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ABSTRACT

This study examined willingness to communicate (WTC) of language learners who were studying English as a foreign language in a Chinese college setting by adapting variables from four theoretical sources: McCroskey and Richmond’s (1987) WTC construct, Gardner’s (2001a) Socio-Educational model, MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model, and Wen and Clément’s (2003) conceptualization of WTC in a Chinese setting.

Three objectives guided this study: 1) to examine the relationships among willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence in Chinese and English language contexts respectively; 2) to examine the relationships between integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with WTC in English; 3) to test the proposed relationships among communication variables (i.e., communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (i.e., integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), teacher immediacy, and WTC in English.

Two hundred and thirty-five (235) sophomores and juniors majoring in English at a public university in China participated in this study. A quantitative research method using self-report questionnaires was employed to collect data that addressed ten different aspects or variables concerning the participants’ communication and affective orientations, as well as the perceived teacher immediacy behaviors. Pearson correlation coefficient, multiple regression, and a path model were utilized as statistical analysis methods in line with each research question.

The results of the study showed that all of the communication variables including willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence were significantly correlated with each other at the .01 level in both Chinese and English communication settings. Moreover, the correlations between Chinese and English for communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate were all positive and statistically significant, indicating their trait-like predisposition which remained constant across languages used in communication settings.

All of the four affective variables (i.e., integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation) and the variable of willingness to communicate in English were significantly correlated with each other at the .05 level. However, only attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation contributed significant predicative power to WTC in English.
Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were the only two direct effects on WTC in English. Communication apprehension also had indirect effect on WTC in English through its negative effect on self-perceived communication competence. Teacher immediacy had direct positive effect on communication apprehension and negative effect on self-perceived communication competence. WTC in English was indirectly dependent on teacher immediacy through the mediation of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

Motivation had direct effect on communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. The hypothesized predictive relationships from attitudes toward learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation to motivation were supported. Motivation could indirectly predict WTC in English through the mediation of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

The importance of this study lies in its theoretical contributions to the WTC research and the pedagogical implications for second language teaching and learning. Willingness to communicate was examined in China where English was learned as a foreign language. Therefore, the different linguistic and language speaking environments in this study enriched the scholarship of the WTC concept. The variable of teacher immediacy was incorporated into a path model with affective and communication variables for the first time in WTC research, which theoretically extended the conceptualization of WTC construct.

This study has pedagogical implications for English teaching and learning as well. A better understanding of students’ willingness to communicate in the target language may help language teachers improve the communicative language teaching approach and curriculum design to provide more communication opportunities for language learners, more importantly, encourage actual engagement into communication behaviors, and finally, facilitate second/foreign language learning and acquisition.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Looking back over a century of second and foreign language teaching, it is easy to watch trends as they come and go. In examining the second and foreign language pedagogy of the present era, it is almost certain that Communicative Language Teaching is taking the lead during the 21st century. The essence of communicative language teaching is the engagement of language learners in communication to allow them to develop their communication competence (Savignon, 2005). Therefore, the understanding and identification of learners’ communication orientation and needs provides a basis for language teachers to design curricula, apply instructional strategies, and improve language teaching effectiveness. Brown (2000) identified four interconnected characteristics to describe the communicative language teaching approach, including “classroom goals are focused on all of the components of communicative competence” and “language techniques are designed to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, and functional use of language for meaning purposes” (p. 266). The important role that the communicative language teaching approach plays in second and foreign language teaching pedagogy reflects an emphasis on the use of language for meaningful communication in the process of language learning and acquisition.

Language acquisition theories have had a considerable impact on the pedagogical approach of the communicative language teaching, in particular, Sociocultural Theory (SCT) has had substantial impact. Sociocultural theory posits that speaking and thinking are tightly interwoven, and argues that speaking mediates thinking (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Lantolf (2005) distinguished differences between sociocultural theory and other mainstream approaches to second language acquisition. He argued that language should be viewed as an emergent system comprised of fragments that emerge and were shaped in the maelstrom of communicative interaction. In the same vein, Swain (2005) pointed out that, from a sociocultural perspective, producing language played a vital and substantial role in second language learning. Swain stated that,

Speaking (and writing) are conceived of as cognitive tools—tools that mediate internalization; and that externalize internal psychological activity, resocializing, and
recognizing it for the individual; tools that construct and deconstruct knowledge; and tools that regulate and are regulated by human agency. (p. 480)

Language was suggested to be learned through interactive meaningful communication in a pragmatic setting (Swain & Lapkin, 2002). Language use and language learning could co-occur, and it was language use that mediated language learning (Swain, 2000). Therefore, it is important to understand the variables that constrain and enhance language learners’ opportunities to produce language, to use language to communicate, and to acquire a language through communication.

Theoretical exploration and pedagogical application throughout the current decade have primarily promoted the important role of using language to communicate in second and foreign language learning and teaching. Moreover, MacIntyre, Clement, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) argued that the ultimate goal of second or foreign language learning should be to “engender in language students the willingness to seek out communication opportunities and the willingness actually to communicate in them” (p. 547). Based on this argument, MacIntyre et al. (1998) proposed that to create willingness to communicate should be a proper objective for second language education.

Willingness to Communicate (WTC) was originally conceptualized with reference to first or native language (L1) verbal communication. It was introduced to the communication literature by McCroskey and Richmond (1987), based on Burgoon’s (1976) work on unwillingness to communicate, that of Mortensen, Arnston, and Lustig (1977) on predisposition toward verbal behavior, and of McCroskey and Richmond (1982) on shyness. WTC was initially referred to as an individual’s general personality orientation towards talking by McCroskey and Richmond (1987). Given the personality trait of WTC, McCroskey and his associates suggested that WTC reflected a stable predisposition to talk, which was relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts and types of receivers.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) pointed out that “it is highly unlikely that WTC in the second language is a simple manifestation of WTC in the L1” (p. 546). WTC in second language (L2 WTC) was, then, defined as a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a second language. MacIntyre et al. (1998) proposed a heuristic model of the WTC construct with an account of linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables that might affect one’s WTC in a second language communication context. The trait-like conceptualization of WTC advanced by McCroskey
and Richmond (1987) in L1 communication was then extended as a situational variable with both transient and enduring influences in an L2 setting in MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) study.

Although WTC is a relatively new concept, there have been some studies dedicated to examining its conceptual components and empirical outcomes in L2 communication. Personality variables, communication variables, affective variables, and social psychological variables were investigated for the purpose of understanding WTC in terms of its relationships with different influential components (e.g., Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre & Chaos, 1996; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Wen & Clément, 2003; Yashima, 2002). Structural Equation Model is typically utilized to analyze the potential relationships among WTC and different influential variables. Studies that have focused on the outcome research of WTC have suggested that WTC consistently predicted classroom participation in L1 (Chan & McCroskey, 1987) and the initiation of communication in L1 (MacIntyre, Babin, & Clement, 1999) and L2 (MacIntyre & Carre, 2000). Therefore, willingness to communicate, which was suggested as the final intention to really initiate a communication, held a great value in the research of second and foreign language learning and instruction.

**Problem Statement**

Willingness to communicate has been proposed both as an individual difference variable affecting L2 acquisition and as a goal of L2 instruction by MacIntyre et al. (1998). It was also suggested that the combination of communication and second language learning research would provide insight into the study of individual differences in second language acquisition (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003). Compared to research that has been conducted on other individual difference factors, such as motivation, aptitude, learning strategy, working memory, and personality, the understanding and the scholarship that have been built up on WTC concept are still comparatively limited. This study was intended to contribute to the scholarship of research in second language learning through an examination of willingness to communicate—a recently developed individual difference variable.

