

## THE CORRELATION BETWEEN PRONUNCIATION ANXIETY AND MOTIVATION

Amedea Cathriona Maharia<sup>1,\*</sup>, Noor Rachmawaty<sup>2</sup>, dan Susilo<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UPT Bahasa Universitas Mulawarman

<sup>2</sup>FKIP Universitas Mulawarman

<sup>1,\*</sup>Email: [amedeacathriona@gmail.com](mailto:amedeacathriona@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This study reports on quantitative study, conducted among 48 English majors, examining the relationship between a language-skill-specific type of anxiety—pronunciation anxiety and motivation. Pronunciation anxiety is presented as a feeling of apprehension and worry deriving from negative self-perceptions, and beliefs. The fears related specifically to pronunciation (Baran–Lucarz, 2014). When motivation is concerned, it has been conceptualized on the basis of the L2 Motivational Self System Model (Dörnyei, 2005), as the desire to reach highest communication proficiency levels natively-like target language accent, represented by the ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 self. The result of the calculation to find the correlation between pronunciation anxiety and motivation were having correlation but not significant. The data from 2 questionnaires which were calculated by using Pearson product moment formula showed most of subcomponents of PMQ and MPA had correlation but not significant, only between pronunciation anxieties to talk outside the classroom with Criterion Measure which had correlation and they were significant. The results showed in the table that Pearson correlation between PA-cl and Criter.Meas were  $-0.777^*$ , it meant if the pronunciation anxiety to talk to native and non-native speaker outside the FL-classroom was high than the strength of desire to achieve target language native-like pronunciation free from L1 influenced would be low. There was correlation but not significant between the level of motivation to reach a target language, represented by the Ideal L2 Self and the Ought to L2 Self of high and low PA students. However, in the level of motivation between high and low PA students to become communicative in the TL, represented the Ideal L2 Self and Ought to L2 self was found significantly difference.

**Keywords:** Pronunciation anxiety, Self-perceptions, Motivation

### A. INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation is part of our tool to communicate like a native when we apply target language. Nowadays there are many studies that discuss about pronunciation in many forms. Some researchers find that anxiety can be as a tool to measure whether someone succeeds or not in target language (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991, p. 96). Anxiety involved in language acquisition, i.e. on taking in (input stage), retention (processing stage) and production (output stage) (Gregersen & MacIntyre, 2014). Anxiety also popular topic to discuss in many studies, usually anxiety link with other skill specific types such as (Kim, 2005), writing anxiety/apprehension (Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999), reading anxiety (Saito, Garza & Horwitz, 1999),

speaking anxiety (Woodrow, 2006), grammar anxiety (VanPatten & Glass, 1999), pronunciation anxiety (Baran–Lucarz, 2014). Despite the fact that they all belong to the class of anxiety related to foreign language learning, each of them has its own unique nature that might be triggered by other factors.

It is assumed that the pronunciation anxiety is accompanied by typical cognitive, physiological/somatic and behavioral symptoms of anxiety (e.g., Vasa & Pine, 2004). Baran–Lucarz, (2014) wrote some of the interrelated components in pronunciation anxiety as below:

- (1) Pronunciation self-efficacy and self-assessment—learners' perceptions about their inborn predisposition to acquire or learn a FL phonological system and about the level of the TL pronunciation they represent, which is usually formed by the students by them comparing themselves to classmates or other speakers of the TL;
- (2) Pronunciation self-image—FL learners' self-perceptions of the way they sound and look when speaking a FL, and their acceptance of the perceived self-image;
- (3) Fear of negative evaluation—learners' projection of being negatively assessed by their interlocutors/listeners (their classmates, teacher, native speakers or other non-native speakers), on the basis of their pronunciation;
- (4) A set of beliefs held by learners related to pronunciation, i.e. beliefs about its importance for successful communication, its level of difficulty for learners with a particular L1, and about the sound of the TL and attitudes towards it.

When someone being anxious, we try to seek other factors which may contribute to lower their pronunciation anxiety. Dornyei (2015) wrote 3 components of motivation. There are :

- (1) the ideal L2 self (what one would like to become) and the desire to reduce the discrepancy between it and the actual L2 self,
- (2) the ought-to L2 self (social pressure), typically identified with the wish to avoid experiencing the negative outcomes of having not fulfilled the expectations of others, and
- (3) the previous L2 learning experience and motives deriving from it (e.g., taking pleasure from the course, the positive influence of experiencing smaller and bigger successes in learning).

