Lingua Cultura, 13(1), February 2019, 55-66
DOI: 10.21512/lc.v13i1.5155

P-ISSN: 1978-8118
E-ISSN: 2460-710X

WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN ENGLISH OF NON-ENGLISH MAJOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN INDONESIA

Adaninggar Septi Subekti

Department of English Education, Duta Wacana Christian University
Jl. dr. Wahidin Sudirohusodo no. 5-25, Yogyakarta 55224, Indonesia
adaninggar@staff.ukdw.ac.id

Received: 27th November 2018/**Revised:** 13th February 2019/**Accepted:** 26th February 2019

How to Cite: Subekti, A. S. (2019). Willingness to communicate in English of non-English major university students in Indonesia. *Lingua Cultura, 13*(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i1.5155

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to investigate the willingness to communicate (WTC) of Indonesian learners of English as a second language (L2) at the university level. It was conducted based on several rationales. WTC in L2 was often regarded as the primary goal of language instructions, and there might be various factors influencing WTC in L2 and the two so-called strongest factors, namely learners' perceived communication competence and communication apprehension, need to be investigated further to find out the degree to which they affected learners' WTC. Besides, Indonesian learners' low frequency of English use outside classroom contexts might lead them to be unwilling to make actual communication in English. Through probability random sampling, a total of 276 non-English major university students participated in the study, the data of which were analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, correlation and regression, in SPSS 21. This research finds that learners have reported a high level of WTC, their perceived communication competence is found to be a strong predictor of learners' WTC, communication apprehension is found to be correlated with WTC in just a moderate level, and despite experts' supports on the importance of WTC in L2 learning, it surprisingly cannot predict learners' L2 achievement.

Keywords: *willingness to communicate (WTC), perceived communication competence, communication apprehension, language achievement*

INTRODUCTION

The roles of learners' individual differences (IDs) in the second language (L2) learning has been acknowledged by many researchers, such as Aydin (2009); Baghaei and Dourakhshan (2012); Matsuoka et al. (2014); and Ortega (2009). IDs are individual learner's characteristics which distinguish learners from one another and are believed to influence L2 learning (Dornyei, 2005). These characteristics further explain why learners acquire an L2, in a broad sense, differently from one another (Dornyei, 2005). IDs influence the way learners learn and succeed in their L2 learning (Alemi, Tajeddin, & Mesbah, 2013; Dornyei, 2005) and they include a wide range of learners' characteristics, including learning styles, language aptitude, anxiety, motivation, learning strategies, and willingness to communicate (WTC) (Dornyei, 2005; Ymeri, 2016).

In relation to WTC, some experts have believed that learners' WTC in L2 is mainly predicted by L2 communicative confidence (Fadilah, 2018a; Fallah, 2014). Besides that, it is influenced by learners' communication apprehension or anxiety and self-perceived communication competence, and to a lesser extent, by learners' attitudes (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Ortega, 2009; Yashima, 2002). Ortega (2009), for example, they has mentioned that several pieces of research found the correlation between WTC in L2 and communicative confidence being in the range of 0,60 to 0,80 indicating a high positive association between the two variables. With regard to that, Clement, Baker, and MacIntyre (2003) have found that communicative confidence is closely related to anxiety that is an affective variable and self-perceived competence that is a cognitive self-evaluation variable.

These aforementioned variables are related to frequency as well as the perceived quality of previous L2 contact in which both influence each other (Clement, Baker, MacIntyre, 2003). Thus, it can be stated that both learners' communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence contributing to communicative confidence are greatly influenced by learners' past experience, either positive or negative in using L2 (Ortega, 2009).

Furthermore, even though both self-perceived competence and communication apprehension are often considered the major antecedents of learners' WTC in L2, these two a take different weight from each other in explanation (Ortega, 2009). Communication apprehension can better predict L2 confidence in contexts where L2 is used extensively (Ortega, 2009), for example in a community where a language is used as a second language. The use of English in the Indian context can be an example.

Self-perceived competence, in comparison, will be more predictive of L2 confidence than anxiety in contexts where L2 use is low such as in foreign language (FL) contexts (Ortega, 2009; Yashima, 2002). This idea is supported by the results of some empirical researches such as Baker and MacIntyre (2000); Yashima (2002). Explaining the results of their empirical research in Canada where French as L2 is used very extensively. Baker and MacIntyre (2000) have stated that self-perceived competence has little effect on learners' confidence as in general they have attained higher communicative competence and have been accustomed to successful previous experiences in L2 use. However, this context does demand learners to communicate much more complex ideas and entail higher stakes than in a context where L2 use is low. This situation can, in turn, instill anxiety (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000).

In comparison, in a context where L2 use is low, like the typical Indonesian context, most learners are still developing their communicative competence and have little contact with L2 speakers or situations which compel them to use an L2. Hence, the demand for communication is much less complex. In such a situation, learners in this context are likely to be concerned more about how well they believe they can communicate with their fairly limited abilities (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000). This phenomenon may also extend to FL classroom settings because class activities often demand interactive communication, thus testing FL learners' perceived communication competence (Yashima, 2002).

Furthermore, many experts have asserted that WTC in L2 plays such a vital role in L2 learning. It has been mentioned as the most immediate determinant of L2 use (Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003) as well as the major cause of L2 learning (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010). WTC influences the success in L2 learning (Baghaei & Dourakhshan, 2012) and becomes the key component of L2 acquisition (Kang, 2005). Even MacIntyre et al. (1998) have firmly emphasized that it becomes the primary goal of language instruction.