**Limited WTC Studies in Foreign Language Learning Context**

Given the insufficient number of studies on WTC in second language communication, most of the previous studies on L2 WTC are carried out in a particular setting where the target language is learned and communicated as a second language rather than a foreign language. Oxford and Shearin (1994) have argued that there is distinction between second language and foreign language learning environments. A foreign language, as Oxford and Shearin suggested, is usually exclusively obtained inside the classroom. Language learners who are learning a target language as a foreign language rarely have the opportunity to...
practice the language on a daily basis. Therefore, they lack the opportunities to use the language for pragmatic communication. On the other hand, a second language learner may have many more opportunities to use the language in a practical daily communication context because the language is used as a main vehicle of communication in settings outside the classroom.

MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan (2002) argued that when examining relationships between variables influencing L2 communication behavior, it was important to take into consideration the learner's experience and engagement with the target language. Therefore, studies on WTC in foreign language communication settings are needed to enrich the theoretical foundation of the WTC research.

Studies on WTC in a foreign language learning context have been carried out in a number of countries, including Japan, Korea, and Turkey. However, few studies have been conducted in China, where a large number of individuals are learning English as a foreign language. In one of the few China-based studies of WTC, Wen and Clément (2003) examined college language learners’ willingness to communicate and presented a Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in English based on the heuristic WTC model of MacIntyre et al. (1998). Wen and Clément identified a dilemma in teaching English in China: the discrepancy between students’ high English proficiency in grammar and vocabulary and deficiency in carrying out English conversations. They argued that cultural values, which were the dominant force shaping the individual’s perception and way of learning, were manifested in Chinese students’ English communication. For instance, submission to authority, a valued social norm in Chinese culture, might account for Chinese students’ reluctance to participate in classroom communication in English.

Wen and Clément (2003) also gave an account of linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables that might affect the students’ WTC in a Chinese setting. Although Wen and Clément’s study addressed the concept of WTC in a Chinese setting, empirical studies are needed to verify the proposed variables and their impact on WTC. Teacher immediacy, which refers to teachers’ communication behaviors that are intended to develop physical and psychological closeness with students, was suggested by Wen and Clément as one of the important variables which could affect Chinese students’ WTC in English due to the Chinese cultural value of submitting to authority. To test this assumption, this study examined the potential relationship between teacher immediacy and language learners’ WTC in English.
Personal English Learning and Teaching Experiences in China

As a foreign language learner, I have witnessed a common phenomenon of a mismatch between learners’ willingness to communicate in English and their actual English proficiency. It was not unusual that individuals who could obtain high scores in standardized English proficiency tests, such as TOEFL, GRE, and GMAT, could barely carry out pragmatic conversation in English. The lack of practice opportunities in the environment, in which English was primarily studied as a school subject and used exclusively inside the classroom, seemed to be the principal reason for students’ low capability in English communication. However, not until I became a teacher of an Oral English class a couple of years ago did I realize that most of the students in the class were reluctant to participate in English communication even when they were given sufficient communication opportunities.

I had taught the Oral English class at a public university in China for three years. My students were freshman English majors in the Department of English Language. The Oral English class was designed specifically to develop English language learners’ communicative competence. Therefore, a lot of classroom activities were designed to encourage students’ engagement in English communication, and meanwhile, plenty of opportunities for the students to communicate in English were provided inside the classroom. In this case, the common excuse of the shortage of communication opportunities for students’ lack of involvement in communication behaviors might sound vulnerable. Then, the following questions occurred to me: What are the causes of the students’ unwillingness to communicate in English? What factors could be influential toward students’ English communication willingness? How could the factors, if any, affect students’ willingness to communicate in English? Based on my exploration of the literatures on this topic, studies were needed to be able to answer these questions. The current study was expected to shed some light on the answers to these questions.

English Education in China

The Ministry of Education, formerly the State Education Development Commission (SEDC) from 1985 to 1998, is a branch of the central government which regulates all aspects of the educational system in mainland China. It makes educational policies, certifies teachers, standardizes curricula and textbooks, establishes standards, and generally monitors the entire educational system. Before 1992, a structural curriculum was used exclusively as a guideline for English teaching in China. In teaching practice, teachers tended to put primary emphasis on grammar instruction and vocabulary (Liao, 2000). Teaching materials were focused on grammatical study rather than pragmatic language use. As a result of the teaching methods
A re-evaluation of the traditional English teaching methods conducted by the SEDC led to a reform of the English teaching methods as well as the curriculum. A new functional curriculum was introduced by the SEDC in 1992 as a national unified curriculum, which set “being able to use English to communicate” as a major teaching goal (Yu, 2001). The new functional curriculum was designed to train students in listening, speaking, reading, and writing and enable them to “gain basic knowledge of English and competence to use English for communication” (Yu, 2001, p. 195). This innovation in English teaching curriculum, in which using English for communication was specified as the major teaching goal, called for and encouraged the relevant reforms in teaching methods. After the implementation of the new English teaching curriculum, the communicative language teaching approach started to draw serious attention from English teachers and researchers, although it had been introduced in China in an article by Xiaojun Li back in 1979 (Yu, 2001).

The implementation of the communicative language teaching approach in English teaching in China has not been a smooth process. Beyond the doubt and debate as to whether communicative language teaching was really superior to the traditional teaching methods mainly based on grammar instruction, there have been constraining factors that impact the application of the communicative language teaching approach inside the English classroom. Teachers’ inability to teach communicatively because of their language proficiency and their professional background, negative influence from the teaching tradition, and grammar-oriented examination processes were suggested to be the main factors which limited a real application of the communicative language teaching approach in a Chinese setting (Liao, 2000). Moreover, Yu (2001) pointed out that the large size of classes might also impose constraints on the implementation of communicative language teaching.

However, given the importance of the communicative language teaching approach to teaching English in a Chinese setting (Liao, 2000; Yu, 2001), most of the factors explored previously that might have hindered the application of the approach are related to the role of English teachers’ lack of ability to teach English communicatively because of their limited oral English communication proficiency as nonnative speakers of English, or their insufficient professional knowledge about communicative language teaching. Possible influences from the perspective of language learners were ignored. Students, as the main participants of the process of English learning and as language users in the discourse of
communication, also may play a critical role in the implementation of the communicative language teaching approach. Therefore, a study of students’ willingness to communicate may help researchers understand language learners’ communication orientations and behaviors, and then assist in a real application of the communicative language teaching approach in the English classes. Moreover, a study of students’ willingness to communicate could also contribute to the English instructional pedagogy and teacher training programs in the English education system in China.

**The Purposes of the Study and Research Questions**

This study examined the willingness to communicate construct in a Chinese college setting by adapting variables from four theoretical sources: McCroskey and Richmond’s (1987) WTC construct, Gardner’s (2001a) Socio-Educational model, MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model, and Wen and Clément’s (2003) conceptualization of WTC in a Chinese setting.

Three objectives guided this study: 1) to examine the relationships among willingness to communicate (WTC), communication apprehension (CA), and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC) in L1 (Chinese) and L2 (English) language contexts respectively; 2) to examine the relationships between integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with WTC in English; and 3) to test the proposed relationships among communication variables (communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), teacher immediacy, and WTC in English.