Motivation and anxiety always become the topic in recent years. There are many studies have discussed about Motivation and anxiety, one of them is from Malgorzata Baran-Lurcaz (2017) "*FL Pronunciation Anxiety and Motivation: Results of a Mixed Method Study*". In previous study, Baran Lucarz (2017) used mixed method study with 78 participants from English major, divided into two groups female and male. The study used 2 items of questionnaire that was not distributed on the same day. Measure Pronunciation Anxiety (MPA) was distributed at the beginning of the Phonetic lesson and Pronunciation Motivation Questionnaire was distributed at the end of the phonetic class. The distribution was conducted in different time to prevent students for feeling overwhelmed to fill the questionnaire.

The result showed that statistically significant scores were achieved in the case of beliefs, students held about the sound of TL. Beliefs about the important of pronunciation for communication were concerned, a positive correlation was found with the total PMQ score and the criterion measure indicating that the belief of

participants went hand in hand with their desire to reach highest levels in pronunciation and actual and intended effort put into improving pronunciation.

## B. METHOD

To find out whether motivation was related to pronunciation anxiety and whether there was significant different between students with high pronunciation anxiety and students with low pronunciation anxiety, a study was conducted in English Department Mulawarman University, which was addressed to sixth semester English Department Students. There were two parts of questionnaire to answer the research questions as follow. Questions addressing the link between PA and motivation to reach a TL native-like-accent:

1. Does motivation have any correlation with pronunciation anxiety ?
2. Which component of motivation and pronunciation anxiety that has correlation?
3. Is there any significant different between students with high pronunciation anxiety and students with low pronunciation anxiety?

The questionnaire was adopted from Baran–Lucarz (2017) for *Measuring Pronunciation Anxiety* was applied. The MPA was a self-report questionnaire consisting of 50 statements with a 6-point Likert scale (agree/disagree). It constituted a modified version of an earlier instrument—the Measure of Pronunciation Anxiety in the FL Classroom (Baran–Lucarz, 2014; Baran–Lucarz, 2016) and was addressed to average learners. The elements of questionnaire as follows: general FL oral performance apprehension (8 items—from 1 to 8 on the MPA;  $\alpha = 0.89$ ), pronunciation self-efficacy and self-assessment, (7 items—from 9 to 15;  $\alpha = 0.83$ ), pronunciation self-image (8 items—from 16 to 20 and 22 to 24;  $\alpha = 0.66$ ), fear of negative evaluation (8 items, i.e. 25, 27, 28, 33, 34, 37-39;  $\alpha = 0.86$ ), beliefs about the nature/sound of the TL (3 items, i.e. 26, 30, 31;  $\alpha = 0.80$ ), beliefs about the importance of pronunciation for communication (3 items, i.e. 21, 32, 35;  $\alpha = 0.70$ ), beliefs about difficulties with learning TL pronunciation by learners representing a particular L1 (PA 3 items, 29, 36, 40;  $\alpha = 0.72$ ), PA when talking to native and non-native speakers outside the FL classroom (10 items—from 41 to 50;  $\alpha = 0.93$ ). The internal consistency value of the entire scale reached the level of 0.95 ( $df = 76$ ;  $p < 0.0005$ ). The subjects could achieve a minimum of 50 points and a maximum of 300 points. The higher the individuals scored, the more anxious they were considered to be.

To learn about the students' level of motivation to achieve high levels in pronunciation, a 29-item Pronunciation Motivation Questionnaire was designed (see Appendix 2), which had a similar format to the MPA, i.e. the respondents were to agree to various extent with the statements provided. The basis for operationalizing the construct was the L2 Motivational Self System proposed by Dörnyei (2005). The subscales of the instrument and their internal reliability values were as follows:

- (1) The criterion measure, which entailed the strength of desire to achieve TL nativelike pronunciation, free from L1 influences (4 items—1, 2, 5, 6), and the actual and planned effort put into pronunciation practice (5 items—from 7 to 11). The Cronbach alpha for this subscale was  $\alpha = 0.74$ .
- (2) Ideal L2 self—pronunciation—6 items (12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25), most of which referred to visualizing/imagining oneself as a successful TL speaker characterized by native-like accent ( $\alpha = 0.63$ ).