However, it is interesting that, "It is not uncommon to find people who tend to avoid entering L2 communication situations even if they possess a high level of communicative competence" (Dornyei, 2005). In other words, learners with a high level of communicative competence do not always exhibit high WTC (Peng, 2016). Alemi, Tajeddin, and Mesbah (2013) have stated that this intricacy may contribute to WTC being one of the IDs' variables which have become the subject of thorough L2 research in the last two decades in various learning contexts. For examples are in Canada (Donovan & MacIntyre, 2009), in Sweden (Cao & Philp, 2006), in Kosovo (Ymeri, 2016), in Poland (Baran-Lucarz, 2014; Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak, 2016), in Turkey (Oz, 2014, 2016; Oz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015), in Iran (Barjesteh, Vaseghi, & Neissi, 2012; Gol, Zand-Moghadam, & Karrabi, 2014; Rastegar & Karami, 2015; Rostami, Kashanian, & Gholami, 2016; Zarrinabadi & Abdi, 2011), in Korea (Kang, 2005), and in Japan (Matsuka, 2004; Osterman, 2014; Watanabe, 2013).

Recent empirical researches in the field of WTC across various learning contexts yield various, and rich findings. In Kosovo, for example, Ymeri (2016) has found that learners' proficiency has a notable effect on WTC in which proficient learners have a higher WTC than the less proficient counterparts. Baran-Lucarz's (2014) research in Poland has suggested that WTC is highly correlated with learners' language anxiety. He has found that the more his student participants feel anxious about their pronunciation, the less WTC they have. Barjesteh, Vaseghi, and Neissi's (2012) research in Iran, furthermore, have found that learners have a higher WTC in group discussion and meeting situations and among people they are already familiar with. This is in line with the results of Cao and Philp's (2006) research in the Swedish context that learners tend to have more WTC with people they have known well.

Then, Gol, Zand-Moghadam, and Karrabi's (2014) research in another Iranian context has found that learners tend to have a higher WTC when their teachers demonstrate immediacy behaviors such as being friendly and creating the less-stressful learning environment. In the Japanese context, Matsuka (2004) has found that learners' WTC could significantly predict their language achievement. Next, through longitudinal research over a period of three years, Watanabe (2013) has found that high school students seem to have the stagnant level of WTC with friends, acquaintances, and stagnantly low level of WTC with strangers. He concludes that the result may be attributed to WTC questionnaires he used, which may be more appropriate for English learners with much exposure to the language, unlike typical Japanese learners who have limited contact with English.

At the Japanese university context, in comparison, Osterman (2014) has found that even though positive previous experiences with English learning positively affected learners' WTC, English grammar-based learning in Japan is not really helping them in developing oral communication competency. He has also found that classroom environment greatly affects learners' WTC and their interaction with other students. Matsuoka et al. (2014) may offer an explanation of Japanese students' low WTC. They have found that Japanese sociocultural norms impede spontaneous communication, which in turn, lower learners' WTC in English. In the Korean context, Kang (2005) has mentioned that learners sharing the same first language (L1) with fellow classmates could at times be attributed to their reluctance in using English.

Furthermore, the recent empirical researches on WTC in English of the Indonesian context have investigated both secondary school student participants (Ningsih, Narahara, & Mulyono, 2018; Sa'adah, Nurkamto, & Suparno, 2018) and university student participants (Fadilah, 2018a; 2018b). Ningsih, Narahara, and Mulyono (2018) have found that secondary school learners are more willing to communicate if they feel need to do so. Participants in Sa'adah, Nurkamto, and Suparno's (2018) research hold the opinion that their teachers' oral corrective feedback does not make them reluctant to speak. Fadilah's (2018a) research then has found that learners' self-confidence affects university students' WTC in the Facebook communication context.

Despite the possibly useful results of these empirical researches in the Indonesian context, there are still some aspects of WTC that need to be investigated further. For example, Ningsih, Narahara, and Mulyono (2018) and

Sa'adah, Nurkamto, & Suparno's (2018) researches on Indonesian secondary school learners' WTC in English may not be indicative to the WTC of Indonesian learners at university level despite their high reticence and hesitance in speaking (Shao, Yu, & Ji, 2013; Subekti, 2018b). Fadilah's (2018a) quantitative research on university student participants, whilst the results could possibly be generalized, investigated learners' WTC by using Facebook which mainly deal with written communication rather than WTC in a speaking environment and as such the results may not reflect their WTC in spoken English.

In fact, in the Indonesian context in which English is learned largely as an FL, the use of English is largely confined to English classes. Outside classroom contexts, it is highly unlikely for these EFL learners to communicate in English as the society largely use both Indonesian language, which is the national language, and possibly region languages depending on the geographical areas (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Hence, Kirkpatrick (2012) has argued that these learners may not see any necessity to communicate in English. The low frequency of English use in daily life might lead them to be hesitant to make actual communication in English even in English classes despite the importance of WTC in L2 learning.

Besides, today's communicative teaching approaches which emphasize on meaningful communication, it might also give some kind of support to the idea that learners' WTC and actual use of L2 should be the goal of L2 learning (Alemi, Tajeddin, & Mesbah 2013), amplifying the importance of WTC even more. Despite this importance, however, there may be many factors influencing learners' WTC in L2, either positively or negatively. Moreover, some of these factors need to be investigated further to find out the degree to which they actually affect learners' WTC (Baghaei & Dourakhshan, 2012; Cao, 2013).

The results of the present research can benefit teachers, students, and researchers. The results can inform teachers on learners' WTC level, factors being at play in learners' WTC, and the effect of WTC on learners' achievements, based on which they could modify and improve their teaching practices for better learning instructions. Besides, considering that WTC researches in the Indonesian context are still in need of research findings that can be generalized, for researchers in this field, the present research's results can pave the way for further researches in the field of WTC in L2 in this context.

With regard to the rationales, the present research seeks to answer four research questions. First, how is the English 2's students' level of WTC in L2? Second, what are the relationship between their WTC in L2 and their perceived communication competence? Third, what are the relationship between their WTC in L2 and their communication apprehension? Also, fourth, to what extent does their WTC in L2 predict their L2 achievement?