Three research questions were investigated in the study:

1. What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English) communication?
2. What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?
3. What are the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?
Research Question 1

Among the research conducted on the relevant antecedents of WTC in L1 and L2, communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence have consistently demonstrated a substantial influence on WTC. However, not many studies have compared these variables in different language contexts (L1 vs. L2) and examined their potential relationships. McCroskey and Richmond (1987) identified cultural differences as one of the antecedents influencing L1 WTC. They pointed out that “communication norms are highly valuable as a function of culture” and thus, “one’s communication norms and competencies are culture-bound” (p. 140). Although some studies have been conducted in various countries and evaluated different communication variables (e.g., Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey, 1988; Burroughs & Marie, 1990; McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990; McCroskey and McCroskey, 1986; Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991), different language contexts were seldom involved in the comparison. As a result, the first research question examines the relationships among these three communication variables: communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate in the first and second language communication settings. The purpose of this question is to a) examine the relationships between communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate in L1 and L2 settings respectively, and b) cross-compare the relationships between L1 and L2 communication apprehension, L1 and L2 self-perceived communication competence, and L1 and L2 willingness to communicate to investigate whether or not each of these three communication variable in a person’s native language would affect his/her relevant communicative orientation in a second/foreign language. The investigation of the relationships among these three communication variables between L1 and L2 would facilitate a better understanding of the features of people’s communication orientations.

Research Question 2

Motivational research in the field of second language learning and acquisition has been carried out for several decades. The most influential study can be represented by Gardner’s Socio-Educational Model (Gardner, 1985; Gardner, 2001a) which suggested significant relationships between affective variables (i.e., attitude, desire, and motivation) and second language learning achievement.

Gardner’s Socio-Educational Model suggested that affective variables integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation were all influential to an individual’s language learning achievement. Gardner (1985; 2001a)
described a dichotomy between integrativeness and instrumental orientation. Integrativeness involves emotional identification with another cultural group, which usually stems from a genuine interest in approaching emotionally and physically toward the population who speak the target language. On the other side, there is instrumental orientation, which refers to utilitarian and practical reasons for language learning, such as better employment opportunities or higher salary. In line with Oxford and Shearin’s (1994) differentiation between second language learners and foreign language learners in terms of the availability of the target language input and output in daily communication, it was assumed that integrativeness and instrumental orientations would issue different effects on the second or foreign language learners’ communication willingness.

Studies on L2 WTC have shown results from the impact of either integrativeness (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, Donovan, 2003) or instrumental orientation (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, Conrod, 2001) on L2 WTC, but none of them have put these two variables together to compare their individual relationships with L2 WTC. Therefore, based on Gardner’s Socio-Educational model, the second research question examined these variables simultaneously (i.e., integrativeness and instrumental orientation) along with attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation to examine their relationships with language learners’ willingness to communicate in English. The purpose of this question was to explore, in a Chinese setting where English was learned as a foreign language instead of a second language, which affective variables would have strongest relationship with the participants’ willingness to communicate in English.

**Research Question 3**

The construct of immediacy refers to the communication behaviors that enhance physical and psychological closeness with another (Mehrabian, 1967). Wen and Clément (2003) pointed out that teacher immediacy—teachers’ communication behaviors that were intended to develop physical and psychological closeness with students—was a very important factor which influences Chinese students’ willingness to communicate in English. They suggested that teacher immediacy should be identified as one of the proximal influences on students’ English communication willingness, because hierarchical social relationships place teachers in the position of authority especially in the Chinese setting. Therefore, in the third research question, communication variables (communication apprehension, perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, instrumental orientation), the variable of teacher immediacy, and WTC in English were examined together by using a proposed path model comprising the
presumed relationships among the variables based on hypotheses (see Figure 1.1). The purpose of the third research question was to investigate the variables’ predictive relationships with the WTC in English. As a result, the investigation to the predictive impact on WTC from these different variables would provide evidence to test and evaluate MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model in a Chinese setting.

Figure 1.1. The proposed initial path model
Note. CA: Communication Apprehension; SPCC: Self-Perceived Communication Competence; ATLS: Attitude toward Learning Situation; WTC_E: Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language

For the purpose of testing the path model, three research hypotheses pertaining to relationships among different variables were proposed based on the previous studies on WTC. An examination of these research hypotheses facilitated the investigation of research question three, which was designed to examine the relationships among the proposed variables and their impact on WTC in English. Three hypotheses regarding the third research question “What are the relationships of communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?” are as follows:
Hypothesis 1: Self-perceived communication competence would directly predict WTC in English. Communication apprehension would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence.

Hypothesis 2: Teacher immediacy would have direct effect on communication apprehension, motivation, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English.

Hypothesis 3: Motivation would directly predict WTC in English. Attitudes toward learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would be indirectly related to WTC in English through their direct effect on motivation.

**Significance of the Study**

The importance of this study lies in its theoretical contribution to the WTC research and the pedagogical implications for second language teaching and learning. The concept of WTC was introduced to L2 communication settings in late 1990s. Since then, research has been conducted with the effort of conceptualizing the L2 WTC and examining and testing the L2 WTC construct. The current study is aimed at enriching the theoretical foundation of the WTC construct in a different country and linguistic environment.

Communication norms are highly variable as a function of culture. McCroskey and Richmond (1990a) suggested that the relationship between WTC and various variables might be substantially different in one culture than in another. Studies of WTC have been conducted in Australia (Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988), Sweden, (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990), Micronesia (Burroughs & Marie, 1990; Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003), Finland (Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991), Korea (Kim, 2004), Turkey (Cetinkaya, 2005), and Japan (Matsuoka, 2005; Yashima, 2002), but few studies have been conducted in China (Wen & Clément, 2003; Hsu, 2005).

Meanwhile, most of the previous studies of L2 WTC were conducted in settings where the target languages were learned and used as a second language, while it was suggested that the differences between second language and foreign language settings could affect language learners in a tremendous way (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). The current study investigates the L2 WTC in a Chinese college setting where English is learned as a foreign language.

The second theoretical significance regards the scope of the proposed variables presumed to be influential on the WTC construct. The potential relationships among variables and their impact on WTC that were proposed in this study were based on previous studies. Although the relationships between WTC and each individual variable have been examined separately by researchers to some degree, this study provided a broader scope of investigation of the
potential relationships among communication variables, affective variables, and the variable of teacher immediacy. For the first time in L2 WTC studies, this study examined 1) integrativeness and instrumental orientation together to test their predictive power to L2 WTC, and 2) the contribution of teacher immediacy to L2 WTC along with communication and affective variables.

This study has pedagogical implications for English teaching and learning as well. Language use, to a large degree, refers to using language to communicate. Willingness to communicate was suggested as the final intention to really initiate a communication. Therefore, a better understanding of students’ willingness to communicate in the target language may help language teachers improve their teaching methods and curriculum design. On the other hand, because students who are learning English as a foreign language usually lack authentic language communication opportunities, a better understanding of students’ willingness to communicate in English may help language teachers to realize and implement instructional strategies that could create more opportunities to promote communication and student engagement, and as a result, facilitate students’ English learning and acquisition.

**Summary**

The concept of willingness to communicate originated in the area of native/first language communication. Recent studies on willingness to communicate have shifted the research interest from first language to second or foreign language communication domains. However, limited studies on willingness to communicate in L2 settings have encouraged further investigations in different language and cultural environments. This study on Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English may help language teachers and researchers understand the construct of willingness to communicate by examining it in a Chinese setting. Moreover, the study had pedagogical implications that may help language teachers improve teaching methods and curriculum design for the purpose of increasing students’ willingness to communicate in a foreign language.

**Definition of Terms**

The definitions of the particular terms used in this study are provided below as following:  
*Willingness to Communicate:* In L1 communication settings, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) defined WTC as an individual’s general personality orientation towards talking. It refers to the probability of engaging into a communication when an individual has the freedom to choose to do so. McCroskey (1997) redefined WTC as “an individual’s predisposition to initiate communication with others” (p. 77). In L2 communication
settings, WTC is then defined as a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a second language (MacIntyre et al., 1998).

Communication Apprehension: This concept is defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1997, p. 192).

