CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Review of Related Literature

1. Anxiety

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope in 1986 were among the first researchers that devise the Foreign Language Classroom Scale (FLCAS) as a research instrument that focused particularly on feelings of anxiety experienced by foreign language learners in the classroom.[1] They characterized language anxiety based on three factors, which are communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation and a general feeling of anxiety.

According to Horwitz, anxiety is a kind of troubled feeling in the mind. It is a subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the automatic nervous system.[2] Scovel classified anxiety into three types: trait anxiety, state anxiety and situation-specific anxiety.

Trait anxiety refers to "a more permanent predisposition to be anxious" while state and situation-specific anxiety are usually experienced in relation to some particular event or situation.[3] English anxiety, the target of this reseach belongs to the last category, which refers to the students experienced when a situation requires the use of English as a foreign language when the individual is not fully proficient.

---

[1] Nur Afi qah binti Ab. Latif, *A Study on English Language Anxiety among Adult Learners in Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM)*, Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 208 (2015): 227

[2] Janaki Sinnasamy and Noor Harun Abdul Karim, *A Correlational Study of Foreign Language Anxiety and Library Anxiety Among Non-native Speakers of English: A Case Study in a Malaysian Public University*, The Journal of Academic Librarianship 40 (2014) 432

[3] Zhao Na, *A Study of High School Students' English Learning Anxiety*, The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, Volume 9, Issue 3, (2007): 23

Hodges claimed that "research on self effortin online environments is in its infancy".[4] In fact, how self effort manifests in online learning contexts deserves additional research and studies. Although different learning settings are assumed, little empirical research on self efforthas been conducted with a focus on all three settings in online learning environments.

In their recent study, Cho and Kim found that the number of online courses students took is not related to their self-regulation for interaction with others.[5] They viewed other factors, such as task structures for interaction and requirements for interaction, including quality and the number of online interaction may be associated with self-regulation for interaction with others.

Although Cho and Kim's study is not directly related to language anxiety, their findings imply that online learning activity may not necessarily predict English language anxiety. Because we have two reasonable but contrastinghy possible answer and because little research has been done to investigate the relationship between online experience and English language anxiety as foreign language, this research findings will contribute to the expansion of understanding that relationship.

2. Online Learning Activity

Online learning activity is almost similar to online school or online course. Many online courses were established. Some example of the course are futurelearn.com, coursera.org alison.com, and indonesiax.co.id. Both of them are using virtual learning, virtual classes, and materials that can be accessed via the internet. Students or participants in every online course or online school will get a certificate if they are able to complete all

[4] Hodges, C. B. (2008). *Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research*. Performance Improvement Quarterly, 20(3–4), 7–25.

[5] Cho, M. -H., & Kim, B. J. (2013). *Students' self-regulation for interaction with others in online learning environments.* Internet and Higher Education, 17, 69–75.

the tasks and understand all material and following the whole learning process.

The literature for online education supports that although students report a preference for online learning, it is not more time saving for faculty. According to Taft, Perkowski, and Martin, the workload and intensity of effort for faculty are heavier for online education than for classroom education.[6]

In terms of social interaction, Cho and Jonassen found two dimensions of online learning: to interact with instructors and to contribute to the online community.[7] In addition, they found that students who have high self effort in interacting with instructors and contributing to the online community are more likely to use active interaction strategies, such as writing, responding, and reflecting. According to Cho and Jonassen researchers of online learning activity should consider diverse situations that can occur in online learning contexts, such as interacting with others through discussion or collaboration. Hodges claimed that "research on online environments is in its infancy".

The current study shows that three dimensions of online self-efficacy are related to social interactions among students and between students and instructors. Although diverse learning settings are assumed, little empirical research on it has been conducted with a focus on all three settings in online learning environments.[8] The nature of online learning requires students to interact actively with both instructors and classmates. Especially those students with less experience may experience anxiety about interacting with others and may feel social isolation if they perceive lack of support from others.

---

[6] Taft, S. H., Perkowski, T., & Martin, L. S. (2011). *A framework for evaluating class size in online education.* The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 12(3), 181–197.

[7] Cho, M. -H., & Jonassen, D. (2009). *Development of the human interaction dimension of the Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire in asynchronous online learning environments.* Educational Psychology, 29, 117–138.