- (3) Ought-to self—pronunciation, (3 items—23, 26, 28), referring to the assumption that it is generally expected or that the tastes believe that significant others want them to speak the target language with a near-native-like accent ( $\alpha = 0.68$ ).
- (4) Ideal L2 self—communicative competence (8 items—3, 4, 13–15, 18, 19, 22), denoting the proneness of the participants to picture themselves being highly proficient speakers of English, able to communicate fluently and effortlessly on any topic ( $\alpha = 0.73$ ).
- (5) Ought-to self—communicative competence (3 items—24, 27, 29), referring to the belief that high proficiency in the TL is generally a must for all the English majors or that it is considered to be necessary from the perspective of the participants' significant others ( $\alpha = 0.61$ ).

The higher the students scored on the scale, the more motivated they were considered to be.

### C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After gathering the data, the researcher computing all data by using excel and SPSS. The results are presented in table.

Although the participants from English Department, we'd likely to assume that they would have low anxiety level and high motivation, and we probably assumed that anxiety and motivation has strong connection in learning foreign language. However, we found that The achieved values displayed in the below tables show that the levels of both PA and pronunciation motivation (PM) varied among the students, implying that in each case the scores were normally distributed, which the descriptive statistics indeed reveal.

**Table 1. Pronunciation Motivation Questionnaire, N = 48**

PMQ	Mean	Median	SD
PM total	100.14	104.00	15.74
Criterion Meas.	107.11	105.00	14.19
IS-pr	96.50	105.50	21.08
OS-pr	77.67	78.00	6.50
IS-com	105.50	110.00	11.80
OS-com	98.00	98.00	1.00

PMQ Total total score, entailing desire and effort (criterion measures), IS-pr Ideal self—pronunciation; OS-pr ought-to self—pronunciation; IS-com ideal self—communicative competence; OS-com ought-to self—communicative competence.

**Table 2. Measure of Pronunciation Anxiety, N = 48**

MPA	Mean	Median	SD
PA total	41.24	41.50	7.31
SE/SA	42.14	41.00	7.75
SI	43.12	40.50	9.78
FNE-cl	37.75	38.00	6.15
B-sound	42.00	43.00	8.54
B-com	46.67	43.00	7.23
B-diff	39.00	39.00	3.00
PA-outcl	43.50	42.50	5.17

MPA Total MPA total score; SE self-efficacy; SA self-assessment; SI self-image; FNE-cl fear of negative evaluation in the FL classroom; PA-outcl pronunciation anxiety outside the FL classroom; B-sound beliefs about the sound of the

TL; B-com beliefs about the importance of pronunciation for effective communication; B-diff beliefs about difficulty of TL pronunciation learning.

In table 3, it showed the total mean score of PMQ and MPA and most of subcomponents in PMQ and MPA has correlation but they were not significant. Only between pronunciation anxieties to talk outside the classroom (PA-cl) with Criterion Measure (Criter.Meas) which had correlation and they were significant. The result in the table showed that Pearson correlation between PA-cl and Criter.Meas were  $-.777^*$ , it meant if the pronunciation anxiety to talk to native and non-native speaker outside the FL-classroom was high than the strength of desire to achieve target language native-like pronunciation free from L1 influenced will be low, in other word, when Criterion Meas was high than the PA-cl will be low.

