The Correlation between Listening Anxiety and Listening Skill among B-1 Level EFL Learners in an Indonesian Kampung Inggris Pare Program
Korelasi antara Kecemasan Mendengarkan dan Keterampilan Mendengarkan di Kalangan Pembelajar EFL Tingkat B-1 dalam Program Kampung Inggris Pare di Indonesia

Fizky Laurenza[1)], Niko Ferdiyanto [*,2)]

[1)]Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia
[2)] Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia
*Email Penulis Korespondensi: nikoferdiyanto@umsida.ac.id

Abstract. *Listening is a major source of input for Indonesian learners in an intensive program of Kampung Inggris, yet it is often stressful. This study investigates the relationship between foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA), a language-specific, non-test-bound affect, and listening achievement among B1-level EFL learners in a Kampung Inggris program. A CEFR B1 listening test based on the TOEFL and an adolescent-adapted FLLA questionnaire are completed by 40 students using a cross-sectional correlational design. A brief B1 hearing screening assignment and the institute's placement test are used to confirm B1 competency. The FLLA performance relationship is investigated using reliability, correlation, and basic regression analysis. The researchers postulated a negative correlation based on research on anxiety dynamics, cognitive load, and assessment format. Findings informed low-anxiety, strategy-aware teaching and CEFR A2-B1 listening test design in Indonesian EFL contexts*

Keywords *– Foreign language listening anxiety; Listening comprehension; B1 level; Kampung Inggris; assessment design*

Abstrak. *Listening merupakan sumber utama masukan bahasa bagi pembelajar Indonesia dalam program intensif Kampung Inggris, namun kegiatan ini sering menimbulkan stres. Penelitian ini mengkaji hubungan antara foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA), yaitu afek spesifik-bahasa yang tidak terikat pada situasi ujian, dan pencapaian menyimak pada pembelajar EFL tingkat B1 dalam program Kampung Inggris. Dengan desain korelasional potong lintang (cross-sectional correlational), 40 peserta mengerjakan kuesioner FLLA versi adaptasi remaja serta tes listening CEFR level B1 yang dimodelkan dari TOEFL. Kemahiran B1 dikonfirmasi melalui tes penempatan dari lembaga dan tugas penyaringan listening B1 singkat. Selanjutnya, analisis reliabilitas, korelasi, dan regresi sederhana diterapkan untuk menelaah hubungan antara FLLA dan kinerja listening. Dengan mengacu pada kajian tentang dinamika kecemasan, beban kognitif, dan format asesmen, penelitian ini menghipotesiskan adanya hubungan negatif. Temuan penelitian diharapkan dapat memberikan masukan bagi pembelajaran yang rendah kecemasan dan berorientasi strategi, serta bagi perancangan tes menyimak CEFR A2–B1 dalam konteks EFL di Indonesia..*

Kata Kunci *– Kecemasan mendengarkan bahasa asing; Pemahaman mendengarkan; Tingkat B1; Kampung Inggris; desain penilaian*

I. INTRODUCTION

Listening is a primary channel of input for EFL learners in Indonesia, including participants in intensive programs such as Kampung Inggris. B1-level learners whose proficiency aligns with CEFR A2-B1 descriptors are expected to identify main ideas and key details, draw short inferences, and discern speakers' attitudes in spoken passages of one to three minutes. A lot of learners find listening is the most stressful skill, especially when people speak quickly, use unfamiliar accents, or pack in a lot of information. Recent reviews describe this specific kind of stress as foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA): a language-related, broadly situational anxiety that shows up during second-language listening, rather than just general test anxiety[1], [2].

From a mechanisms perspective, anxiety in second-language learning is best seen as something that shifts in real time, driven by immediate thoughts (like "I'm going to miss what they're saying"), social pressure, and limits on

how much the brain can process at once; MacIntyre & McGillivray[2]. According to this perspective, anxiety is not just a "cause-and-effect" issue. Rather, it is an internal, ever-changing system that actively engages with performance, emotions, and attention while an individual is performing a task. According to that perspective, FLLA is likely to disrupt listening by enhancing self-monitoring and impairing attentional control. In other words, especially when they feel assessed, students may expend more mental energy fretting and self-checking, leaving less cognitive resources available for deciphering the speech and creating meaning. By differentiating between general listening anxiety (across classroom, daily, and media contexts) and listening test anxiety, Li et al. [3] support a componential view and propose that test anxiety may be the more immediate factor weakening self-perceived listening performance, fully mediating the effect of general listening anxiety. When combined, a practical framework suggests that task demands, context, and learners' moment-to-moment assessments shape both general and test-specific FLLA, which in turn causes cognitive-affective interference during listening and ultimately affects outcomes like self-perceived performance, participation, and achievement. Measurement is made to capture both general and test-related dimensions.

