test anxiety may speak to an inclination that hides a student’s real potential (Zheng & Cheng, 2018).

The study’s overall purpose was to determine if there is a relationship between student’s level of anxiety and its impact on performance in English learning. To achieve the goal of this study, the researcher described the procedure used to define, classify and categorize participants and found that: (a) there was a moderate, positive, significant linear relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety, (b) there was no significant relationship between the level of cognitive test anxiety and cumulative GPA, (c) there was a small, negative, but not quite significant relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and GPA. This chapter reports the discussion, implications, limitations, recommendations for future research that resulted from this study.

Discussion

A total of 103 participants were recruited for this study from a public university located in the Maryland. However, of that total, 96 were evaluated because they completed the vital components of the survey. Additionally, the evaluated participants met the following criteria: 18 years of age or older, an English language learner, a second-semester freshman, a sophomore, a
junior, or a senior student, and non-native English speaker students. These participants also completed the demographic survey, the Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale, and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale.

**Research Question One**

The first research question asked whether there was a relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety. Basically, the study aimed to determine whether highly anxious foreign language students were also high on cognitive tests. To address this question, the correlation coefficient between the scores obtained in FLCAS and CTAS was calculated. There was a moderately positive relationship between these two kinds of anxiety (r=0.370) and was statistically significant at p<.001. Prior research that tested the correlation between cognitive test anxiety and foreign language classroom anxiety found no correlation (Aida, 1994; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004). Therefore, this study’s results are in direct contrast to prior studies, which may be attributed to the variance in statistical methods. Unlike this study, these other studies used factor analysis on the foreign language classroom anxiety scale. The prior studies conducted a factor analysis of some items that measure test anxiety, resulting in low factor loadings. Consequently, the difference between this study’s results and prior students may be due to the use of factor analysis vs. correlation coefficient/linear regression. Based on this result and analysis, the role of foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety in learning requires further research.

**Research Question Two**

The second research question asked whether there was a relationship between the level of cognitive test anxiety and academic performance for ELLs. Essentially, the study aimed to establish whether students’ high anxiety level on cognitive test anxiety contributed to low
academic performance, measured by cumulative GPA. The correlation coefficient between the scores obtained in cognitive test anxiety and GPA was calculated to address this question. There was no significant relationship between the level of cognitive test anxiety and cumulative GPA ($r = -.093$) and was not statically significant at $p = .365$. According to Ne’Eman-Haviv and Bonny-Noach (2019), cognitive test anxiety has been associated with negative outcomes between college students. These negative outcomes include lower educational performance, weakened critical thinking capacity, declined self-adequacy, and harmed feelings of self-esteem. Therefore, this research results are in direct contrast to previous studies that may be obtained to the variance in statistical methods.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question asked whether there was a relationship between the level of foreign language classroom anxiety and academic performance for ELLs. The study intended to establish whether students’ high anxiety levels in the foreign language classroom contributed to low academic performance, measured by cumulative GPA. The correlation coefficient between the scores obtained in foreign language classroom anxiety and GPA was calculated to address this question. There was a small, negative relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety and GPA ($r = -.193$) and was not statistically significant $p = .059$. Wang (2011) argued that foreign language classroom anxiety negatively correlated with English academic performance for tested students. Moreover, it was concluded that these students who had foreign language classroom anxiety tended to have low academic performance, which is reflected in their final grades. Therefore, this study's results support previous studies that may be obtained to the variance in statistical methods.
Implications

Based on the findings of this study, several implications were drawn that lead to some recommendations. For students learning English as a second language, it could be assumed that taking courses and exams in English that is not their primary language may contribute to test-taking anxiety. As seen in the current study, those with greater anxiety in foreign language classroom also have greater anxiety about taking exams. In addition, while those with greater foreign language classroom anxiety have lower GPAs, it is possible that they could have mastered the material and their native English-speaking peers, but that their struggle to interact in the classroom or with the test material impacted their GPA. Therefore, the GPA may not be an accurate representation of their knowledge gained. The researcher believes that another possible implication of the study is the consideration that should be given to the need to apply additional methods such as alternative assessments such as project work to determine ELLs mastery of the material to better represent their academic performance.

Alternatively, perhaps the lower GPA among those with greater foreign language classroom anxiety does reflect worse academic performance that is not specifically linked to difficulties with English. Greater foreign language classroom anxiety could indicate people who have other struggles that could make academic achievement difficult. For example, students whose parents have a low educational level or who are from low-income households may be more likely to have foreign language classroom anxiety because English is not their primary language at home. Thus, they may have lower GPAs due to their lower-income and parental level of education, which are known to cause greater academic struggles (Bercerra, 2012).
Limitations

This study had several limitations. First, it was limited to one institution, which was one of the public universities located in the state of Maryland. It is recommended for further research to include more than one institution to have a more diverse sample. Therefore, outcomes could vary contingent upon the geographical culture of this sample. This also contributed to the sample size being small.