METHODS

The present research employs a quantitative research design, conducting descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses using SPSS 21. With regard to the fact that empirical studies on WTC in L2 in the Indonesian context are generally still very rare, the results of the quantitative analysis will provide insight and generalizable findings that can further pave the way for further research in the field in the context (Basit, 2010). The use of quantitative method, furthermore, is also attributed to the popularity of this method in the field of WTC in which there have been numerous researches conducted in various contexts using this method (Alemi, Tajeddin, & Mesbah, 2013; Baghaei & Dourakhshan, 2012; Baran-Lucarz, 2014; Donovan & MacIntyre, 2009; Gol, Zand-Moghadam, & Karrabi, 2014; Oz, 2016; Rastegar & Karami, 2015; Yashima, 2002). In comparison, relatively few numbers of researches in WTC have been conducted using qualitative designs (Cao & Philp, 2006; MacIntyre, Burns, & Jessome, 2011; Osterman, 2014), indicating that quantitative method is by far more popular than qualitative one in this field of research.

The instruments of the research are the Indonesian translation of the original English questionnaires which are the compilation of questionnaire items which have been used in numerous previous researches. One set of questionnaires, more precisely, consists of 15 items on WTC in L2, 15 items on self-perceived communication competence, and 15 items on communication apprehension. The 15 items on WTC in L2 are adapted from Peng and Woodrow's (2010) research in the Chinese context, and Baghaei (2011)'s research in the Iranian context. The 15 items on self-perceived communication competence are adapted from the works of Peng and Woodrow (2010) and Matsuoka et al. (2014) in the Japanese context.

Finally, the 15 items on communication apprehension are adapted from Matsuoka et al.'s (2014) work and that of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986). That the questionnaire items are compiled from a number of items used in several previous researches that are based on the rationale of combining applicable and highly relevant questionnaire items into one set to best achieve the goals of the present research. To maintain the validity of the questionnaires, before the questionnaires are distributed to the participants, they are piloted by two non-English major students to ensure the accuracy, unambiguity, and simplicity of each of the item in relation with the purpose of the research (Gray, 2014). Based on their feedback, necessary revisions are made.

Furthermore, to respond to the questionnaire items on WTC in L2 and perceived communication competence, the participants are required to give the following possible answers: 'Strongly agree', 'Agree', 'Disagree', and 'Strongly disagree'. The option 'neither agree nor disagree' or 'neutral' that typically appears in the middle of those possible answers is purposely omitted because of, to the best of my knowledge, the tendency of many Indonesian participants to give such response when feeling unsure. Items associated with WTC in L2 and self-perceived communication competence are numerically scored: 'Strongly agree' equal to 4, 'Agree' equal to 3, 'Disagree' equal to 2, and 'Strongly disagree' equal to 1.

As for the other items associated with communication apprehension, the responses are scored: 1 for 'Strongly agree', 2 for 'Agree', 3 for 'Disagree', and 4 for 'Strongly disagree'. The scoring is based on the assumption that self-perceived communication competence would be in line with WTC in L2. Thus the corresponding scoring and that communication apprehension may hinder WTC in L2 and increase un-WTC, thus the reverse scoring.

The learner participants' responses to the questionnaire items as well as the composite final grades that they obtained in the English 2 course are then recorded in SPSS 21. In order to answer the first research question on the level of WTC in L2, the researcher uses descriptive statistics, and the data are presented in the form of

percentages. To investigate the relationships between WTC in L2 and self-perceived communication competence, and between WTC in L2 and communication apprehension, bivariate correlation formula is conducted. Then, the researcher conducts linear regression formula to find out the extent to which learners' perceived communication competence and their communication apprehension could predict their WTC in L2, and the extent to which their WTC in L2 could predict their L2 achievement as measured by their final grades.

The use of the students' final grades as the measurement of L2 achievement is based on a sound reason. Yashima (2012) has reminded that to achieve communicative functions should be the ultimate goal of L2 learning. This is in line with Fallah's (2014) idea that in today's L2 education programs, learners' achievement is assessed based on their ability to effectively communicate in L2. This goal, as far as English as Foreign Language (EFL) learning contexts are concerned, can be measured with speaking performances in English classes. This is attributed to the fact that in such contexts as the typical Indonesian context, it is highly unlikely for learners to have extensive actual L2 use outside English classes. Hence, the use of the students' final grades is based on the idea that English speaking grades in English classes can be treated as the closest resemblance to actual L2 use. In this context because, in speaking assessments, learners are normally required to demonstrate their competence in real-life tasks such as presentations, group discussions, and role-plays of daily activities.

The research used probability random sampling relies on "taking a completely random sample of the population" (Gray, 2014). This sampling method is used because it is believed that the population of this research is relatively homogenous in relation with the research questions (Gray, 2014; Walliman, 2011). As a result, a total of 276 students from the total number of 402 registered students of English 2 course at a university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, participate in the present research. The other 126 students who do not participate in the research either dropped the class with their names still in the class' database or they are absent when the questionnaires are distributed. All the class lecturers who administered the questionnaires are reported all attending students participated in the research.

English 2 is a non-credited General English course that is taken by all non-English major students at the university. These students have to pass three levels of General English courses, namely English 1, English 2, and English 3, to be able to take credited courses on English for Specific Purposes in their respective faculties. Of these three levels, English 2 course is selected because this course heavily focuses on speaking. It is in line with the aim of the present research in investigating learners' WTC in L2, in comparison with English 1 that focuses on Grammar and basic writing, and English 3 that focuses on reading.