[8] Hodges, C. B. (2008). *Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research.* Performance Improvement Quarterly, 20(3–4), 7–25.

Online literature suggests that instructors should create social presence and teaching presence to foster a sense of learning community.[9] Possible examples to promote social interactions with others include instructors' direct interactions efforts, such as participating in discussion boards.[10] providing guidelines for social interaction, recognizing students' contribution to online learning community[11] and monitoring students' social interaction processes. [12]

B. Review of Previous Studies

Online Learning experience measured with the number of online courses was a significant predictor for two beliefs: self wonder to complete an online course and self-efficacy to interact with classmates for academic purposes. This finding indicates that the students who took more online courses were more likely to have higher online learning energy to complete an online course; in addition, they were more likely to communicate and collaborate with other students on academic tasks.

The finding or another research academic status was not related with most of the dimensions of online learning activity, which was consistent with other studies; for example, Artino and Stephens found

[9] Yang, C. -C., Tsai, I. -C., Kim, B., Cho, M. -H., & Laffey, J. M. (2006). *Exploring the relationships between students' academic motivation and social ability in online learning environments.* The Internet and Higher Education, 9, 277–286.

[10] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

[11] Shea, P., Li, C. S., & Pickett, A. (2006). *A study of teaching presence and student sense of learning community in fully online and web-enhanced college courses*. Internet and Higher Education, 9, 175–190.

[12] Cho, M. -H., & Kim, B. J. (2013). *Students' self-regulation for interaction with others in online learning environments.* Internet and Higher Education, 17, 69–75.

no significant difference in self-efficacy between undergraduates and graduates students.[13]

Many research findings indicated that student effort was a significant predictor of both the satisfaction of online learners and their intention to take future web-based courses. Lin, Lin, and Laffey investigated students' task value, self-efficacy, social ability and learning satisfaction.[14] Among participants from 11 online courses in a distance learning program, the researchers found that task value, and social ability significantly impacted online learning satisfaction.

The current study shows that three dimensions of online learning activity are related to social interactions among students and between students and instructors. The nature of online learning requires students to interact actively with both instructors and classmates. Especially those students with less experience may experience anxiety about interacting with others and may feel social isolation if they perceive lack of support from others. Online literature suggests that instructors should create social presence and teaching presence to foster a sense of learning community. [15]

Possible examples to promote social interactions with others include instructors' direct interactions efforts, such as participating in discussion boards,[16] providing guidelines for social interaction,

---

[13] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

[14] Lin, Y. M., Lin, G., & Laffey, J. (2008). *Building a social and motivational framework for understanding satisfaction in online learning.* Journal of Educational Computing Research, 38(1), 1–27.

[15] Yang, C. -C., Tsai, I. -C., Kim, B., Cho, M. -H., & Laffey, J. M. (2006). Exploring the relationships between students' academic motivation and social ability in online learning environments. The Internet and Higher Education, 9, 277–286.

[16] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

recognizing students' contribution to online learning community,[17] and monitoring students' social interaction processes.[18]

Most of people have to deal with anxiety when they learn english as foreign language because nervous, affraid of making mistakes, upset when they don't understand what the teacher said, comparing their language achievement with their friends, afraid that the other students will laugh at them when they speak the foreign language, and fear of embarrassing things happen to them. [19] Womble, investigated the relationship between e-learning and e-leaner satisfaction among 440 government agency employees in training courses, found significant and positive correlation between them.[20]

A recent study by Oliver, Kellogg, and Patel reporting that students who enrolled in online foreign-language courses at North Carolina Virtual Public School, had significantly less positive perceptions of their courses than students who taking other subjects by offline. Among intermediate and advanced foreign-language students in the same study, just 19% students admited that they learned as much in online courses as in offline ones. Yet, the extent to which Oliver et al.'s participants learned their target languages in online vs. offline courses remained unclear.[21]

Among all subjects, foreign languages are especially challenging to learn online. A meta-analysis by Cavanaugh found that, among all online subject areas, only online foreign-language courses produced

---

[17] Shea, P., Li, C. S., & Pickett, A. (2006). *A study of teaching presence and student sense of learning community in fully online and web-enhanced college courses.* Internet and Higher Education, 9, 175–190.

[18] Cho, M. -H., Shen, D., & Laffey, J. (2010). *The role of metacognitive self-regulation (MSR) on social presence and sense of community in online learning environments*. Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 21(3), 297–316.