Self-Perceived Communication Competence: Communicative competence is defined as “adequate ability to pass along or give information; the ability to make known by talking or writing” (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988, p. 109). The term self-perceived communication competence refers to how an individual believes his/her communication competence is, based on self awareness rather than the actual communication competence (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987).

Integrativeness: This term reflects “a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer psychologically to the other language community” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 8). Since integrativeness involves emotional identification with another cultural group, Gardner suggested that it would be reflected in an integrative orientation toward leaning the second language, a favorable attitude toward the language community, and openness to other groups in general.

Attitudes toward the Learning Situation: This construct involves “attitudes toward any aspect of the situation in which the language is learned” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 9). In the school context, these attitudes could be directed toward teacher, course, course materials, classroom activities, and extra-curriculum activities, etc. In this present study, attitudes toward learning situation refer to the attitude toward the target course and the course instructor.

Motivation: It refers to “the driving force in any situation” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 9). It is viewed as requiring three elements: 1) the motivated individual expends effort to learn the language; 2) the motivated individual wants to achieve the goal; 3) the motivated individual will enjoy the task of learning the language.

Integrative Motivation: It represents a complex notion of three components: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation (Gardner, 2001a).

Integrative orientation: An integrative orientation refers to the language learning goals involving a genuine interest in approaching emotionally and physically toward the population who speak the target language (Gardner, 2001a).

Instrumental orientation: An instrumental orientation, according to Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) reflects practical and utilitarian purposes of learning a language.
Teacher Immediacy: The construct of immediacy refers to the communication behaviors which enhance physical and psychological closeness with another (Mehrabian, 1967). Immediacy is composed of two kinds: nonverbal and verbal. Nonverbal immediacy refers to the behaviors such as eye contact, smiling, positive use of gestures, vocal variety, forward body lean, and a relaxed body position. Verbal immediacy then indicates verbal behaviors such as using “we” and “our”, using students’ first name, and using humor in class (Frymier, 1993). In this study, teacher immediacy particularly refers to teachers’ communication behaviors which enhance physical and psychological closeness with their students.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Willingness to communicate (WTC) in a second or foreign language is a specialized area of research in the field of second language acquisition. The research purpose of the current study was to examine language learners’ willingness to communicate in a foreign language learning context. Previous research and studies on willingness to communicate in both first language (L1) and second language (L2) settings are presented in this chapter, in detailed chronology. Beginning with the antecedent studies contributing to the initial construct of WTC in L1 and tracing the evolution of the construction of WTC models and their components, the concept of willingness to communicate was extended from its prime origin from the first language communication field to a complex involving communicative, linguistic, and social psychological perspectives after it is brought into second language learning and communication scope. From this general overview, a scrutinious exploration of the factors which were suggested to influence WTC in L2 follows. Contemporary studies conducted on WTC in L2 settings are then examined to provide a better understanding of the progress, achievements, and the most recent research in this field, in order to give an in-depth view of how the current study contributed to the scholarship of willingness to communicate.

Early Studies of Communication

The original source of the concept of willingness to communicate comes from research in the field of communication. Serious studies in communication, particularly empirical research, started around the 1930s (McCroskey, 1997). Public speaking was almost an exclusive focus of the communication studies during that period. Lack of public speaking skills was suggested as the sole reason for stage fright (Clevenger, 1959), which later evolved into the notion of communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1982a). The publication of Clevenger’s (1959) article reviewed 25 years of studies on stage fright and was considered a seminal piece that inspired subsequent research in the areas of communication approaching and avoidance.

Philips’ (1965) early study viewed “reticence” as a personality-based anxiety disorder. In his later work (1984, 1986, 1997), however, he rejected this initial interpretation, suggesting that while anxiety might be the cause of reticence, a lack of communication skills
should be presented as a major reason. Philips (1984) also pointed out that reticent people may or may not actually have deficient social skills, but they think they do.

The work of Clevenger and Philips paved the way for the later conceptualization of willingness to communicate as well as the two well-studied communication factors: Communication Apprehension (CA) and Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) (McCroskey, 1997). Although the studies of communication apprehension and perceived communication competence based on the initial work of speech anxiety and communication skills were conducted earlier than the development of the WTC concept, WTC is a more comprehensive construct embracing a wide range of influential elements including CA and SPCC.

**Conceptualization of WTC in First Language Communication**

McCroskey and Richmond (1987) advanced the construct of willingness to communicate and referred it as an individual’s general personality orientation towards talking. They pointed out that people were different considerably in the degree to which they actually do talk, to whom they talk, and in what situation they talk. A broad range of situational variables could affect people’s willingness to communicate with others. For instance, how people feel on a given day, the previous experience of communication with a certain person, what has happened before the communication, whether the topic is familiar or not, whether the communication is evaluated or not, could all impact communication willingness. Therefore, WTC, to some degree, was viewed as situation dependent.

However, although McCroskey and Richmond (1987) identified WTC’s situational feature, they claimed that WTC was basically a personality orientation, a concept which has been noticed in decades of research through consistent behavioral tendencies regarding the frequency and amount of talking (Borgatta & Bales, 1953; Chapple & Arensberg, 1940; Goldman-Eisler, 1951; as cited in McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). McCroskey and Richmond stated that:

> Individuals exhibit regular willingness-to-communicate tendencies across situations...Such regularity in communication behavior across interpersonal communication contexts suggests the existence of the personality variable, willingness to communicate. It is this personality orientation which explains why one person will talk and another will not under identical, or virtually identical, situational constraints. (pp. 129-130)

Verbal communication is a volitional act, which to a major extent, points to the essential cognitive nature of human communication behavior. On the other hand, cognition about
communication is viewed as considerably influenced by the individual’s personality (McCroskey and Richmond, 1990a). Therefore, an individual’s personality has a general impact on the cognitive choices this person would make about his/her communication orientations, the most important, the willingness to initiate a communication.

To further specify the conceptualization of WTC, McCroskey (1997) restated and defined that “the WTC trait is an individual’s predisposition to initiate communication with others” (p. 77). Therefore, when the concept of WTC was initially advanced by McCroskey and his associates in the communication field, the underlying assumption was all about its personality-based, traitlike predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts and types of receivers.

**Foundations of the Willingness to Communicate Construct**

Three major studies based on a presumed traitlike predisposition toward communication were identified as the foundational work upon which McCroskey and associates built their initial WTC concept. These important studies were the work of Burgoon (1976) on unwillingness to communicate, Mortensen, Arnston, and Lustig (1977) on predisposition toward verbal behavior, and McCroskey and Richmond (1982) on shyness (McCroskey, 1997; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987).

Burgoon’s (1976) study originated the construct of unwillingness to communicate, which was considered a global communication construct representing the predisposition of “a chronic tendency to avoid and/or devalue oral communication” (p. 60). Based on the research in the areas of anomie and alienation, introversion, self-esteem, and communication apprehension, Burgoon employed a self-reported measure, the Unwillingness-to-Communication Scale (UCS) to define the construct operationally. There were two factors in the measure which were labeled “approach-avoidance” and “reward” to refer respectively to “how likely a person is to approach and participate in communication situations” (p. 64) and “whether an individual generally finds communication rewarding—because others listen, understand and are honest—or unrewarding—because they ignore or try to use him/her” (p. 64). The results of data analysis did not support the supposed predisposition of unwillingness to communicate. Instead, the results simply suggested that people who had communication apprehension were unlikely to engage in communication than others (McCroskey, 1997).