The access to the research, furthermore, is obtained from the Director of the Language Centre of the university. The questionnaires are distributed during the period of two weeks (7 May 2018 – 18 May 2018) before the participants completed the English 2 course in the even semester of 2017. Before completing the questionnaires and participating in the research, the participants are given time to read and understand the informed consent form on the first page of the questionnaires detailing the purpose of the research, their rights of voluntary participation, and confidentiality of the data (Creswell, 2014; Walliman, 2011). The class lecturers who distribute the questionnaires to the participants on my behalf are provided with written guidelines on no intervention, no coercion, as well as confidentiality. It is done in order to maintain both of the data's reliability (Bryman, 2012) and research ethics (Creswell, 2014). All data reported are made anonymous (Gray, 2014).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From the total of 276 university student participants, 113 participants are males (40,9%) and 163 are females (51,9%). The minimum age of the participants is 17, while the maximum is 24 (SD = 1,09). One hundred seventy-one participants (62%) indicate their willingness to participate in possible further research through interviews, which means a large number of participants show their enthusiasm in the present research. The other 105 participants (38%) have exercised their rights of voluntary participation, including the right not to participate (Gray, 2014) by stating their refusal to be invited for possible follow-up research.

The 15 questionnaire items on WTC in L2 have 0,85 Cronbach's alpha coefficient. That the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is close to one (1) indicated that the questionnaire items have high internal reliability.

In relation with the first research question on the English 2's students' level of WTC in L2, the mean score of the 15 item questionnaire on WTC in L2 is 44,68 (SD = 4,69). The complete results of the participants' responses could be observed in Appendix 1. As could be seen in Appendix 1, the participants' responses, in general, tended to be in either 'Strongly agree' or 'Agree' alternative, which indicates that the participants generally have the high level of WTC in L2. However, as could be observed in Table 1, some items, item number 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15, yield mean scores lower than 3,0, which indicate that the participants tend to have less WTC in the respective items.

Table 1 The Means of Participants' Responses on Questionnaire Items on WTC in L2

Item Number	Means
1	3,15
2	3,16
3	3,13
4	3,04
5	3,24
6	3,12
7	2,84
8	3,10
9	3,02
10	2,55
11	3,09
12	2,36
13	2,68
14	2,86
15	2,58

First, item number 7, "I am willing to talk and express my opinions in English in the class when all my classmates are listening to me" yields a mean score of 2,84 in which 27,9% participants indicate their un-WTC.

It may indicate that learners are more self-conscious and thus have a lower WTC when they know that they are in the spotlight when speaking in class. Subekti (2018a; 2018b) has also found that learners' being self-conscious when speaking is attributed to their hesitation in speaking in class. Subekti (2018a) has further stated that this might happen due to learners' perceived insufficient ability to express their ideas in L2, English in this context. Besides, such a public speaking situation in which learners are placed in a spotlight has been acknowledged as one major source of speaking anxiety hindering learners from communicating in L2 (Subekti, 2018b).

Second, item number 10, "In group work activities in the class when the group is not composed of my friends I am willing to speak in English" produces the mean score of 2,55. 46,4% of the participants either disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. This indicates that learners tend to be more willing to communicate in groups when they are familiar with the group mates and vice versa if the groups are composed of students who are not familiar with each other, they tend to have less WTC. This result exactly matches with the result of Barjesteh, Vaseghi, and Neissi's (2012) research in the Iranian context and Cao and Philp's (2006) research in the Swedish context which may be quite different from the Indonesian context. These two pieces of research have found that familiarity with the interlocutors or addressees influenced learners' WTC in L2. The student participants in their researches have reported that they prefer interacting with their friends compare to classmates they are not close to (Barjesteh, Vaseghi, and Neissi's 2012; Cao & Philp, 2006). Based on this same result of three pieces of research conducted in three different contexts, it could be stated that many learners have the tendency to have a greater WTC in L2 when they are communicating with people they already know.

Third, the mean score of item number 12, "I am willing to speak without preparation in class" is the lowest mean score across all items on the WTC questionnaire at 2,36, in which 60,9% of the participants indicate their disagreement to the statement. The result could be indicative of learners' apprehension in communicating in L2 without prior preparation. In regard to this specific finding, learners' perceived communication competence may play a role. Learners may feel unsure whether or not they are capable of speaking in L2 spontaneously. This result is in line with Kang's (2005) research which also reports that the participants need to feel secure, including feeling secured with their own perceived competence, in order to have a high WTC in L2.

The next is item number 13, "I am willing to tell my group mates in English about things I do in my free time," which has the mean score of 2,68. 34,8% of the participants indicate their un-WTC through their disagreement with the statement. Interestingly, this result could be interpreted in some different ways. First, this result could indicate that learners may feel they could not sufficiently explain their free time which may include doing various activities hard to explain in L2. Second, this result could also indicate that learners may not be so willing to talk about their free time in L2. It is because they simply feel more comfortable talking about such topics in a language with whom they feel more proficient their L1, with their fellow L1 speakers or their classmates. This result also resembles a result of Kang's (2005) research in the Korean context in which some participants report their reluctance to speak in L2 in groups consisting of fellow speakers of Korean language, their L1. One participant in the research has even stated, "I feel like I'm wearing a mask" (Kang, 2005), indicating that this participant thinks it is unnatural to speak in L2 with friends who share the same L1.

Furthermore, item number 14, "I am willing to give a short impromptu speech to my class" also produces a low mean score of 2,86, in which 22,1% of the participants indicate their disagreement to the statement. This result may resemble that of item number 12 as both deals with learners' preparation. This is indicative of learners' tendency to be more willing to communicate when they are given some preparation time and their tendency to be unwilling to communicate when they are asked to speak without any preparation.

Finally, 44,6% participants disagree to item number 15, "I am willing to lead the discussion," which then produce a low mean score of 2,58. This result may parallel to that of item number 7 in which in both cases, learners tend to be less willing to communicate when they are in the center of attention. Leading discussions in item number 15, for instance, would likely put learners into the spotlight within their groups in which everybody would likely pay attention to their speaking. Even though speaking in small groups is thought to be less anxiety-provoking and thus be able to increase learners' WTC in L2 (Cao & Philp, 2006; Subekti, 2018a). Matsuoka et al. (2014) have mentioned that sometimes even diligent students who are excessively conscious of errors tend to become less willing to communicate in English and thus keep silent because they want to avoid embarrassment if they make errors when communicating.