[19] Murat Hismanoglu, *Foreign language anxiety of English language teacher candidates: A sample from Turkey*, 932-933

[20] Womble, J. (2008). *E-learning: The relationship among learner satisfaction, self-efficacy,and usefulness.* The Business Review, 10(1), 182–188.

[21] Oliver, K., Kellogg, S., & Patel, R. (2012). An investigation into reported differences between online foreign language instruction and other subject areas in a virtual school. CALICO Journal, 29(2), 269–296.

negative learning effects. Given that Cavanaugh's study was conducted more than 15 years ago, and dramatic changes in online learning have taken place over the past few years, its findings could well be obsolete.[22] Many findings demonstrate differences in all dimensions of online learning and students interact socially with classmates. Female students have significantly higher power than male students. Online instructors may need to provide additional support for male students to help them develop online self-efficacy. Possible instructional strategies include paying extra attention to male students' learning processes, providing immediate feedback and assistance, supporting them in the completion of tasks, and encouraging them to interact with others by sending an individual note or recognizing their contributions to the development of an online learning community.

In terms of social interaction, Cho and Jonassen found two dimensions of online self-efficacy: self effort to interact with instructors and contribute to the online community.[23] In addition, they found that students who have high self effort in interacting with instructors and contributing to the online community are more likely to use active interaction strategies, such as writing, responding, and reflecting.

According to Cho and Jonassen researchers of online learning self effortshould consider diverse situations that can occur in online learning contexts, such as interacting with others through discussion or collaboration. Hodges claimed that "research on self effortin online environments is in its infancy"; in fact, how self effortmanifests in online learning contexts deserves additional research and studies. Although diverse learning settings are assumed, little empirical

[22] Lin C.-H., Zhang Y. & Zheng B., *The roles of learning strategies and motivation in online language learning: A structural equation modeling analysis*, Computers & Education (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.05.014.

[23] Cho, M. -H., & Jonassen, D. (2009). *Development of the human interaction dimension of the Self-Regulated Learning Questionnaire in asynchronous online learning environments.* Educational Psychology, 29, 117–138.

research on self efforthas been conducted with a focus on all three settings in online learning environments.[24]

The current study shows that three dimensions of online self effortare related to social interactions among students and between students and instructors. The nature of online learning requires students to interact actively with both instructors and classmates. Especially those students with less experience may experience anxiety about interacting with others and may feel social isolation if they perceive lack of support from others. Online literature suggests that instructors should create social presence and teaching presence to foster a sense of learning community.[25]

Last, academic status was not related with most of the dimensions of online learning self preseption, which was consistent with other studies; for example, Artino and Stephens found no significant difference in self different between undergraduates and graduates. In the current study, academic status predicted self effortto handle tools in a CMS only; in other words, graduate students tended to have higher levels of technological self effortthan undergraduate students perhaps because graduate students had more experience with online learning technology and perhaps because more graduate level courses were delivered online than undergraduate courses.[26] This was verified by the number of online courses taken by undergraduate and graduate students.

Three variables including gender, online experience, and academic status were related to online learning self effortto some extent. First, genderwas a significant predictor of all the self effortbeliefs except self effortto interact socially with classmates. In general, the results demonstrate that female students were likely to

---

[24] Hodges, C. B. (2008). *Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research.* Performance Improvement Quarterly, 20(3–4), 7–25.

[25] Yang, C. -C., Tsai, I. -C., Kim, B., Cho, M. -H., & Laffey, J. M. (2006). *Exploring the relationships between students' academic motivation and social ability in online learning environments.* The Internet and Higher Education, 9, 277–286.

[26] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

have higher online learning self effortthan male students, implying that female students may be more active, seek more help, or function better than male students. Our results are consistent with Gebara's study, demonstrating that female students reported higher level of online self effortthan male students.[27]

Second, online experience measured with the number of online courses was a significant predictor for two self effortbeliefs: selfefficacy to complete an online course and self effort to interact with classmates for academic purposes. This finding indicates that the students who took more online courses were more likely to have higher online learning self effortto complete an online course; in addition, they were more likely to communicate and collaborate with other students on academic tasks. However, online experience was not significantly related to self effortto interact socially with classmates, self effortto handle tools in a CMS, and self effort to interact with instructors in an online course.