Mortensen et al.’s (1977) study went one step further in the examination of the predisposition feature of communication behaviors. The authors noticed that there was a consistent amount of communication for an individual across various communication
situations and they labeled this consistency “predisposition toward verbal behavior”. A self-report scale titled Predisposition toward Verbal Behavior (PVB) scale was utilized to measure the presumed global predisposition characteristic. However, the factor analysis suggested that only one factor appeared to test a general tendency in communication engagement. The validity of this scale on its examination of the predisposition of willingness or unwillingness to communicate was then in doubt. Consequently, as suggested by McCroskey (1997), the results of the study did not provide “additional indications that some regularity exists in the amount an individual communicates” (p. 80).

The third foundational work for the conceptualization of WTC is McCroskey and Richmond (1982)’s study on shyness. They defined shyness as “the tendency to be timid, reserved, and most specifically, talk less” (p. 460). The McCroskey Shyness Scale (MSS) was designed as a self-report of the amount of talk which individuals typically engaged in. The study also used the observable behavior report of the participants aimed to test the validity of the measurement scale. The results of the study suggested that the MSS was a valid predictor of the actual communication behavior in terms of the amount of talk. However, the MSS did not test specifically the predisposition of willingness or unwillingness to communicate.

Variables Contributing to the Willingness to Communicate Construct

Although the previous studies did not provide significant evidence of the presumed predisposition of a communication orientation, they did suggest that there was a certain kind of regularity in people’s communication pattern in terms of the amount and frequency of talk. With this belief, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) advanced the concept of willingness to communicate and viewed it as a personality-based predisposition. This personality orientation can explain why one person would talk and another would not under similar circumstances.

To address the question why people vary in their willingness to communicate, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) examined a series of variables that they believed would lead to differences in a person’s communication willingness. They referred these variables the “antecedents” of willingness to communicate, however, also admitted the ambiguity that these variables might not be the causes of the variability in WTC. They suggested there was the possibility that some of these antecedents developed with the WTC predisposition at the same time, and therefore,

It is more likely that these variables may be involved in mutual causality with each other, and even more likely that both the antecedents and the willingness to communicate are produced in common by other causal element. (p. 138)
Six variables were addressed by McCroskey and Richmond (1987) as the factors that might contribute to individual difference of willingness to communicate. These six variables were introversion, anomie and alienation, self-esteem, cultural divergence, communication skill level, and communication apprehension. All variables were believed to have a possible relationship with communication behavior characteristics based on previous studies of each variable in the communication and psychology fields.

The identification of these six antecedents triggered a series of subsequent studies which focused on building the WTC construct by examining different variables and possible interrelationship. Because WTC was initially brought up in L1 communication environments as a personality-based predisposition, most of the variables inspected by researchers during 70s, 80s, and the early 90s were personality factors based on these six antecedents (Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988; MacIntyre, 1994; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987, 1990a, 1990b; Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991).

Among the research conducted on the relevant antecedents of WTC in L1, two factors—communication apprehension (CA) and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC)—have received substantial attention from researchers both in the conceptualization and empirical studies concerning WTC. McCroskey and Richmond (1987) pointed out that the level of an individual’s communication apprehension was “probably the single best predictor of his or her willingness to communicate” (p. 142) and “the most potent of the antecedents of willingness to communicate” (p. 142). By using a causal model, MacIntyre (1994) found that communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were the only two immediate variables responsible for the variation of an individual’s WTC. Based on the contemporary empirical studies conducted on WTC, McCroskey (1997) argued that WTC appeared to be the best predictor of people’s actual communication behaviors, whereas “CA and SPCC appeared to measure the factors that make the major contribution to prediction of a person’s WTC” (p. 105).

**Communication Apprehension.** Based on the early work of Clevenger (1959) on stage fright and Philips (1965) on reticence, McCroskey advanced the original conceptualization of communication apprehension in the 1970s. He viewed communication apprehension as “a broadly based anxiety related to oral communication” (McCroskey, 1982a, p. 136). From then on, communication apprehension was treated as the subject of tremendous studies in the communication field from 1970-1980 (McCroskey, 1982a) and inspired research in relevant areas focusing on different communication notions (i.e. unwillingness to communicate, social
anxiety, audience anxiety, shyness, WTC, etc.), among which the most principal concept was willingness to communicate.

Communication apprehension was redefined by McCroskey (1997) as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p. 192), and has experienced few modifications since then (McCroskey, 1982a, 1984, 1997; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). Two main concerns have been particularly addressed during the re-conceptualizing process of communication apprehension; one pertains to its oral communication focus, and the other concerns its trait orientation. McCroskey (1997) reemphasized the conceptual stresses of communication apprehension on these two concerns:

Consequently, it should be recognized that current instruments labeled as CA measures...are restricted to oral CA, specifically apprehension about talking to or with others. (p. 83)

In sum, the CA construct has been broadened substantially. Although it originally was restricted to a trait orientation, it is now viewed as representing both trait and state approaches….It should be recognized, however, that the most popular measures of CA are restricted to a trait conceptualization. (p. 84)

While there is no explicit claim whether communication apprehension was originally advanced as a traitlike or situational communication factor, it has been dominantly treated and examined as a traitlike personality-type variable in most of the studies conducted in the area of L1 communication (McCroskey, 1997). Few empirical studies have been done about situational communication apprehension, although there are plenty of conceptual discussions about its existence in real communication environments (McCroskey, 1984, 1997; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987).

The most recent conceptualization about the types of communication apprehension was presented by McCroskey (1997), since then the dichotomy of trait and state communication apprehension was discarded. Four types of communication apprehension (CA) were introduced: trait-like CA, generalized-context CA, person-group CA, and situational CA. McCroskey argued that the trait-like, generalized-context, and the person-group CA were all viewed as a relatively enduring orientation toward communication “across a wide variety of contexts,” “in a given type of context,” or “with a given person or group of people” while situational CA was more considered “a transitory orientation toward communication with a given person or group of people” (pp. 85-87). Therefore, he argued there was no absolute trait or state communication apprehension, but a continuum “ranging from the extreme trait pole
to the extreme state pole, although neither the pure trait nor pure state probably exists as a meaningful consideration” (1997, p. 84).

**Self-Perceived Communication Competence.** Enlightened by the early work of Philips’ on reticence (1965, 1984) in which anxiety and lack of communication skills were listed as two major reasons of the communication withdrawal and avoidance, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) suggested communication apprehension and communication skills to be the antecedents which may impact an individual’s willingness to communicate. They noticed that in the training of communication skills, people’s willingness to communicate in the training context were positively correlated with their communication skill development.

However, different from the case of communication apprehension, on which abundant studies had already suggested its close relationship and significant impact on communication willingness, there was not much direct support for the causal relationship between communication skills and people’s communication willingness. Kelly (1982) found that the communication skills of self-identified reticent speakers were not different from those who claim nonreticent. Therefore, the perception of one’s own communication skill level might weigh more significantly than the person’s actual skill level.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1988) reiterated the definition of communicative competence which had been provided in McCroskey’s previous studies (McCroskey, 1982a; 1984). They defined communicative competence as “adequate ability to pass along or give information; the ability to make known by talking or writing” (p. 109). McCroskey and Richmond (1990a) argued that self-perceived communication competence might be more associated with people’s willingness to communicate since “the choice of whether to communicate is a cognitive one, it is likely to be more influenced by one’s perceptions of competence (of which one usually is aware) than one’s actual competence (of which one may be totally unaware)” (p. 27). McCroskey (1997) reemphasized that it was not a person’s actual communication skills or competence which was supposed to influence their willingness to communicate; it was more likely that the individual’s self-perceived communication competence would make the difference. Therefore, people who consider themselves competent in communication are believed to be more willing to initiate or participate in communication behaviors.