Furthermore, with regard to the second research question on the relationship between learners' WTC in L2 and their perceived communication competence, the results of the correlation formula between learners' WTC and their perceived communication competence could be observed in Table 2. Additionally, the mean score of 15 items questionnaire on learners' perceived communication competence in L2 is 41,34 (SD = 5,46). These items have 0,87 Cronbach's alpha coefficient indicating high internal reliability. The detailed results of the participants' responses to these questionnaire items would not be commented further as this research merely focuses on the components of WTC in L2. However, the complete results could be observed in Appendix 2.

Table 2 Correlation between Learners' WTC in L2 and Their Perceived Communication Competence

		Learners' Perceived Communication Competence
Learners' WTC in L2	Pearson Correlation	0,645**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	276

**. Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).

In regard to the results shown in Table 2, some points could be commented on. Firstly, the research has found a significant positive relationship between the participants' WTC and their perceived communication competence. The correlation was strong, r (274) = 0,65, p < 0,01. This indicates that the higher the learners' perceived communication competence, the higher their WTC in L2 tends to be. In other words, if learners consider themselves

capable of communicating in L2, they would likely be more willing to communicate in L2. The same result is also obtained by Yashima (2002) and Ymeri (2016) who have found that a higher level of the Japanese learners' self-perceived competence is associated with a higher level of their WTC in L2. This result also becomes the confirmation that WTC in L2 is enhanced as learners see themselves as able communicators (Modirkhameneh & Firouzmand, 2014; Ymeri, 2016). Moreover, the perceived competence becomes a key variable which affects WTC in L2 (Matsuoka et al., 2014; Rostami Kashanian, & Gholami, 2016).

Furthermore, to see the predictive strength of learners' perceived communication competence towards their WTC in L2, the regression formula is conducted, and the result could be observed in Table 3.

Table 3 Regression Results with Learners Perceived Communication Competence as the Independent Variable

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
0,645a	0,416	0,414

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learners' perceived communication competence

As could be seen in Table 3, learners' perceived communication competence could predict 41,6% of the variance of their WTC in L2, which suggests that this factor could strongly predict learners' WTC in L2. This result is consistent with MacIntyre et al.'s (1998); Baker and MacIntyre's (2000) idea that perceived communication competence is a strong predictor of learners' WTC in L2. Besides, in an FL context like the Indonesian context in which many learners relatively have limited L2 communicative competence and are still developing it in such limited exposure to L2. Learners' belief about their capability of communicating in L2 plays a larger role in influencing learners' confidence to communicate in L2 (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Ortega, 2009; Yashima, 2002).

Related to the third research question on the relationship between learners' WTC in L2 and their communication apprehension, the result can be observed in Table 4. The mean score of the 15 items questionnaire on learners' communication apprehension was 33,72 (SD = 7,27). These items have 0,92 Cronbach's alpha coefficient indicating high internal reliability. The detailed results in each of the item could be observed in Appendix 3.

Table 4 Correlation between Learners' WTC in L2 and Their Communication Apprehension

		Learners' Communication Apprehension
Learners' WTC in L2	Pearson Correlation	-0,374**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	276

**. Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).

As observed in Table 4, learners' WTC in L2 significantly correlates with their communication apprehension negatively, r (274) = -0,37, p < 0,01. The strength of the correlation is at a moderate level. This result is consistent with the idea of Modirkhameneh and Firouzmand (2014) who held that as learners' communication apprehension is lowered, their WTC will increase.

Furthermore, the predictive strength of learners' communication apprehension towards their WTC in L2 can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 Regression Results with Learners' Communication Apprehension as the Independent Variable

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
-0,374a	0,140	0,137

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learners' communication apprehension

The result of the regression formula shown in Table 5 in which learners' communication apprehension could only predict 14% of the variance of un-WTC in L2 is rather surprising as it is contradictory to the idea of some authorities in WTC research. This result is slightly denied, even though not being totally contradictory to Matsuoka et al. (2014), and Oz, Demirezen, and Pourfeiz (2015). They have asserted that communication apprehension is one of the strongest and most reliable causes of un-WTC in L2 and the idea of Baker and MacIntyre (2000) that communication apprehension is one key antecedent and one of the best predictors of WTC in a negative way (un-WTC). The result further has also contradicted the results of some previous researches which have found that learners' communication apprehension becomes one of the strongest factors in reducing learners' WTC in L2 (Matsuoka et al., 2014; Oz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015).

With regard to this, there may be some explanations why this rather surprising finding emerged. First, in an FL context, like in the present research, communication apprehension cannot predict learners' WTC in L2 as strongly as learners' perceived communication competence because learners' belief of their capability in communicating in L2 will likely improve their L2 confidence more than their apprehension will likely decrease it (Ortega, 2009; Yashima, 2002). Besides, in this context, many other factors, such as learners' personality, cultural diversity (Fadilah, 2018b; Oz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015), classroom environment (Fadilah, 2018b; Peng & Woodrow, 2010), age and gender (Donovan & MacIntyre, 2009) may have played in predicting the participants' WTC in L2.

Furthermore, the linear regression formula in SPSS 21 is performed to answer the fourth research question on the extent to which learners' WTC in L2 could predict their L2 achievement as measured with their composite final grades. With learners' grades as the dependent variable, in which the minimum is 36,75, while the maximum is 90 (M = 74,22, SD = 8,95), and learners' WTC in L2 as the independent variable, the regression result could be seen in Table 6.

As seen in Table 6, the formula produced R2 of 0,005, which indicates that learners' WTC in L2 could predict only 0,5% of their L2 achievement as measured with their grades. Simply put, other variables make up the other 99,5%, which are not included in the regression formula. Considering this very small percentage of predictive strength of learners' WTC in L2, it is perhaps very safe to state that in the present research, the learner participants' WTC in L2 does not affect

their grades. Interestingly, this result has contradicted the result of Matsuka's (2004) research in a nursing college in Japan. It is found that the participants' WTC in L2 significantly predicts their language achievement.