Moreover, the study only included participants from undergraduate studies and did not include participants from the beginner grade level, i.e., first-semester freshman. The first-semester freshman participants were excluded because students from this grade level were unable to provide a cumulative GPA. The fact that participants were not equally distributed in each grade and language proficiency could also contribute to the misinterpretation of the results.

Second, the study examined academic performance as measured by cumulative GPA, but it relied on the GPA being self-reported to preserve anonymity. This made it difficult for the researcher to identify if responses were accurately reported. Additionally, both the cognitive test anxiety scale and the foreign language classroom anxiety scale were self-reported questionnaires. Drawbacks of self-report questionnaires include social desirability bias, self-deception, untrustworthy and uninterested participants. It can be concluded that not all responses might be reported with total honesty.

Third, the study was limited to a quantitative method, which emphasizes collecting numerical data. This method is also utilized to solely test and confirm hypotheses and assumptions. However, this study did not utilize the qualitative method to comprehend the participant’s beliefs, experiences, interactions, and/or behaviors. Therefore, to better evaluate
and interpret with greater accuracy, this study did not take into account factors that could have contributed to the participant’s responses to the surveys.

The fourth limitation is that the researcher only made the demographic survey, the cognitive test anxiety scale, and the foreign language classroom anxiety scale available in the English language. The research did not consider the possible struggles and challenges that some participants may have encountered completing the survey in a foreign language. Therefore, it is recommended to have the survey forms available in different languages for higher accuracy in responses.

Another limitation is that it is unknown how the participants interpreted the foreign language classroom anxiety scale. This scale was intended to represent the level of anxiety in college-level courses of any topics/subjects taught in English, which is not the primary language of most participants. However, it is possible that some participants interpreted the questions to be about anxiety related to foreign language courses of study, for example, taking Spanish courses as a part of ones’ university study requirement. The COVID-19 outbreak might also have an impact on the results due to the participants including other anxiety factors linked to the pandemic instead of solely focusing on specifics of the two scales. Therefore, some participants might have reported a higher level of anxiety.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research may consider examining other measures of academic performance such as formative and summative assessments other than focusing on GPA. This could help distinguish if they can master the material or if those with foreign language classroom anxiety are struggling with the learning itself. Future studies could include taking a mixed-methods approach to include both quantitative and qualitative data. This would provide more
comprehensive information on ELL students’ perceptions of challenges related to their academic accomplishment in a foreign language. Lastly, because some of the students speak more than one language, additional studies could examine the connection between multilingualism and the academic performance of ELL students. For students to feel comfortable expressing themselves, teachers should consider creating a secure, calm, and welcoming environment to support the student’s learning process (Amiri & Ghonsooly, 2015). Additionally, students who dread committing errors should not be demanded to partake in oral presentations; however, there should be steps to assist them to work on presentations while ensuring that the students collaborate with other students to partake in class discussions. Future studies could consider observing the students’ learning atmosphere to assess the effectiveness of this recommendation. Therefore, importance should be pointed towards listening and speaking while assuring that errors are tolerable but inevitable in learning when using a foreign language (Amiri & Ghonsooly, 2015). Coping skills for anxiety-provoking circumstances should be provided to students who are experiencing anxiety so they do not revert to avoidance behavior.

**Summary**

This study aimed to further the discussion on the relationship between student’s level of anxiety and its impact on academic performance among ELLs. Hashemi (2011) argued that anxiety is prevalent in the field of education and psychology and having a negative impact on language acquisition. Moreover, Zheng and Cheng (2018) discussed that anxiety is prone to have a negative effect on test-taking, complex learning, and effective thinking in the foreign language classroom. Researchers have recommended that teachers improve the classroom atmosphere to promote ELLs’ target language development (Hashemi, 2011). With that improvement, therefore, students will feel more comfortable making mistakes throughout the learning process.
and not be categorized as incompetent. Additionally, teachers should consider the type of activities given to the students with the purpose of promoting success. Hashemi (2011) also believes teachers should consider learners’ beliefs and self-associated cognitions, which could contribute to the effectiveness of adapting to language anxiety.

Initially, this study recruited 103 participants through Survey Monkey via email to undergraduate students starting from the first-semester freshman to the senior year. After data screening, 96 participants met the criteria, as well as completed all the sections of the demographic survey, the cognitive test anxiety scale, and the foreign language classroom anxiety scale. Participant’s scores were moderate, positive, and significantly correlated with foreign language classroom anxiety and cognitive test anxiety. However, participant’s scores were not significantly correlated with the level of cognitive test anxiety and cumulative GPA. Lastly, participant’s scores were small, negative, but not significantly correlated with foreign language classroom anxiety and GPA. In conclusion, it has been found participants with greater anxiety in foreign language classrooms also have greater anxiety about taking exams.
APPENDIX A
Survey Questionnaire (Cadet, 2020)

Please answer the following questions.