**Empirical Studies Conducted on WTC Antecedents**

Along with the conceptualization and investigation of the communicative antecedents which are believed to be influential on individual’s willingness to communicate, the research in the communication area gradually casts more attention on empirical studies focusing on
the interrelationship of different variables and how they would really affect people’s communication orientations.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986a, 1986b, 1986c) found that communication apprehension was significantly related to a person’s willingness to communicate, and that communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were powerful predictors of willingness to communicate. In their studies, communication apprehension was negatively related to a person’s willingness to communicate with the correlation coefficient of -.52. The studies also showed that people who believed they were competent in communication were more willing to initiate or engage in communication \( (r = .59) \). The strongest relationship appeared between people’s communication apprehension and their perceived communication competence, with the highest correlation of -.63.

A study conducted by Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey (1988) in Australia with 195 college students revealed the similar pattern of interrelationship among the three communication orientations, obtaining -.49, .57, and -.64 as the correlations between communication apprehension (CA) and WTC, WTC and self-perceived communicative competence (SPCC), and CA and SPCC, respectively. The findings of the study indicated that greater willingness to communicate was associated with higher self-perceived communication competence and lower communication apprehension. However, they did find statistically significant differences in mean scores for SPCC and WTC (no significant difference between average CA scores) between Australian and American college students. Therefore, they argued that similar studies in cultures differing from that of the U. S. in a variety of ways should be conducted to provide a database for generalization.

Cross-cultural studies were then carried out by groups of researchers in Sweden (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990), Micronesia (Burroughs & Marie, 1990; Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003), and Finland (Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991) to explore the interrelationship among different communication orientations in different countries in first language communication. McCroskey et al. (1990) conducted a comparative study in Sweden aiming to examine the relationship among the communication variables (i.e., WTC, CA, SPCC) between American and Swedish college students. The correlations among the communication variables were reported to be -.44, .44, -.52 with reference to the relationships between CA and WTC, SPCC and WTC, and CA and SPCC. The results also demonstrated that the Swedish students were significantly less willing to communicate and more introvert than American students, yet saw themselves more communicatively competent in the group and dyad contexts as well as talking to strangers.
and acquaintances. A similar study conducted by Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond (1991) in Finland compared the data obtained from previous studies and pointed out that the Finnish students were less willing to communicate than their American, Australian, and Swedish counterparts yet perceived themselves more competent than their American, Australian, and Micronesian peers, except the Swedes. In the same vein, Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond’s study reported a similar pattern of relationships between CA and WTC, SPCC and WTC, as well as CA and SPCC \( (r = -.39, .41, -.59) \).

Table 2.1 presents a comparison of the relationships among communication variables (WTC, CA, and SPCC) across different countries. All of these studies were conducted with college students for the purpose of examining their orientations toward communication in their native language. Although most of these studies have revealed that people in different countries do have somewhat different orientations toward communication, a similar pattern was observed all through with regard to the relationships among the communication variables, which was demonstrated by a general significant negative correlation between WTC and CA, CA and SPCC, as well as a common significant positive relationship between WTC and SPCC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Place of the Study Conducted</th>
<th>CA and WTC</th>
<th>SPCC and WTC</th>
<th>CA and SPCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCroskey and McCroskey (1986a, 1986b, 1986c); McCroskey &amp; Baer (1985)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey (1988)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, &amp; Richmond (1990)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs &amp; Marie (1990)</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond (1991)</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs, Marie, &amp; McCroskey (2003)</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model of WTC Construct in First Language Communication

Although many studies have been conducted across different countries to explore the interrelationship among these variables and all of them have shown that these variables are significantly correlated and demonstrate a similar pattern of relationships, none of them has investigated the integrative underlying structure of the communication variables which were suggested to be influential on an individual’s willingness to communicate.

MacIntyre (1994) proposed a causal model to test six variables identified as determinants of the willingness to communicate construct: anomie, alienation, self-esteem, introversion, communicate apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence. He initiated the model with more general personality dispositions (i.e., anomie, self-esteem, and introversion), and then followed up the paths with more specific predispositions such as communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. The model terminated with willingness to communicate, considering that it was the last step before an individual actually initiated a communication behavior. By drawing upon the data from previous studies using these variables, MacIntyre found that the model “shows excellent fit to the data” (p. 136), with approximately 60% of the variance in WTC being explained by the model (see Figure 2.1).

According to the model, there were only two immediate variables—communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence— responsible for the variation
of an individual’s WTC. Therefore, people who were not anxious about communication and believe they were capable of communication would appear more willing to initiate a conversation. Anomie and alienation were not suggested as causal factors of WTC by the model. In addition, MacIntyre (1994) pointed out that the exclusive use of personality-based variables might be a limitation of the model. In this case, although past research has argued that personality variables strongly influenced the development of WTC, situational factors should also be expected and examined. Thus, suggested by MacIntyre (1994), “the interaction between general personality variables and specific situational characteristics also would provide a potential avenue for future research” (p. 140).

**Conceptualization of WTC in Second Language Communication**

Up to this point, the mainstream studies of willingness to communicate were conducted in a native/first language communication setting since the concept was originally introduced and conceptualized from the discipline of communication. The development of research on willingness to communicate in L1 started to gain researchers’ attention in the area of second language acquisition in the early 1990s.

During the same period, Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, which claimed that cognitive development arose as a result of social interaction, had been broadly employed to explain the development of second language learning and acquisition. Researchers (Donato, 1994; Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 2000) suggested that second language learners acquired language when they collaborated and interacted with other speakers through comprehensible communication. Swain (2000) also pointed out that “language use and language learning can co-occur” and “it is language use [that] mediate[s] language learning” (p. 97). In the sense that communication is the final implementation of language use, what had been achieved in the field of communication research started to shed light on the studies of second language learning and acquisition.

On the other hand, it is even much plainer to understand that the primary purpose of language learning is to communicate by using the language. In this case, how to encourage language learners to use the language to communicate and in turn, to learn the language through the communication, has become a critical interest of study for many researchers in the field of second language acquisition. Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model, to a large degree, has set up a theoretical foundation for the research of WTC in an L2 setting.

**Gardner’s Socio-Educational Model**

Motivational research in the field of second language learning and acquisition has been carried out for several decades. The most influential study can be represented by the
Socio-Educational Model (see Figure 2.2) based on a series of studies conducted by Gardner, Lambert, and their associates as early as 1959. This model is viewed as a dynamic in which attitudes and motivation influenced language achievement. Although the socio-educational model has undergone a number of changes since its initial form (Gardner, 1985), there is considerable similarity between the earlier version and the most recent one (Gardner, 2001a; also see, for example, Gardner, 1979; Gardner, 1985; Gardner, 2001b; Gardner & Lambert, 1959; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Gardner & Smythe, 1975).

**Figure 2.2.** Gardner’s (2001a) Socio-Educational Model

As demonstrated in Figure 2.2 (Gardner, 2001a), two classes of variables, integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation are two correlated variables that influence motivation to learn a second language. Then motivation and language aptitude have an influence on language achievement.

The variable, integrativeness, reflects “a genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer psychologically to the other language community” (2001b, p. 8). Since integrativeness involves emotional identification with another cultural group, Gardner indicated that integrativeness would be reflected in an integrative orientation toward
leaning the second language, a favorable attitude toward the language community, and openness to other groups in general.

The variable, attitudes toward the learning situation, involves “attitudes toward any aspect of the situation in which the language is learned” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 9). In the school context, these attitudes could be directed toward the teacher, course, course materials, classroom activities, and extra-curriculum activities, etc. Although likelihood of the existence of some negative attitudes toward the above school dimensions is a concern, the social-educational model recognizes that “in any situation, some individuals will express more positive attitudes than others, and it is these differences in attitudes toward the learning situation that are the focus of the model” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 9).