Table 6 Regression Results with Learners' WTC in L2 as the Independent Variable

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
0,070a	0,005	0,001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learners' WTC in L2

Concerning this another surprising result; some points could be pointed out. First, the self-report questionnaire inherently carries the consequence that the participants' responses are based on what they do or what they believe rather than what they actually do. Hence, it is possible that the participants, despite reporting a relatively high WTC in L2, may not actually have this high level of WTC in L2 at the class. Secondly, as pictured in MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) pyramid model of WTC in L2, it could not be treated as the actual use of L2 as it is merely the antecedent of it (MacIntyre et al., 1998). The actual use of L2 is placed at the top of the pyramid while WTC in L2 is situated as its immediate antecedent. Hence, it is persuasive to state that this antecedent, despite being very potential to be translated into actual L2 use (Oz, 2016), is not always translated into actual use of L2. To put it in another way, learners' WTC in L2 is perhaps only indirectly related to their L2 achievement measured with grades, which may be more closely related to several more immediate factors such as their preparation before the speaking assessments and test anxiety (Aydin, 2009).

Finally, to summarise, the present research has found several important findings. First, in general, learners report a high WTC in L2 in English 2 class. In more detailed, however, learners report that they are less willing to communicate some typical situations that are replicating the findings of several previous pieces of research. These are when they have more addressees or interlocutors (Kang, 2005), when they are not familiar with the interlocutors (Barjesteh, Vaseghi, & Neissi, 2012; Cao & Philp, 2006), and when they are asked to speak without any preparation (Kang, 2005). Secondly, this research confirms many experts' idea that learners' perceived communication competence is strongly related to their WTC (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Clement, Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Ortega, 2009; Yashima, 2002). It could be seen from the statistically significant, strong correlation between the two components and from the finding that their perceived communication competence could predict 41,6% of the variance in their WTC.

Third, this research also confirms that learners' communication apprehension is related to their WTC. However, it slightly diverges from many experts' statement that communication apprehension is a strong predictor of WTC in a negative way (Matsuoka et al., 2014; Modirkhameneh & Firouzmand, 2014; Oz, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015). This research has found that it is negatively correlated with learners' WTC only at a moderate level, with very weak prediction strength of 14%. Finally, despite many experts' support on WTC in L2 as an indicator of successful L2 learning, this research has found that learners' WTC in L2 could only predict 0,5% of the variance in learners' achievement. This seemingly surprising result may be attributed to the possibility that despite the importance of WTC for successful L2 learning, it is only indirectly related to L2 achievement measured with their grades in the class.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this research have several implications in regard to English as L2 learning. First, English teachers should provide more situations or factors facilitating learners as much as possible to increase their WTC, for examples, by asking learners to have small group discussions rather than a whole class discussion and by giving them preparation time before they speak. Furthermore, considering that learners' perceived communication competence becomes a strong predictor of learners' WTC, it is suggested that teachers design activities in such a way that they can build a sense of achievement among learners, and thus increase their perceived competence. As they have been capable of envisioning themselves as capable L2 communicators, they will likely be more willing to communicate, leading to actual L2 use and improved proficiency.

The present research, despite revealing several useful findings, also has several limitations. Firstly, questionnaires distributed to participants at one particular point may not be able to capture learners' dynamic WTC throughout the semester. Also, self-reported questionnaires inherently bring a consequence that the data obtained depend on the participants' reports despite the possible inaccuracies. For example, they may have reported their WTC in the questionnaire, but in the real classroom situations, this willingness is not manifested in actual L2 use.

The next is related to the extent to which grades really reflect learners' actual ability to communicate. The use of learners' grades to represent their L2 achievement, despite logical and understandable, may inherently be responsible for the result suggesting the minimal effect of learners' WTC in L2 towards their L2 achievement. L2 achievement in this research is 'confined' to academic achievement in the form of grades, which may not really reflect their actual proficiency in communicating in L2. Finally, even though the findings of this research could be generalized, they should be seen within the context of participants of this research, Indonesian undergraduate university students taking General English classes. This research's results, for example, may not be generalized to the population of Indonesian students from English departments or Indonesian students from lower educational levels.

The results of the present research may suggest the pattern and, at the same time, the complexity and dynamicity of WTC construct. Interplays of psychological, linguistic, educational, and communicative dimensions of language may affect a person's WTC. As might be intuitively expected, learners' perceived communication competence could strongly predict their WTC and their communication apprehension is found to be moderately correlated with their WTC. However, despite many experts' reiterated idea on the importance of WTC in L2 learning, this research has surprisingly found that WTC could not predict learners' L2 achievement. While this result clearly suggested WTC is not predictive to learners' grades, at least as the results of this research are concerned, it may also suggest that learning environment, not captured in the statistical formula, plays an important part in affecting WTC – learners' grades relationship. Teachers' possible differing

standards in grading learners' speaking performances, for example, can affect the validity of learners' grades in reflecting learners' real ability to communicate. That is to say, researchers intending to investigate WTC – L2 proficiency may need to focus their attention to investigate the extent to which learners' WTC can predict their actual observable proficiency rather than their readily used grades in English class.

Finally, several directions for future researches can be suggested. The first is to investigate factors contributing to WTC in L2 using qualitative methods like interviews, focus groups, and observations. The use of the qualitative method is intended to investigate the WTC phenomenon in-depth with a small number of selected participants in which 'truths' about WTC from the participants' perspectives can be obtained. The use of qualitative methods is an acknowledgment that WTC in L2 is such a complex and dynamic construct that can change and fluctuate across time depending on learners' increased proficiency and wider communication experiences in L2. Even though unlike quantitative methods, qualitative methods are rarely used in the field of WTC researches, they may offer a new insight from the participants' experiences in regard to the WTC phenomenon. For example, instead of treating learners' grades as L2 achievement and conducting statistical formula, future research can use the combination of the participants' journals, interviews, and observation to investigate the dynamics of WTC and how it fluctuates across time.