Last, academic statuswas not related with most of the dimensions of online learning self-efficacy, which was consistent with other studies; for example, Artino and Stephens found no significant difference in self effortbetween undergraduates and graduates.[28]

The current study shows that three dimensions of online learning to social interactions among students and between students and instructors. The nature of online learning requires students to interact actively with both instructors and classmates. Especially those students with less experience may experience anxiety about interacting with others and may feel social isolation if they perceive lack of support from others. Online literature suggests that instructors should create social presence and teaching presence to foster a sense of learning community. [29]

---

[27] Gebara, N. L. (2010). *General self-efficacy and course satisfaction in online learning: A correlational*
study. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri.

[28] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

[29] Yang, C. -C., Tsai, I. -C., Kim, B., Cho, M. -H., & Laffey, J. M. (2006). Exploring the relationships between students' academic motivation and

Possible examples to promote social interactions with others include instructors' direct interactions efforts, such as participating in discussion boards,[30] providing guidelines for social interaction, recognizing students' contribution to online learning community,[31] and monitoring students' social interaction processes.[32]

The feeling in language learning activity has been reported as a consistent variable in predicting students' learning satisfaction in online learning environments. Womble, who investigated the relationship between e-learning selfefficacy and e-leaner satisfaction among 440 government agency employees in training courses, found significant and positive correlation between them.[33] Lim examined the relationships among computer self-efficacy, academic self-concept, satisfaction, and future participation of adult distance learners.[34]

Self-directed learning provides students opportunity to develop autonomy. One of the largest challenges for online learning from both a student and faculty perspective is the LMS.[35] Students' active regulation of learning, through being motivated and a variety of

---

social ability in online learning environments. The Internet and Higher Education, 9, 277–286.

[30] Artino, A. R. (2008).*Motivational beliefs andperceptions of instructional quality: Predicting satisfaction with online training.* Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24, 260–270.

[31] Shea, P., Li, C. S., & Pickett, A. (2006). *A study of teaching presence and student sense of learning community in fully online and web-enhanced college courses.* Internet and Higher Education, 9, 175–190.

[32] Cho, M. -H., Shen, D., & Laffey, J. (2010). *The role of metacognitive self-regulation (MSR) on social presence and sense of community in online learning environments*. Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 21(3), 297–316.

[33] Womble, J. (2008). *E-learning: The relationship among learner satisfaction, self-efficacy,and usefulness.* The Business Review, 10(1), 182–188.

[34] Lim, C. K. (2001). *Computer self-efficacy, academic self-concept, and other predictors of satisfaction and future participation of adult distance learners.* The American Journal of Distance Education, 15(2), 41–50.

[35] Gummesson, C., & Nordmark, E. (2012). *Self-reflection in an online course—Reflecting learning strategies? Advances in Physiotherapy*, 14, 87–93. http://dx.doi.org/10. 3109/14038196.2012.671848.

cognitive and metacognitive strategies, is crucial to their online learning success. Despite the large numbers enrolled in online language courses, very little is known about students' motivation and strategy use in these learning environments, or how they may affect their online learning outcomes. This study helps fill this gap by examining students' motivation and learning-strategy use across a number of online language courses, and investigating the role of motivation and such strategies within the framework of selfregulated learning.

Self effort is context-specific.[36] In terms of online self-efficacy,we need to consider at least three areas: technology, learning, and social interaction; however, a majority of researchers of online self effortconsider only the technological aspect of online learning. Consequently, self effortin the other two areas has rarely been explored. With regard to technology, numerous studies have been conducted on the role of technological self effortin online student achievement.

For instance, McGhee found a significant,moderate, and positive relationship between online technological self effortand the academic achievement of 45 community college students.[37] Thompson and Lynch studied the psychological processes underlying resistance to web-based instruction (WBI) and demonstrated that students with weak Internet self effortbeliefs tended to resist WBI.