Foreign Language Listening Anxiety (FLLA) can be understood as a listening-specific, context-sensitive type of language anxiety that arises when learners have to make sense of spoken language while dealing with uncertainty, limited time, and a feeling that they're being judged or evaluated. A systematic review by Ji, Qin, and Li [1]shows that FLLA has typically been explained from (a) a psychological angle, focusing on worry and emotional arousal while listening, (b) a social angle, highlighting negative beliefs about one's listening ability and fear of being judged, and increasingly (c) a situation-specific angle that views listening anxiety as something that shifts across contexts rather than a fixed, stable trait. Importantly, the review also highlights a prevalent problem in the literature: there is sometimes a discrepancy between the definitions of FLLA and the instruments used to measure it, leading to inconsistent or mixed results across studies and contexts. An explicit definition of FLLA as anxiety during L2 listening that varies by situation (e.g., classroom vs. test) and the selection of measurement instruments that support that definition should therefore be the first steps toward a sound theoretical framework for FLLA. According to Li, Qin, Ji, and Zou [3], Both general listening anxiety and listening test anxiety are associated with poorer self-rated listening performance among Chinese learners of English, suggesting that anxiety can distort how learners judge their understanding and regulate their comprehension. Similarly, Wang and MacIntyre [4]they also report that listening anxiety is strongly connected to listening metacognitive awareness in second-language comprehension, supporting the idea that emotions can influence how well learners monitor, regulate, and reflect on their listening process.

Anxiety and listening skills can be modulated by a number of evaluation and instructional design elements. Replaying the input, or "double-playing," might encourage the application of strategies and, in some situations, lessen test anxiety, leading to modest but significant performance improvements. However, the impacts vary depending on the sort of item[5]. In order to accommodate teenagers' processing limitations, listening activities should be structured with distinct pre-, while-, and post-listening phases and adjusted for speech rate, lexical density, and topic familiarity from the standpoint of cognitive load[6]. These principles align with classroom observations in Indonesia and neighbouring contexts: studies using authentic materials such as TED Talks show that native-speed delivery and accent variability increase perceived difficulty and anxiety among secondary and tertiary learners [7], whereas extensive listening/viewing programmes that increase exposure to level-appropriate spoken input are associated with greater comfort and more resilient listening habits over time [8].

EFL learners' listening is influenced by the learning environment and delivery method not only by the audio they hear, but also by the ways in which the class is structured to provide opportunities for interaction and support. Clear participation procedures, low-pressure response options (such as chat or small-group work), guided prompts, breakout discussions, and brief, timed check-ins were all used in online and blended learning during COVID-19 to help students feel more comfortable, participate more, and control their anxiety while understanding spoken input[9]. In Indonesian EFL settings, adding simple, low-effort listening journals to regular coursework can extend this kind of support by encouraging learners to reflect on what they understood, what they missed, and the reasons behind it. When students note the strategies they tried, the specific challenges they faced (like speed, vocabulary, or accent), and one or two small goals for the next activity, they can gradually improve both comprehension and confidence, while also developing critical thinking in integrated Listening-Speaking classes[10].

More generally, emotional research indicates that enjoyment and worry are separate emotions that have different effects on achievement. Both can increase or decrease based on the teaching style, work requirements, and changes over time. Anxiety is typically associated with poorer performance, whereas enjoyment is typically associated with higher results. Because of this, students may have low enjoyment but high worry, or vice versa, so each construct should be considered independently rather than as the two extremes of a single scale. Recent field-mapping of foreign language anxiety (FLA) research also highlights a shift toward sharper construct definitions, multi-component

measurement, and a stronger focus on interventions that can be applied in classrooms. Within this trend, listening is increasingly recognised as a coherent subdomain of FLA, warranting targeted investigation and pedagogical support rather than being treated as a secondary skill [11], [12], [13].