The variable, motivation, refers to “the driving force in any situation” (Gardner, 2001b, p. 9). Motivation has three elements: 1) the motivated individual expends effort to learn the language; 2) the motivated individual wants to achieve the goal; 3) the motivated individual will enjoy the task of learning the language. Therefore, in the social-educational model, “all three elements, effort, desire, and positive affect, are seen as necessary to distinguish between individuals who are more motivated and those who are less motivated. Each element, by itself, is seen as insufficient to reflect motivation” (Gardner, 2001b, p.9). That is, even if an individual wants to learn a language but doesn’t make enough effort to achieve the goal, this individual is not truly motivated in the language learning.

Another important concept in Gardner’s socio-educational model which has aroused plenty of attention is orientation. Gardner (2001a) defined orientation as a collection of reasons that reflect common or conceptually similar goals to learn a language. People may be interested in learning a language for different reasons. Therefore, an integrative orientation, which is a part of integrativeness, refers to the language learning goals involving a genuine interest in approaching emotionally and physically toward the population who speak the target language (Gardner, 2001a). An instrumental orientation, according to Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972) reflects practical and utilitarian purposes of learning a language. However, it is possible that both sets of orientation could apply in the situation if an individual wants to learn a language. For instance, people want to move to a language community and intermingle with the new people and culture and meanwhile to find a good job. Other than the two dichotomy orientations of language learning, Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) also suggested that there were complex reasons for studying another language.

Clément and Kruidenier (1983) conducted a large-scale survey to investigate a variety of language learning orientations beyond the integrative and instrumental orientations. They
found four orientations common to several groups of language learners: job related, travel, friendship, and increased knowledge (about the target language group). Based on Gardner (1985) and Clément and Kruidenier’s (1983) findings about affective variables of second language learning, researchers who were interested in the relationships between communication variables and affective variables in second/foreign language learning began to include integrativeness, attitudes toward learning situation, motivation, and orientation as key concepts in their studies of L2 WTC. Although there are not many empirical studies on the willingness to communicate in a second language, quite a few of them examined the relationships between L2 WTC and different affective variables for language learners (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre et al., 2001; MacIntyre et al., 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan, 2003, ).

Gardner’s socio-educational model suggests significant relationships of affective variables (i.e., attitude, desire, and motivation) and second language learning achievement, and clearly differentiates the affective variables from the more purely cognitive individual difference factors associated with language learning such as intelligence, language aptitude, and learning strategy (MacIntyre, 2002). This discrimination has, then, illuminated a large body of study on individual differences in terms of the variety of affective variables. The studies of willingness to communicate in the area of second language learning, as well, take tremendous advantage of the research conducted on affective variables in the field of second language acquisition.

**A Conceptual Model of WTC in Second Language Communication**

Research that has been conducted on WTC in second language communication (L2 WTC) is classified under the umbrella of individual differences study in the field of second language acquisition. By drawing upon the studies in the disciplines of communication, psychology, and second language acquisition, the studies on L2 WTC started to draw researchers’ attention from the late 1990s.

MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, and Noels (1998) stated that “it is highly unlikely that WTC in the second language (L2) is a simple manifestation of WTC in the L1” (p. 546). In fact, although the studies contributing to the comparison of WTC between L1 and L2 are scarce, the limited findings have revealed consistent results. Burroughs, Marie, and McCroskey (2003) found that the Micronesian students’ L1 WTC was significantly higher than their L2 WTC, although their communication apprehension in L1 and L2 remained similar. MacIntyre et al. (2003) obtained non-significant correlation between L1 and L2 WTC
for both groups with or without immersion experience, which indicated “some degree of independence between WTC in L1 and WTC in L2” (p. 600).

Despite the relevant independence between L1 and L2 WTC suggested by limited studies, it is indisputable that there does exist “a more complex manner with those variables that influence L1 WTC” in L2 use (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 546). An example provided by MacIntyre et al. is that the range of communication competence with reference to L2 is much greater than that of L1, considering L2 communication competence among most adults could range approximately from zero percent to a full 100 percent, yet communication competence would be usually above a certain level for normal adult L1 communicators. In addition, the differences between L1 and L2 WTC may also be interpreted by extra social, cultural, and political implications carried in the context of L2 use.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) proposed a heuristic model to present the conceptualization of WTC in an L2 communication setting. Different from its original notion of being a traitlike predisposition, the WTC in this model was treated as a situational variable with both transient and enduring influences. MacIntyre et al. distinguished and defined the transient and enduring influences as follows:

The enduring influences (e.g., intergroup relations, learner personality, etc.) represent stable, long-term properties of the environment or person that would apply to almost any situation. The situational influences (e.g., desire to speak to a specific person, knowledge of the topic, etc.) are seen as more transient and dependent on the specific context in which a person functions at a given time (p. 546).

Figure 2.3. MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) heuristic WTC model
The heuristic model (see Figure 2.3) represents the range of potential influences on WTC in a second language. The shape of pyramid stands for the proximal and distal, or the most immediate and the broadest foundational factors which could operate potential influences on initiating an L2 communication.

As shown in Figure 2.3, there are six categories referred to as “layers” of the model. The first three layers (i.e. Communication Behavior, Behavioral Intention, and Situated Antecedents) represent situational influence on WTC at a given moment in time. The other three layers (Motivational Propensities, Affective-Cognitive Context, and Social and Individual Context) signify enduring influences on L2 communication process. Therefore, from the top to the bottom, the layers represent a move from the most immediate, situation-based contexts to the more stable, enduring influences on L2 communication situations.

The first layer of communication behavior is interpreted in a broad sense of L2 use. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argued that “the ultimate goal of the learning process should be to engender in language students the willingness to seek out communication opportunities and the willingness actually to communicate in them” (p. 547). Therefore, L2 use is set at the peak of the model as the primary and ultimate purpose of the second language learning.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) extended the definition of WTC advanced by McCroskey and Richmond (1987), and recognized more explicitly the situational feature in L2 WTC. They define L2 WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a[n] L2” (p. 547). MacIntyre et al. placed WTC in Layer II and claimed that WTC strongly implies a behavioral intention and the intention is the most immediate cause of a communication behavior if a person also has actual control over his or her actions.

The desire to interact with a specific person and state self-confidence are considered the most immediate determinants of WTC. The desire to interact with a specific person is believed to come from a combination of affiliation and control motives. Affiliation refers to the interest in establishing a relationship with interlocutors, while control motive stands for the operation of power or influence over other communicators. For example, affiliation could be the most immediate reason to initiate communication with an attractive L2 speaking interlocutor. Clément (1980) described self-confidence as a relatively enduring personal characteristics that was composed of two key constructs: 1) perceived competence and 2) a lack of anxiety. Different from Clément’s concept of trait-like self-confidence, state communication self-confidence indicated in Layer III is suggested as a momentary feeling of
confidence which may be transient within a given situation. For example, in an evaluated situation, an L2 interlocutor may experience a very high state anxiety and low perceived competence even though the individual may possess a considerable persistent self-confidence across other situations.

The remaining Layers IV to Layer VI deal with relevant stable individual difference variables that apply in broad communication situations. The motivational propensities in Layer IV have three variables: interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation, and L2 confidence. Similar to the desire to interact with a specific person in Layer III, affiliation and control are still viewed as the basic causal components. Therefore, the affection to affiliate with another person or group of people who use another language or the social power relationship established between people or groups of people can also produce persistent influences on language communication behaviors in broader situations. Different from the state communication self-confidence, L2 self-confidence stands for the “overall belief in being able to communicate in the L2 in an adaptive and efficient manner” (MacIntyre et al. 1998, p. 551).