Beliefs about self effortdetermine level of motivation as reflected in the amount of effort exerted in an endeavor and the length of time persisting in a difficult situation.[38] Self preception is defined

---

[36] Bandura, A. (1988). *Self-regulation of motivation and action through goal systems. In V. Hamilton, G. H. Bower, & N. H. Frijda (Eds.),* Cognitive perspectives on emotion and motivation (pp. 37–61). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

[37] McGhee, R. M. H. (2010). *Asynchronous interaction, online technologies self-efficacy and self-regulated learning as predictors of academic achievement in an online class.* (Doctoral dissertation). Baton Rouge, LA: Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

[38] Bandura, A. (1988). *Self-regulation of motivation and action through goal systems. In V. Hamilton, G. H. Bower, & N. H. Frijda (Eds.),*

as “people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute a course of action required to attain designated types of performances”.[39] If a person has a low level of self efforttoward a task, he or she is less likely to exert effort; therefore, the person will less likely achieve. Other research findings have demonstrated that self effortis a better predictor of academic achievement than any other cognitive or affective processes;[40] therefore, self effortis critical in learning and performance.[41]

Student self effort seems particularly important in challenging learning environments, such as an online learning environment where students lack the opportunity to interact with others and as a result can become socially isolated and easily lost.[42] Recent studies have shown that the drop-out rateamong students in online learning environments is higher than in traditional learning environments.[43]

Among all subjects, foreign languages are especially challenging to learn online. A meta-analysis by Cavanaugh found that, among all online subject areas, only online foreign-language courses produced negative learning effects. Given that Cavanaugh’s study was conducted more than 15 years ago, and dramatic changes in online

---

Cognitive perspectives on emotion and motivation (pp. 37–61). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

[39] Bandura, A. (1988). *Self-regulation of motivation and action through goal systems. In V. Hamilton, G. H. Bower, & N. H. Frijda (Eds.),* Cognitive perspectives on emotion and motivation (pp. 37–61). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

[40] Schunk, D. H. (1991). *Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist*, 26, 207–231.

[41] Schunk, D. H. (1991). *Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist*, 26, 207–231.

[42] Cho, M. -H., Shen, D., & Laffey, J. (2010). *The role of metacognitive self-regulation (MSR) on social presence and sense of community in online learning environments*. Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 21(3), 297–316.

[43] Ali, R., & Leeds, E. (2009). *The impact of face-to-face orientation on online student retention: A pilot study.* Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 12(4) (Retrieved from , http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter124/ali124.html)

learning have taken place over the past few years, its findings could well be obsolete.[44]

A more recent study reporting that students enrolled in online foreign-language courses at Virtual Public School had significantly less positive perceptions of their courses than students taking other subjects had of theirs. Among intermediate and advanced foreign-language students in the same study, just perceived that they learned as much in online courses as in offline ones. Yet, the extent to which Oliver et al.'s participants learned their target languages in online vs. offline courses remained unclear.

Many findings demonstrate differences in all dimensions of online interact socially with classmates. Female students have significantly higher self effort than male students. Online instructors may need to provide additional support for male students to help them develop online self-efficacy. Possible instructional strategies include paying extra attention to male students' learning processes, providing immediate feedback and assistance, supporting them in the completion of tasks, and encouraging them to interact with others by sending an individual note or recognizing their contributions to the development of an online learning community.

Some researchers have asserted that the drop-out rate is related in part to lack of self-efficacy.[45] Researchers have argued that with the self-directed nature of online learning, self effortcan be a key component of academic success in distance education.[46] therefore, understanding self effortin online learning is critical to improve online education. The current study was an investigation of self effortin online learning settings. However, online experience was not significantly related to self effortto interact socially with classmates,

---

[44] Lin C.-H., Zhang Y. & Zheng B., *The roles of learning strategies and motivation in online language learning: A structural equation modeling analysis,* Computers & Education (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.05.014.

[45] Lee, Y., & Choi, J. (2011). *A review of online course dropout research: Implications for practice and future research*. Educational Technology Research and Development, 59, 593–618.

[46] Hodges, C. B. (2008). Self-efficacy in the context of online learning environments: A review of the literature and directions for research. Performance Improvement Quarterly, 20(3–4), 7–25.

self effortto handle tools in a CMS, and self effortto interact with instructors in an online course.

Even English learners' anxiety level has been explored in a number of studies, few of them have focused on online learning activity. Most of students anxiety are caused they lack to deal with other people, shy, afraid of making mistake, nervous, ect which only can accur when they learn English as a group, face to face. Whereas in an online , they just need to focus on themself and their mentor, without dealing with other students. Therefore this study aimed to investigate the correlation between online school student and their anxiety when they learn English as foreign language.