REFERENCES

Alemi, M., Tajeddin, Z., & Mesbah, Z. (2013). Willingness to communicate in L2 English: Impact of learner variables. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 42–61.

Aydin, S. (2009). Test anxiety among foreign language learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 5*(1), 127–137.

Baghaei, P. (2011). *Validation of a multidimensional scale of willingness to communicate.* Paper presented at the Meeting of the Methodology and Evaluation Section of the German Association of Psychology, Bamberg, September 21-23.

Baghaei, P., & Dourakhshan, A. (2012). The relationship between willingness to communicate and success in learning English as a foreign language. *Elixir Psychology, 53*, 12160–12164.

Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 311–341. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00119.

Baran-Lucarz, M. (2014). The link between pronunciation anxiety and willingness to communicate in the foreign language classroom: The Polish EFL context. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 70*(4), 445–473. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2666.

Barjesteh, H., Vaseghi, R., & Neissi, S. (2012). Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate across different context- and receiver types. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 2*(1), 47–54. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p47.

Basit, T. N. (2010). *Conducting research in educational contexts*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cao, Y. (2013). Exploring dynamism in willingness to communicate: A longitudinal case study. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*(2), 160–176. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.36.2.03cao.

Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics, 34*(4), 480–493.

Clement, 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, 22*(2), 190–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0261927X03022002003.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Donovan, L. A., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2009). Age and sex differences in willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived competence. *Communication Research Reports, 21*(4), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090409360006.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fadilah, E. (2018a). Perception, motivation, and communicative self-confidence of Indonesian students on willingness to communicate in L2 using Facebook. *JEELS, 5*(1), 23–48. doi: https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v5i1.562.

Fadilah, E. (2018b). Willingness to communicate from Indonesian learners' perspective : A dynamic complex system theory. *Journal of ELT Research, 3*(2), 168–185. https://doi.org/10.22236/JER.

Fallah, N. (2014). Willingness to communicate in English, communication self-confidence, motivation, shyness, and teacher immediacy among Iranian English-major undergraduates: A structural equationmodeling approach. *Learning and Individual Differences, 30*, 140–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.12.006.

Gol, M., Zand-Moghadam, A., & Karrabi, M. (2014). The construct of willingness to communicate and its relationship with EFL learners' perceived verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT), 3*(1), 135–160.

Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x.

Kang, S. J. (2005). Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System, 33*(2), 277–292. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2004.10.004.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English in ASEAN: Implications for regional multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(4), 331–344. doi: 10.1080/01434632.2012.661433.

MacIntyre, P. D., Burns, C., & Jessome, A. (2011). Ambivalence about communicating in a second language: A qualitative study of French immersion

students' willingness to communicate. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(1), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01141.x.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2 : A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545–562.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Doucette, J. (2010). Willingness to communicate and action control. *System, 38*(2), 161–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.013.

Matsuka, R. (2004). Willingness to communicate among Japanese college students. In *Proceedings of the 9th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics.* Chonan, Republic of Korea. pp. 151-159.

Matsuoka, R., Matsumoto, K., Poole, G., & Matsuoka, M. (2014). Japanese university students ' willingness to communicate in English : The serendipitous effect of oral presentations. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics 18*(1), 193–218.

Modirkhameneh, S., & Firouzmand, A. (2014). Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate and language learning orientations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 1134–1139. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.526.

Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A., & Pawlak, M. (2016). Designing a tool for measuring the interrelationships between L2 WTC, confidence, beliefs, motivation, and context. In M. Pawlak (Ed.), *Classroom-oriented research: reconciling theory and practice* (pp. 19–38). Basel, Switzerland: Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30373-4.

Ningsih, S. K., Narahara, S., & Mulyono, H. (2018). An exploration of factors contributing to student' unwillingness to communicate in a foreign language across Indonesian secondary schools. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(4), 811–824. doi: 10.12973/iji.2018.11451a.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition.* New York: Routledge.

Osterman, G. L. (2014). Experiences of Japanese university students' willingness to speak English in class: A multiple case study. *SAGE Open, 4*(3), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014543779.

Oz, H. (2014). Big five personality traits and willingness to communicate among foreign language learners in Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality, 42*(9), 1473–1482. doi: https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.9.1473.

Oz, H. (2016). Role of the ideal L2 self in predicting willingness to communicate of EFL students. In I. H. Mirici, I. H. Erten, & H. Oz (Eds.), *Research Papers on Teaching English as an Additional Language* (pp. 163–182). Rijeka: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka.

Oz, H., Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Willingness to communicate of EFL learners in Turkish context. *Learning and Individual Differences, 37*, 269–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2014.12.009.

Peng, J. E. (2016). The context-sensitivity of self-concept and willingness to communicate in the Chinese EFL classroom: A case study. In J. King (Ed.), *The dynamic interplay between context and the language learner*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peng, J. E., & Woodrow, L. J. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies, 60*(4), 834–876. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00576.x.

Rastegar, M., & Karami, M. (2015). On the relationship between foreign language classroom anxiety, willingness to communicate, and scholastic success among Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(11), 2387–2394. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0511.25.

Rostami, G., Kashanian, V., & Gholami, H. (2016). The relationship between language proficiency and willingness to communicate in English in an Iranian EFL context. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 3*(2), 166–176.

Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education, 5*(2), 240–252. doi: 10.24815/siele.v5i2.11532.

Shao, S., Yu, W., & Ji, Z. (2013). An exploration of Chinese EFL students' emotional intelligence and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(4), 917–926. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12042.x.