		PM Total	Criter. Meas	IS-pr	OS-pr	Is-com	OS-com
PM Total	Pearson Correlation	1	.830**	.278	-.989	.279	-.327
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006	.594	.093	.504	.788
	N	29	9	6	3	8	3
Criter. Meas	Pearson Correlation	.830**	1	.451	-.984	.529	-.295
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006		.369	.114	.177	.809
	N	9	9	6	3	8	3
IS-pr	Pearson Correlation	.278	.451	1	-.775	-.028	.203
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.594	.369		.436	.959	.870
	N	6	6	6	3	6	3
OS-pr	Pearson Correlation	-.989	-.984	-.775	1	-.985	.461
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.093	.114	.436		.109	.695
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3
Is-com	Pearson Correlation	.279	.529	-.028	-.985	1	-.606
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.504	.177	.959	.109		.585
	N	8	8	6	3	8	3
OS-com	Pearson Correlation	-.327	-.295	.203	.461	-.606	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.788	.809	.870	.695	.585	
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3
MPA Total	Pearson Correlation	.087	-.049	.183	.994	-.151	.359
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.654	.901	.729	.071	.721	.766
	N	29	9	6	3	8	3
SE/SA	Pearson Correlation	-.624	-.507	.198	.593	-.044	.988
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.134	.246	.707	.595	.926	.099
	N	7	7	6	3	7	3
SI	Pearson Correlation	-.430	-.251	.484	.996	.138	.541
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.287	.548	.331	.059	.745	.636
	N	8	8	6	3	8	3
FNE-cl	Pearson Correlation	.089	.126	-.548	-.843	.666	-.866
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.833	.767	.260	.362	.071	.333
	N	8	8	6	3	8	3
B-nat	Pearson Correlation	.421	.391	-.103	-.549	.684	-.995
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.723	.744	.934	.630	.521	.065
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3
B-com	Pearson Correlation	-.799	-.779	-.378	.878	-.947	.829
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.410	.432	.753	.318	.208	.377
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3
B-diff	Pearson Correlation	.655	.680	.950	-.538	.386	.500
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.546	.524	.203	.638	.748	.667
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3
PA-outcl	Pearson Correlation	-.514	-.777*	-.486	.843	-.411	.866
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.129	.014	.328	.362	.312	.333
	N	10	9	6	3	8	3

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

After finding the correlation between two variables, t-test analysis was conducted to provide answers in research questions. To examine the level of



motivation of high and low pronunciation anxiety. Thus, researcher divided into two groups High PA and Low PA participants. The mean, standard deviation and results of the t-test are displayed in Tables below

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PMQ TOTAL	High	29	59.5172	11.20147	2.08006
	Low	29	48.4483	8.68326	1.61244

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PMQ TOTAL	Equal variances assumed	2.113	.152	4.206	56	.000	11.06897	2.63185	5.79674	16.34119
	Equal variances not assumed			4.206	52.724	.000	11.06897	2.63185	5.78950	16.34843

The result showed that the group means were statistically significant difference because the Sig(2-tailed) was  $0.00 < 0.05$ . The significant difference in total score of Pronunciation Motivation Questionnaire in lower group ( $48.45 \pm 8.68$ ) was lower than high group ( $59.52 \pm 11.20$ ),  $t(46) = 4.21, p=0.00$

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
IS-pr	HIGH PA	6	56.5000	14.93653	6.09781
	LOW PA	6	52.3333	11.03932	4.50679

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
IS-pr	Equal variances assumed	1.662	.226	.550	10	.595	4.16667	7.58251	-12.72922	21.06155
	Equal variances not assumed			.550	9.207	.596	4.16667	7.58251	-12.92753	21.26086

In *Ideal Self Pronunciation* means were no found significantly difference between low and high group because the Sig(2-tailed) more than  $> 0.05$

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS-pr	HIGH PA	3	42.0000	7.00000	4.04145
	LOW PA	3	38.6667	.57735	.33333

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
OS-pr	Equal variances assumed	3.267	.145	.822	4	.457	3.33333	4.05518	-7.92564	14.59230
	Equal variances not assumed			.822	2.027	.496	3.33333	4.05518	-13.89216	20.55893

In *Ought-to-Self-pronunciation* there were no significantly difference between high and low group because the Sig(2-tailed) more than  $> 0.05$

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
IS-com	HIGH PA	8	62.1250	8.21910	2.90589
	LOW PA	8	51.0000	5.87975	2.07880

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
IS-com	Equal variances assumed	1.382	.259	3.114	14	.008	11.12500	3.57290	3.46189	18.78811
	Equal variances not assumed			3.114	12.678	.008	11.12500	3.57290	3.38622	18.86378