The way a listening test is delivered also influences how learners feel and how they approach the task. Visual signals can alter how students approach the test and how challenging it appears, according to research comparing audio-only and video-based assessments. However, the impacts on test results and anxiety vary, frequently depending on how much information the video offers and what the questions ask[14], [15], [16]. The ability to see the speaker's face and understand contextual clues helps some learners feel more supported, but processing both audio and sights adds additional mental strain for others. This relates to research on interventions for anxiety in foreign languages. According to a recent meta-analysis, structured supports like mindfulness, repeated exposure, strategy training, or positive psychology exercises can result in mild to moderate reductions in anxiety and modest gains in academic performance. It has even been demonstrated in experimental investigations that technology-based methods that combine teaching metacognitive listening strategies with working-memory training considerably lower students' listening anxiety[17].

Positive emotions and supportive pedagogy add another layer to this picture. Meta-analytic and longitudinal findings on foreign language enjoyment (FLE) indicate that improving classroom climate and engagement can indirectly enhance listening performance by broadening learners' attention and persistence during difficult segments [18]. In Indonesian TOEFL listening studies, learners consistently report pain points such as rapid speech, unfamiliar accents, and inference items, while also documenting coping strategies they mobilise under pressure, reinforcing that affect and skill should be addressed jointly in instruction and testing [19][29]. More enjoyment and improved language proficiency are also associated with teacher zeal and a positive classroom environment, suggesting an emotional path to success that supplements strategy and skill development[20].

Idiodynamic studies, which monitor anxiety second by second, reveal that stress frequently increases at particular times, such as abrupt changes in subject or bursts of complex information[21], implying that "micro-interventions" like brief previews, explicit cues prior to changes, and deliberate pauses are acceptable. Reviews of metacognitive listening instruction stress the value of explicitly teaching adolescents to plan, monitor, and evaluate their strategies, in ways compatible with routine lessons and assessment demands [22]. Related classroom research on FLE and FLA suggests that balancing challenge with supportive interaction and clear task framing benefits emotional regulation and, in turn, listening performance [23], [24], [25].

Despite these advances, a clear gap remains in the Indonesian context. The majority of research on listening anxiety is on university students or samples with varying levels of competency; just a small number of studies target students at CEFR A2-B1. Even fewer have connected FLLA to how well students do on curriculum-aligned listening assessments that represent the needs of upper-secondary students and those enrolled in rigorous B1-level programs like Kampung Inggris. Located in Tulungrejo and Pelem villages, Pare District, Kediri Regency, East Java, Kampung Inggris Pare is also known as the "Pare English Village." It is a well-known collection of English-course institutions that is frequently connected to the streets Anyelir, Brawijaya, and Kemuning. It is widely described in research as an English-immersion village, where learners join intensive short-course programs and practise English in a supportive social-learning environment[28]. Existing Indonesian work on listening tends to focus either on learners' difficulties in locally developed TOEFL tests, that is, listening tasks whose formats resemble TOEFL listening sections but are pitched at approximately CEFR A2–B1 levels and are not official ETS products [7], [19] or on specific instructional practices [6], [9], [10], without directly modelling the relationship between listening-specific anxiety and listening comprehension using CEFR-based measures.

A framework based on the CEFR sees language proficiency as a social activity, treating students as social agents who use language to accomplish important tasks in specific circumstances rather than merely as individuals who memorize grammar and vocabulary on their own. Clear "can-do" statements that outline what students can comprehend and do in reception, production, and interaction, as well as the tactics they employ, are used to articulate proficiency, which is arranged into common reference levels (A1–C2). The CEFR also aids in constructive alignment, which makes it simpler to defend task difficulty and interpret accomplishment similarly across courses as the same descriptor system may direct outcomes, classroom activities, and assessment. By include extended measures for mediation, online engagement, and plurilingual/pluricultural competence in the 2020 CEFR Companion Volume, the

framework further modernizes these concepts, better reflecting modern communication practices and promoting more inclusive language instruction. The action-oriented approach emphasised in CEFR encourages learner agency and the use of meaningful tasks that connect classroom communication with real-world practices, which is crucial when designing listening or speaking activities that mirror authentic demands. For research purposes, CEFR can function as a common interpretive lens to define target proficiency bands, select or design tasks at appropriate levels, and report findings in a way that is comparable across settings. Overall, CEFR serves as a robust theoretical map for describing proficiency, guiding instructional design, and strengthening validity arguments for language assessment by anchoring claims about learning to clearly articulated, context-sensitive descriptors [26].