1. What is your age?
   a) 18-25
   b) 25 - 35
   c) 35 – 45
   d) 45 and up

2. What is your gender?
   a) Male
   b) Female
   C) Other (Specify): ______________

3. What is your primary language?
   a) French
   b) Spanish
   c) English
   d) Other (please specify) __________________________

4. Were you born in the United States?
   a) Yes
   b) No

5. How long have you been in the United States?
   a) Less than 5 years
   b) 5-10
   c) 11-16
d) More than 17

6. Where were you born?
   a) United States
   b) Other (please specify) ___________

7. How long have you been speaking English (years).
   a) 1-5
   b) 6-10
   c) 11-16
   d) More than 16

8. What language do you speak at home?
   a) English
   b) Other (please specify) ________________

9. What is your grade level?
   a) Second Semester Freshman
   b) Sophomore
   c) Junior
   c) Senior

10. What is your cumulative GPA?
    ________________
APPENDIX B

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Bollinger, 2017)

Likert Scale Response Options

Strongly Agree – Agree - Neither Agree nor Disagree - Disagree - Strongly Disagree

1. I feel nervous when I can't write or express myself in the foreign language.

2. I feel anxious when the teacher asks me a question that I have not prepared for.

3. I feel nervous and confused when the language teacher is unsuccessful in explaining the lesson.

4. I fear speaking or asking the teacher in my foreign language class.

5. I feel anxious when listening to a passage in my listening/speaking class.

6. I get nervous when there is a lot of vocabulary that I don't understand being used in my foreign language class.

7. I feel nervous using the foreign language outside of the college or class.

8. I am not nervous speaking the foreign language in front of my classmates.

9. I get nervous when I arrive late to class or the day following my absence.

10. I get anxious when there are too many foreign language students registered in my class.

11. I feel anxious when I see classmates better than me in my foreign language class.

12. I feel comfortable in speaking with my foreign language teacher.

13. I feel anxious in reading/writing and grammar class.

14. I get upset due to the method of testing in the foreign language class.

15. I get anxious when I feel that I can't speak well in front of other language students not in my class.

16. I get nervous when looking at my grades.
17. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.

18. During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.

19. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.

20. I feel nervous when talking in the foreign language to someone I just met.

21. I get nervous when the language teacher gives us a lot of things to do in so little time.

22. I feel overwhelmed by the number of grammatical rules I have to learn in the foreign language.

23. I fear pronouncing words incorrectly in my foreign language class.

24. I fear failing my foreign language class.

25. I feel low self-confidence about speaking the foreign language in front of the class.

26. I feel anxious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.

27. I feel nervous when I am around more experienced foreign language users.

28. I don't feel anxious when learning a foreign language.

29. In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.

30. I feel anxious when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in the foreign language.

31. I feel anxious when I want to volunteer to say something but can't find the proper words to say it in my foreign language class.

32. I feel nervous at English exam time.

33. I feel nervous when standing or giving a presentation in front of the class.
APPENDIX C
Cognitive Test Anxiety Scale (Thomas et al., 2018)

(A = Not at all typical of me, B = Only somewhat typical of me, C = Quite typical of me, and D = Very typical of me.)

1. I lose sleep over worrying about examinations.
2. While taking an important examination, I find myself wondering whether the other students are doing better than I am.
3. I have less difficulty than the average college student in getting test instructions straight.
4. I tend to freeze up on things like intelligence tests and final exams.
5. I am less nervous about tests than the average college student.
6. During tests, I find myself thinking of the consequences of failing.
7. At the beginning of a test, I am so nervous that I often can’t think straight.
8. The prospect of taking a test in one of my courses would not cause me to worry.
9. I am more calm in test situations than the average college student.
10. I have less difficulty than the average college student in learning assigned chapters in textbooks.
11. My mind goes blank when I am pressured for an answer on a test.
12. During tests, the thought frequently occurs to me that I may not be too bright.
13. I do well in speed tests in which there are time limits.
14. During a course examination, I get so nervous that I forget facts I really know.
15. After taking a test, I feel I could have done better than I actually did.
16. I worry more about doing well on tests than I should.
17. Before taking a test, I feel confident and relaxed.
18. While taking a test, I feel confident and relaxed.
19. During tests, I have the feeling that I am not doing well.

20. When I take a test that is difficult, I feel defeated before I even start.

21. Finding unexpected questions on a test causes me to feel challenged rather than panicky.

22. I am a poor test taker in the sense that my performance on a test does not show how much I really know about a topic.

23. I am not good at taking tests.

24. When I first get my copy of a test, it takes me a while to calm down to the point where I can begin to think straight.

25. I feel under a lot of pressure to get good grades on tests.

26. I do not perform well on tests.

27. When I take a test, my nervousness causes me to make careless errors.
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