Subekti, A. S. (2018a). An exploration of foreign language anxiety in the Indonesian university context: Learners' and teachers' voices. *TEFLIN Journal, 29*(2), 219–244.

Subekti, A. S. (2018b). Investigating the relationship between foreign language anxiety and oral performance of non-English major university students in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu, 18*(1), 15–35. doi: 10.21093/di.v18i1.880.

Walliman, N. (2011). *Research methods: The basics*. New York: Routledge.

Watanabe, M. (2013). Willingness to communicate and Japanese high school English learners. *JALT Journal, 35*(2), 153–171.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(1), 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00136.

Yashima, T. (2012). Willingness to communicate: Momentary volition that results in L2 behaviour. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory, and practice* (pp. 119–135). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ymeri, M. (2016). The impact of gender and second language proficiency on willingness to communicate in the upper secondary schools of Gjilan town- Kosovo. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 2*(1), 103–119. doi- http://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2016.s21.103119

Zarrinabadi, N., & Abdi, R. (2011). Willingness to communicate and language learning orientations in Iranian EFL context. *International Education Studies, 4*(4), 206–214. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n4p206.

APPENDX

Appendix 1 Questionnaire Items on WTC in L2 with Percentages of Participants Selecting Each Alternative

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	I am willing to present arguments to the rest of my class.			
	18,8*	77,2	4	0
2.	I am willing to give a presentation in front of the class.			
	21,4	73,6	5,1	0
3.	I am willing to do a role-play in a small group.			
	19,9	73,6	6,5	0
4.	I am willing to do a role-play in a pair.			
	17,8	68,5	13,8	0
5.	I am willing to take part in a discussion in a small group.			
	28,3	67	4,7	0
6.	I am willing to take part in a discussion in a pair.			
	20,7	71	8	0,4
7.	I am willing to talk and express my opinions in English in the class when all my classmates are listening to me.			
	12,3	59,8	27,2	0,7
8.	I am willing to have pair and group activities in the class so that I can talk in English with my classmates.			
	20,3	69,9	9,1	0,7
9.	In group work activities in the class when the group is composed of my friends I am willing to speak in English.			
	17,4	68,1	13,8	0,7
10.	In group work activities in the class when the group is NOT composed of my friends I am willing to speak in English.			
	4	49,6	43,5	2,9
11.	I am willing to respond when the teacher asks me a question in English.			
	18,9	72,4	8	0,7
12.	I am willing to speak without preparation in class.			
	5,1	34,1	52,2	8,7
13.	I am willing to tell my group mates in English about things I do in my free time.			
	5,1	60,1	33	1,8
14.	I am willing to give a short impromptu speech to my class.			
	9,4	68,5	21	1,1
15.	I am willing to lead the discussion.			
	6,2	49,3	41,3	3,3

* Percentages may not add to 100 due to their being rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Appendix 2 Questionnaire Items on Learners' Perceived L2 Competence with Percentages of Participants Selecting Each Alternative

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	I am able to give my peer sitting next to me directions to my favourite restaurant in English.			
	7,2*	71	21	0,7
2.	I am able to translate a spoken utterance from Indonesian into English in my group.			
	4,3	54,7	39,9	1,1
3.	I am able to do a role-play standing in front of the class in English (e.g., ordering food in a restaurant).			
	4,7	55,1	39,1	1,1
4.	I am able to give a short self-introduction without notes in English.			
	24,6	68,1	6,9	0,4
5.	I feel I can speak English less painfully.			
	6,9	44,6	44,2	4,3
6.	I am sure I can manage to make myself understood in English.			
	4,3	51,4	42	2,2
7.	I know I can manage to speak English using words I know even if it is not correct.			
	17,8	71	10,1	1,1
8.	I am able to speak without being nervous.			
	4,3	33	55,8	6,9
9.	I am alright in speaking English in the class of this size.			
	5,4	56,5	37	1,1
10.	I could speak English in public. I can do it			
	8	40,2	47,8	4
11.	I feel more comfortable in speaking English in public.			
	5,4	21,7	67,4	5,4
12.	I can speak English more fluently than before.			
	9,1	62,3	26,4	2,2
13.	I feel I am a sort of good at English			
	10,1	64,1	24,6	1,1
14.	I know I can speak English if I prepare for speech well.			
	38,4	57,6	3,3	0,7
15.	I can manage to make a speech if I prepare the draft.			
	25,7	60,9	12,3	1,1

* Percentages may not add to 100 due to their being rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Appendix 3 Questionnaire Items on Learners' Communication Apprehension with Percentages of Participants Selecting Each Alternative

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	I felt tense in presentation.			
	22,5*	60,9	15,6	1,1
2.	Even now I feel traumatic about my failure in presentation.			
	6,5	26,1	54,7	12,7
3.	I feel worried that I might use strange English.			
	17,4	58,3	22,8	1,4
4.	Realizing my English is poor, it became hard to speak it and I lost my confidence.			
	15,9	47,1	33,7	3,3
5.	I feel embarrassed in speaking in public.			
	10,5	52,2	33,7	3,6
6.	I feel a little nervous if my English is wrong when speaking in public.			
	18,5	67,4	13	1,1
7.	No matter how many times I may make a speech, I feel tense.			
	17	53,6	26,1	3,3
8.	I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English class.			
	10,1	56,2	33	0,7
9.	It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English.			
	16,3	55,1	26,1	2,5
10.	I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in English class.			
	20,7	46	30,1	3,3
11.	I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.			
	14,5	57,2	26,4	1,8
12.	I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English class.			
	8	51,4	38,4	2,2
13.	I get nervous when I don't understand every word the language teacher says.			
	10,9	50	36,6	2,5
14.	I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak English.			
	11,6	37,7	46	4,7
15.	I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in English class.			
	10,9	36,2	47,1	5,8

* Percentages may not add to 100 due to their being rounded up to the nearest whole number.