Guided by recent work, this study conceptualises foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA) as a language-specific, situation-general affect experienced during L2 listening in both classroom and quasi-exam settings [1], [2]. Test-specific listening anxiety is not considered a distinct type of anxiety, but rather a related but subordinate subfacet of this larger construct that arises in clearly evaluative listening situations [3]. Analytically separating test-specific listening anxiety allows one to place it within FLLA as a whole while avoiding confusing evaluation-related tension with underlying listening capacity.

The CEFR A2-B1 listening test, which is based on a framework similar to the TOEFL, is used to investigate the relationship between FLLA and listening achievement. This approach fits well because CEFR descriptors align with curriculum goals and the typical speech rate and vocabulary load expected of upper-secondary learners around the B1 level, so item difficulty can be set and explained more transparently. It also helps with interpretation because much recent research on listening modes and listening strategies focuses on similar proficiency ranges, making results easier to compare across studiesThe ecological validity of using this framework is strengthened by studies that use TOEFL-style listening tasks in Indonesian contexts, which frequently highlight familiar challenges, accent differences, fast delivery, and inference questions that closely resemble the kinds of demands learners face around the A2-B1 level[19]. The participants are B1-level EFL learners from a Kampung Inggris institute, with their listening level confirmed through the institute's placement test and a separate CEFR-based A2-B1 screening task.

Thus, using a cross-sectional correlational approach, this study investigates the relationship between FLLA and listening comprehension among B1-level EFL learners in an Indonesian Kampung Inggris curriculum. Is there a relationship between listening anxiety and listening test scores? This research question serves as the study's compass. According to the study's predictions, which are in line with previous findings, students who express higher levels of listening anxiety should do worse on a CEFR A2–B1 listening test. The findings are intended to provide contextualised evidence to inform low-anxiety, strategy-aware teaching and assessment in both formal high school settings and intensive non-formal programmes at comparable proficiency levels.

II. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional correlational design to investigate the relationship between foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA) and second language (L2) listening comprehension. According to Creswell and Creswell [27], correlational designs are helpful when the goal is not to test cause-and-effect through experimental manipulation but rather to map how variables connect to each other in real contexts. Test-related listening anxiety is seen as one subcomponent of FLLA, which is a language-specific, generally situational emotional state that arises while learners receive spoken L2 data. Performance on CEFR A2-B1 activities, which evaluate knowledge of essential information, main ideas, concise deductions, and speakers' attitudes or intentions, is used to gauge listening comprehension.

According to the reasoning of non-experimental correlational research, the study relied on naturally occurring variance in anxiety and listening scores without experimental manipulation[27]. The primary analyses were simple linear regression with FLLA as predictor and listening score as outcome, as well as Pearson's product-moment correlation between FLLA and listening scores (or Spearman's ρ if assumptions were broken). The study was designed

to provide roughly 0.80 power to detect correlations of about |r| ≈.25–.30 at α =.05. The expected sample size was 40 students.

2.2 Setting and Participants

The research was conducted at Kampung Inggris, Pare, Indonesia, and focused on EFL learners who were placed in B1-level classes based on the institute's CEFR-aligned placement test covering levels A1-B2. Participants represented late adolescents/young adults aged 18-23, a group commonly engaged in intensive short-course language study and preparing for academic or workplace communication needs. Because the study focused on a single proficiency band, limiting participants to B1 helped reduce the chance that results were mainly due to large differences in baseline ability. The researchers also gathered basic demographic data, like age, gender, and length of study at the institute, in order to provide a clear description of the group. While maintaining the study's alignment with the CEFR proficiency framework, these background elements aid in placing the findings within the local learning context.

The institute's intact-class setup was matched using a cluster sampling technique. All 100 students in one program cycle (all B1 classes) were invited, ensuring that recruiting was inclusive and feasible given the course timetable. In order to balance the need for reasonable representation with practical constraints, the study selected 40 individuals from this group. Due to the fact that students were not individually reassigned, sampling from current classrooms also reduced disruption and preserved the ecological validity of the research conducted in Kampung Inggris.

A two-step check was used to determine participant eligibility in order to guarantee a constant proficiency level and fundamental listening preparedness. First, the institute's placement system has already assigned every candidate to B1. Second, students finished a quick listening test that included 10 multiple-choice A2-B1 questions based on 7–10 minutes of audio. To simulate normal classroom listening conditions, students listened just once before responding to comprehension questions. In order to ensure that they could participate in the study's listening activities in a meaningful way, those who scored at least 50% were deemed qualified.