In *Ideal L2 Self Communicate Competence* means there were significantly difference because Sig(2-tailed) less than 0.05 . The lower group reached lower score ( $51.00 \pm 5.87$ ) than high group ( $62.13 \pm 8.21$ ),  $t(46) = 3.114, p=0.008$

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OS-com	HIGH PA	3	57.6667	2.08167	1.20185
	LOW PA	3	47.3333	.57735	.33333

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
OS-com	Equal variances assumed	5.000	.089	8.285	4	.001	10.33333	1.24722	6.87050	13.79817
	Equal variances not assumed			8.285	2.306	.009	10.33333	1.24722	5.59461	15.07205

Artivato WinDraw

*Comparing means of Ought to Self-Communicative competence* showed significantly difference because the means were less then 0.05. It showed, there were significantly difference between lower group ( $47.33 \pm 0.58$ ) than high group ( $57.67 \pm 2.08$ ),  $t(46)8.29, p=0.001$ .

The result of the calculation to find the correlation between pronunciation anxiety and motivation were having correlation but not significant. The data from 2 questionnaire which were calculated by using Pearson product moment formula showed most of subcomponents of PMQ and MPA had correlation but not significant, only between pronunciation anxieties to talk outside the classroom (PA-cl) with Criterion Measure (Criter.Meas) which had correlation and they were significant. The result in the table showed that Pearson correlation between PA-cl and Criter.Meas were  $-0.777^*$ , it meant if the pronunciation anxiety to talk to native and non-native speaker outside the F1-classroom was high than the strength of desire to achieve target language native-like pronunciation free from L1 influenced will be low, in other word, when Criterion Meas was high than the PA-cl will be low.

The second result, researcher found that most of lack of relationship pronunciation anxiety and its subcomponents with L2 ought to self. Researcher also found that Fear of Negative evaluation had correlation but not significant with motivation to achieve native-like accent or high speaking proficiency. Pronunciation

anxiety when talking to native and non-native speaker outside the classroom also show correlation with the strength of desire to achieve native-like pronunciation, free from L1 influences.

The result of independent t-test also showed that most of the comparison between students with high pronunciation anxiety and students with low pronunciation anxiety had significantly difference in total of Pronunciation Motivation Questionnaire, Ideal L2 Self Communicative Comprehend and Ought to Self-Communication. Meanwhile, there were no significantly difference in Ought to Self-Pronunciation and Ideal L2 Self Pronunciation. Thus, we can conclude there was no significant difference between the level of motivation to reach a TL native-like accent, represented by the Ideal L2 Self and the Ought to L2 Self of high and low PA students. However, in the level of motivation between high and low PA students to become communicative in the T1, represented the Ideal L2 Self and Ought to L2 self was found significantly difference

#### **D. CONCLUSION**

Correlation between pronunciation anxiety and motivation were having correlation but not significant. The result in the table showed that Pearson correlation between PA-cl and Criter.Meas were  $-0.777^*$ , it meant if the pronunciation anxiety to talk to native and non-native speaker outside the Fl-classroom was high than the strength of desire to achieve target language native-like pronunciation free from L1 influenced will be low, in other word, when Criterion Meas was high than the PA-cl will be low. there were no significantly difference in Ought to Self-Pronunciation and Ideal L2 Self Pronunciation. Thus, we can conclude there was no significant difference between the level of motivation to reach a TL native-like accent

#### **REFERENCES**

- Baran-Lucarz, M. (2014). The link between pronunciation anxiety and willingness to communicate in the foreign-language classroom: The Polish EFL context. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 70(4), 445–473. doi:10.3138/cmlr.2666
- Baran-Lucarz M. (2017) FL pronunciation anxiety and motivation: results of a mixed method study. *Language Learning*
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49, 417–449.
- Clément, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*,
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.



- Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning*, 63(3), 437–462.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research. Construction, administration, and processing*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Gregersen, T. (2006). The despair of disparity: The connection between foreign language anxiety and the recognition of proficiency differences in L2 skills. *Lenguas Modernas*, 31, 7–20.
- Gregersen, T., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). *Capitalizing on language learners' individuality: From premise to practice*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety in language learning: A review of the literature. *Language Learning*, 41, 85–117.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *Sage Publications*, 37 (3), 308–328. doi:10.1177/0033688206071315