Two steps were used to determine eligibility. First, every applicant was already ranked at the B1 level. They then finished a brief listening screening test that included 10 multiple-choice A2-B1 questions based on 7–10 minutes of audio. After listening just once, students responded to comprehension questions; those who received a score of at least 50% were deemed eligible. The final participants were EFL students who were willing to give informed consent, were present on the day of data collection, and were in their late teens or early adulthood (18–23 years old). To characterize the sample, basic demographic data such as age, gender, and duration of study at the institute were gathered.

Participants had to be EFL students between the ages of 18 and 23, present on the day of data collection, and willing to provide informed consent in order to be included. This age range was selected to include late adolescents and young adults who are typically capable of self-regulation, independent learning, and reflective reporting of their experiences-skills that are important when looking at emotional aspects and listening processes. Participation was entirely voluntary, and the study followed ethical procedures to protect learners' autonomy and comfort. Demographic information was collected only to describe the sample clearly and support transparent reporting of participant characteristics.

2.3 Instruments

Foreign Language Listening Anxiety (FLLA) Appendix 1

FLLA was measured with a 20-item 5-point Likert questionnaire (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) developed for this study based on conceptualisations in Ji et al., MacIntyre and McGillivray, and existing FLLA scales [1], [2]. Items target anxiety and self-regulatory behaviours during L2 listening in the classroom and test situations. Example items include:

- *"I feel tense when I fail to follow a fast part of the listening"*
- *"I get nervous when I have to answer questions after listening to English"*
- *"I worry that I will miss important information when I listen in English."*

Negatively worded items are reverse-scored so that higher scores indicate higher anxiety. A total FLLA score is obtained by averaging all 20 items, and a test-specific subscore is obtained by averaging items that explicitly refer to tests or exams. Reliability is examined using Cronbach's α and Composite Reliability (CR) (cut-off ≥ 0.70).

Listening Test Skill Appendix 2

The instrument of this study is a TOEFL-based listening test adapted from the Listening Test TOEFL material. It consists of 30 multiple-choice items and is divided into two parts: Part A and Part B. In Part A, test-takers listen to short two-speaker conversations, and each conversation is followed by one question answered based on what is stated or implied. In Part B, test-takers listen to longer conversations and academic-style talks/lectures, and each passage is followed by several questions assessing comprehension of key information (e.g., main ideas, details, and inferences), with some items possibly requiring two correct answers. During administration, students answer the questions based on what they hear, and they are instructed not to take notes. Test reliability is estimated using KR-20, and basic item difficulty and discrimination indices are examined.[19], [22].

2.4 Data Collection

Data were collected in intact B1 classes and took around 45-60 minutes per class, including a device/volume check, the FLLA questionnaire, and the listening test. On the day, the researchers introduced the study, emphasized that participation was voluntary, obtained informed consent, and confirmed that the audio could be heard clearly. After completing the FLLA scale, which took ten to fifteen minutes, students took a listening test with standardized instructions. Students responded to the questions either while or right after listening to each passage, which was played just once.

In order to get an overall score (and, if relevant, a test-specific subscore), FLLA items were reverse-coded when necessary and then averaged. Totals were calculated on a 0-32 scale, with 1 denoting correct listening replies and 0 denoting incorrect ones. If necessary, the totals were translated to percentages. Outliers, distributional assumptions, and missing data were examined in the dataset. While unanswered listening items were scored as incorrect, a relatively modest amount of missing FLLA data might be handled by imputing item meaning. Descriptive statistics, correlation tests (Pearson's r or Spearman's ρ), reliability estimations (α, CR, KR-20), and a straightforward linear regression evaluating whether FLLA predicted listening performance (α =.05) were all included in the analysis.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to institutional ethical standards. Approval was secured from the language institute, and informed consent was obtained from participants (and, when applicable, their parents or guardians). Participation was entirely voluntary, students could withdraw at any point, and all data were anonymized and securely stored for research use only.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Result

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. FLLA scores ranged from 33 to 92 (M = 64.18, SD = 14.50), indicating notable variation in anxiety levels within the sample. Listening scores ranged from 13 to 28 correct answers out of 30 (M = 19.93, SD = 3.70), which reflects a realistic performance distribution for B1-level learners.

Reliability analysis showed that the FLLA questionnaire had excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.93). The listening test showed moderate reliability (KR-20 = 0.58). This level is generally acceptable for classroom-based research, but it also indicates that some items could be refined to improve the test's overall consistency.

Table 2 reports the main inferential findings. The Pearson correlation shows a moderate negative relationship between FLLA and listening performance (r = −0.51, p = .001), indicating that higher anxiety tends to go with lower scores. The regression results tell a similar story: FLLA significantly predicted listening scores (b = −0.13, p = .001). In practical terms, a 10-point increase in FLLA was associated with an average drop of about 1.3 points on the listening test (out of 30). The model explained 26% of the variance in listening achievement (R2 = 0.26).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Main Variables (N = 40)

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Age (years)	40	18	23	21.60	1.24
FLLA total	40	33	92	64.18	14.50

Listening score (0-30)	40	13	28	19.93	3.70

Table 2. Reliability, Correlation, and Regression Summary Appendix 3

Analysis	Statistic	Value
FLLA reliability	Cronbach's alpha	0.93
Listening reliability	KR-20	0.58
Correlation	r (FLLA, Listening)	-0.51 (p = 0.001)
Regression	Intercept (a)	28.27
Regression	Slope (b)	-0.13 (p = 0.001)
Regression	R2	0.26

3.2. Discussion

This study shows a clear pattern: students who felt more anxious during English listening tended to get lower scores on the listening test ($r = -0.51$, $p = 0.001$). According to the regression finding ($R2 = 0.26$), listening anxiety may also be a significant factor in explaining why B1 students' scores varied despite being in the same proficiency band. This result supports the idea that anxiousness is not just a fixed attribute but can function as a "in-the-moment" activity while listening. For instance, anxiety can divert focus to self-monitoring and worry, which lowers the brain capacity for processing L2 data in real time, according to MacIntyre and McGillivray[2]. Likewise, using an idiodynamic lens, Zhang and Wu show that anxiety can fluctuate during the listening process and often rises when learners face difficult segments, which can coincide with weaker comprehension [21]. In a similar direction, Wang and MacIntyre report that anxiety is related to listening outcomes and listening metacognitive awareness, suggesting that anxious learners may struggle to regulate comprehension effectively [4].

The item pattern in this study helps explain what may be happening in this specific context. The strongest anxiety items related to noisy surroundings and fear of missing important information, which fits the nature of listening as a fast and temporary stream of information. Rahimi and Sayyadi argue that listening tasks can impose heavy cognitive load, and when the task becomes demanding, learners have less capacity to integrate meaning and maintain comprehension [6]. Building on that logic, MacIntyre and McGillivray describe how worry can intensify once learners feel they are "losing the message," and that worry can further disrupt attention, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of misunderstanding [2]. Ji, Qin, and Li's systematic review also emphasizes that FLLA is a skill-specific construct shaped by listening conditions and task constraints, which matches the pattern observed in the present data [1]. When combined, the item responses provide a useful mechanism: ambiguous information or distraction raises uncertainty, which in turn causes concern, which in turn weakens attention and results in poorer performance.

According to the results, lowering unnecessary stress may be particularly beneficial for nervous students in the classroom. Given that the most commonly reported trigger was noise, educators might start with simple yet crucial efforts like ensuring proper level, evaluating audio quality, and reducing background noise. Beyond environmental support, strategy-focused instruction is also recommended, especially for fast speech and single-play tasks. Holzknecht and Harding show that repeating the listening text can affect not only performance but also metacognitive strategy use and anxiety, indicating that format decisions can shape how learners cope during listening [5]. In addition, Kwon and Yu found differences in how test-takers use cognitive and metacognitive strategies across audio-only and video-based listening tests, suggesting that modality can influence strategy deployment and perceived task demands [14]. Lesnov further reports that stakeholders often link video-based listening to perceived authenticity and motivation, though format can also affect difficulty perceptions, so teachers and test designers should align format choices with instructional aims and learner needs [16]. Overall, combining supportive conditions with explicit listening strategies can reduce anxiety-related disruption and help learners recover when they miss information.

At the same time, anxiety is only part of the explanation. Because the model accounts for about 26% of score differences, other factors clearly contribute to listening achievement. Wang and MacIntyre's work suggests that metacognitive awareness and affective experiences during listening both matter, so learners' ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate comprehension may work together with emotional factors such as anxiety and enjoyment [4]. According to Ivone and Renandya, prolonged looking and listening can gradually improve fluency and comfort with verbal input, which may tangentially lessen anxiety by fostering a sense of familiarity and control [8]. According to research on authentic materials, Astika and Kurniawan discuss how task complexity and novel information might test students and possibly exacerbate anxiety in intensive learning environments[7]. Li and colleagues advise future research to

differentiate between test and general listening anxiety because these aspects may have distinct associations with performance and self-perceptions [3]. Future studies could also include additional predictors such as vocabulary knowledge, exposure to spoken English, and specific strategy use, and expand sampling across cohorts or institutions to strengthen generalisability and the stability of the findings.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study found a moderate, significant negative relationship between foreign language listening anxiety (FLLA) and listening test performance among B1-level EFL learners in Kampung Inggris, Pare. FLLA accounted for almost 26% of the variation in listening achievement, and learners with higher FLLA tended to receive poorer listening scores. The argument that hearing anxiety is a skill-specific affect that might impede real-time listening processes instead of just reflecting overall anxiousness is supported by this pattern. Anxious students may find it more difficult to maintain focus because spoken input fades quickly. They may become mired in anxiety, such as worrying that they'll overlook something crucial, which impairs their ability to interpret words and construct meaning. This type of interference can negatively impact performance on TOEFL-style listening tasks that require making quick deductions or connecting details, particularly when the speaker speaks quickly or comprehension deteriorates early in the passage.

According to these findings, teachers can reduce needless listening strain by ensuring that the audio is clear, verifying the volume, and minimizing background noise. This is because unfavorable listening conditions can increase anxiety and increase the likelihood that students will miss the information. Teachers can also help students develop coping skills by teaching them strategy-focused instruction for quick speech and single-play tasks. For instance, they can teach students to listen for the main idea first, avoid being stuck on new words, and recover from missing parts by using context and essential content terms. Over time, learners may benefit from incrementally increasing their exposure to rapid speech, structured practice with single-play listening, and encouraging feedback. For future research, larger and multi-site samples would improve generalisability, and including factors like vocabulary knowledge, strategy use, and exposure to spoken English could explain more variation in listening outcomes; researchers could also compare overall FLLA with a test-specific subscore to see whether anxiety in evaluative settings predicts performance more strongly than classroom-based anxiety.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor for the guidance, feedback, and encouragement throughout the completion of this final project. I also thank the lecturers and staff of my department for their academic support. My appreciation goes to all participants who willingly took part in this study and contributed their time and responses. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my family and friends for their constant support, motivation, and encouragement.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Ji, X. Qin, and K. LI, "A Systematic Review of Foreign Language Listening Anxiety: Focus on the Theoretical Definitions and Measurements," *Front Psychol*, vol. 13, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.859021.

[2] P. D. MacIntyre and M. F. McGillivray, "The inner workings of anxiety in second language learning," *Annu Rev Appl Linguist*, vol. 43, pp. 88–104, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1017/S0267190523000065.

[3] K. Li, X. Qin, S. Ji, and L. Zou, "The Effects of General Listening Anxiety and Listening Test Anxiety on Self-Perceived Listening Performance Among Chinese English Learners," *Psychol Res Behav Manag*, vol. Volume 16, pp. 3541–3560, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S422030.

[4] L. Wang and P. MacIntyre, "Second language listening comprehension: The role of anxiety and enjoyment in listening metacognitive awareness," *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 491–515, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.4.2.

[5] F. Holzknecht and L. Harding, "Repeating the Listening Text: Effects on Listener Performance, Metacognitive Strategy Use, and Anxiety," *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 451–478, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1002/tesq.3249.

[6] M. Rahimi and M. Sayyadi, “The cognitive load of listening activities of a cognitive-based listening instruction,” *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 2, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20236.
[7] G. Astika and A. Kurniawan, “The challenges of using TED Talks as authentic resources of academic listening for EFL university students,” *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 589–598, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23209.
[8] F. M. Ivone and W. A. Renandya, “EXTENSIVE LISTENING AND VIEWING IN ELT,” *TEFLIN Journal - A publication on the teaching and learning of English*, vol. 30, no. 2, p. 237, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.15639/teflinjournal.v30i2/237-256.
[9] A. N. Wulanjani, C. W. Anggraeni, and S. S. Yunianti, “Investigating the dimensions of students’ interaction in listening online learning environment amidst Covid-19 pandemic,” *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 321–333, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.17509/ijal.v12i2.51083.
[10] R. A. Purnamaningwulan, “Listening journals to promote students’ critical thinking skills in an integrated Listening-Speaking Course,” *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 744–760, May 2022, doi: 10.24815/siele.v9i2.23387.
[11] P. Resnik and J.-M. Dewaele, “Trait emotional intelligence, positive and negative emotions in first and foreign language classes: A mixed-methods approach,” *System*, vol. 94, p. 102324, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2020.102324.
[12] Q. Yu, “Foreign language anxiety research in System between 2004 and 2023: looking back and looking forward,” *Front Psychol*, vol. 15, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1373290.
[13] J. X. Yan and J. Liang, “Foreign language anxiety and dependency distance in English–Chinese interpretation classrooms,” *Front Psychol*, vol. 13, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.952664.
[14] S. K. Kwon and G. Yu, “Investigating differences in test-takers’ use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in audio-only and video-based listening comprehension test,” *System*, vol. 114, p. 103017, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2023.103017.
[15] R. O. Lesnov, “Furthering the argument for visually inclusive L2 academic listening tests: The role of content-rich videos,” *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, vol. 72, p. 101087, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101087.
[16] R. O. Lesnov, “DOES VIDEO BELONG IN L2 ACADEMIC LISTENING TESTS? STAKEHOLDERS’ PERCEPTIONS ABOUT TEST DIFFICULTY, AUTHENTICITY, AND MOTIVATION,” *International Journal of Listening*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 150–170, May 2024, doi: 10.1080/10904018.2022.2164718.
[17] Y. Xiong *et al.*, “A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review of Foreign Language Anxiety Interventions Among Students,” *J Lang Soc Psychol*, vol. 43, no. 5–6, pp. 620–650, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1177/0261927X241291258.
[18] E. Botes, J.-M. Dewaele, and S. Greiff, “Taking stock: A meta-analysis of the effects of foreign language enjoyment,” *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 205–232, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.2.3.
[19] I. W. Karimullah and N. Mukminatien, “Problems faced and strategies applied by test-takers in completing the TOEFL iBT Test,” *Studies in English Language and Education*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 574–590, May 2022, doi: 10.24815/siele.v9i2.23129.
[20] Y. Liu, M. Zhang, X. Zhao, and F. Jia, “Fostering EFL/ESL Students’ Language Achievement: The Role of Teachers’ Enthusiasm and Classroom Enjoyment,” *Front Psychol*, vol. 12, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.781118.
[21] F. Zhang and X. Wu, “Motivation and anxiety in Chinese EFL students’ listening process: An idiodynamic approach,” *Language Teaching Research*, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.1177/13621688241268632.
[22] M. H. Al-Khresheh and S. F. Alruwaili, “Metacognition in listening comprehension: Analyzing strategies and gender differences among Saudi EFL University students,” *Cogent Soc Sci*, vol. 10, no. 1, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2023.2291954.
[23] Y. Jiang and J.-M. Dewaele, “How unique is the foreign language classroom enjoyment and anxiety of Chinese EFL learners?,” *System*, vol. 82, pp. 13–25, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.02.017.
[24] S. Zheng and X. Zhou, “Enhancing Foreign Language Enjoyment through Online Cooperative Learning: A Longitudinal Study of EFL Learners,” *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 611, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.3390/ijerph20010611.
[25] J. Fathi and F. Mohammaddokht, “Foreign Language Enjoyment and Anxiety as the Correlates of the Ideal L2 Self in the English as a Foreign Language Context,” *Front Psychol*, vol. 12, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.790648.

[26] C. E. F. of Reference, *Companion volume*, vol. 278. 2020. [Online]. Available: http://universitypublishingonline.org/cambridge/histories/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9781139055895
[27] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: CA: SAGE Publications, 2022.
[28] A. N. (et al.), "The Need Analysis of Participation in an English Immersion Village at Kampung Inggris Pare," International Journal of Language Education / ERIC full text. Accessed: Jan. 29, 2026.
[29] W. Taufiq, D. R. Santoso, and N. Fediyanto, "Critical Analysis on TOEFL ITP as a Language Assessment," in Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Intellectuals' Global Responsibility (ICIGR 2017), Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, vol. 125, pp. 226–229, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.2991/icigr-17.2018.55. (atlantis-press.com)

Conflict of Interest Statement:

The author declares that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.