Layer V deals with the affective and cognitive variables which somewhat appear further from the specific language communication situation. The variables represented in this layer are more apt to individually based attitudes and motives accumulated from prior experiences. Intergroup attitudes are interpreted by integrativeness, fear of assimilation, and motivation to learn the L2. Integrativeness and fear of assimilation are utilized here to represent the two attitudes toward a different language and cultural group. Integrativeness is related to the adaptation to an L2 group which may be indicated by increased involvement in frequency and quality with that community, whereas fear of assimilation expresses the fear of losing self-identity by learning an L2, thus demonstrating less contact with the L2 community. Therefore, as an individual shows a different propensity to either one of them, the L2 communication may be facilitated or cumbered. Motivation to learn the L2 is another affective variable which represents an individual’s attitude towards the L2 itself. A positive or negative attitude toward the L2 may lead to different intensity and efforts in language learning and communication.

Another variable in Layer V is social situation which describes a social encounter in a particular setting of communication. This particular communication situation, when regularly recurring in a society in terms of the participants, the setting, the purpose, the topic, and the channel of communication, will develop specific markers of language use, and hence, affect individual’s language communication in a general way. For example, it’s highly likely that
individuals will have different willingness to communicate inside or outside a classroom setting. Communication competence is the last variable in Layer V. Although it is evident that a person’s L2 proficiency will have a significant impact on his or her willingness to communicate, McCroskey and Richmond (1987) have pointed out that WTC is mainly affected by how a person perceives his or her communication competence rather than the actual competence possessed.

The last layer of variables deals with the broadest interaction of social and individual context, specifically: intergroup climate and personality. In a general sense, the demographic representation of two language communities, their socioeconomic power relationship, their social status represented in social institutions (i.e. government, legislation, and church), the social distance between the two languages, and so on and so forth, will all have social influences on a person’s communication behavior in the L2. On the other hand, although personality is not conceptualized as a direct influence on individual’s willingness to communication in the MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model, it still plays an indirect role in forming the person’s communication pattern within a broader social climate. For example, some personality features may be viewed as facilitating L2 communication. MacIntyre and Charos’ (1996) study suggested that the effect of personality on WTC was operated through some more specific variables such as L2 confidence and intergroup attitudes. As a result, intergroup climate and personality are set at the bottom of the pyramid model to refer to their less direct involvement in the determination on a person’s WTC at a given time.

The MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model extends the WTC construct in L1 proposed by McCroskey and Richmond (1987) to an L2 communication setting. Except for the personality variables identified by L1 WTC construct, this conceptual L2 WTC model involves an interaction among personal, societal, and affective variables and explores these variables in terms of their situational and enduring influences on L2 WTC. WTC is then suggested as a construct which synthesizes an integrate effect from this group of variables on authentic communication in a second language. The MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) model is the first attempt at a comprehensive treatment of WTC in an L2, and the hypothesis it posits through the layers of variables in the pyramid toward WTC has encouraged more studies to exam and test the hypothesized relationships (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Cetinkaya, 2005; Kang, 2004; Kim, 2004; MacIntyre 2002; MacIntyre, Babin, & Clément, 1999); MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Conrod, 2001; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003; Matsuoka, 2005; Wen & Clément, 2003; Yashima, 2002).
Empirical Studies of WTC in Second Language Communication

The study of WTC in an L2 setting did not really reach the mainstream communication research until the publication of the MacIntyre et al.’s 1998 model. The integration of linguistic, communicational, and psychological research in this model set a comprehensive foundational threshold for a series of follow-up studies contributing to exploring, explaining, and predicting L2 communication. Although compared to the excessive studies that focus on L1 communication the studies in L2 WTC are still quite limited considering its theoretical development and empirical study spectrum, more and more researchers are making their way to contribute to the literature and scholarship of this merging facet of second language acquisition and communication and continue to inspire further research in this field.

WTC with Affective and Personality Variables. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) conducted their pioneer study in an attempt to adapt MacIntyre’s (1994) model of L1 WTC and Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model of second language learning and developed a “hybrid model” by merging these two streams of research to predict the frequency of second language communication in a bilingual context. MacIntyre’s (1994) model postulated that there were only two direct influences on willingness to communicate, one being self-perceived communication competence and the other communication apprehension. Therefore, these two variables were included in MacIntyre and Charos’s (1996) proposed model. However, instead of using the term “communication apprehension” MacIntyre and Charos drew on “language anxiety”, which they claimed as a “situation-specific apprehension generated in second language contexts” (p. 6).

In addition, the motivation construct (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation) from Gardner’s socio-educational model (1985) was examined. Because WTC was originally advanced as a personal trait predisposition, MacIntyre and Charos adopted the Five Factor Model (Goldberg, 1993), which “intend[s] to represent a taxonomy of the most basic, global personality traits” (p. 10), to test the role played by personality factors in the WTC construct they attempt to develop. Following MacIntyre’s (1994) suggestion that situational variables should be investigated in future study, a measure of language context was included in the model to indicate the concentration of L1 and L2 at home and at work. Finally, both WTC and motivation for language learning were designed to contribute to determine the frequency of second language communication.

The data in MacIntyre and Charos’ (1996) study were collected from 92 adult Anglophone students taking introductory-level conversational French in Ottawa, a bilingual city in Canada. All of the participants spoke English as their native language and only
possessed minimal level of French competence. A path analysis using a maximum likelihood solution from LISREL VII was conducted on the correlation matrix of the entire variables. The results demonstrated that all of the paths derived from Gardner’s (1985) and MacIntyre’s (1994) models were supported, including the proposed impact on L2 communication frequency. Three proposed paths were proved nonsignificant, including the paths from agreeableness to integrativeness, integrativeness to language anxiety, and L2 WTC to motivation (see Figure 2.4).

![Figure 2.4. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) WTC model](image)

The largest single influence from the variables on L2 communication frequency came from self-perceived competence. MacIntyre and Charos argued that this was because all of the respondents were at a relatively low level of actual French proficiency and suggested that one’s actual proficiency could affect the rate of participation in L2 conversation. The hypothesized impact deriving from language anxiety to perceived competence was also supported in the final mode. In addition, the path from the variable context to perceived competence, L2 WTC, and L2 communication frequency suggested that having more opportunity of direct L2 interaction might cause an increase in self-perceived competence, higher willingness to communicate in an L2, and more frequent L2 communication. As a result, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) postulated that the intention or willingness to engage in
L2 communication was determined by “a combination of the student’s perception of his or her second language proficiency, the opportunity to use the language, and a lack of apprehension about speaking” (p. 17).

**WTC with Social Support and Language Learning Orientations.** MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Conrod (2001) conducted a study of L2 WTC in a relatively unilingual context among 79 ninth graders from a junior high school in Canada. WTC was measured in four language skill areas: speaking, writing, reading, and comprehension both inside and outside the classroom. Language skills and whether the participants used the L2 inside or outside the classroom were treated as two situational variables, known as the social situation variables located in Layer V in MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model. The rationale behind this design was that language skills and the place (inside vs. outside classrooms) for language learners to use an L2 were two variables representing situational cues. Therefore, if WTC could be found consistent across different situational variables, its nature of being a stable personality trait advanced by McCroskey and Richmond (1987) would be proved to be credible. Otherwise, as suggested by MacIntyre et al. (1998), WTC would be treated as a situational variable, which was “more closely tied to the type of situation in which one might communicate” (MacIntyre et al., 2001, p. 376).

Gardner (1985) argued that orientation was a key component of motivation in language learning. Therefore, five language learning orientations (i.e., job related, travel, friendship, increased knowledge, and school achievement) based on Clément and Kruidenier’s (1983) study were included in MacIntyre et al.’s (2001) study. Social support was also included as a variable inspired by the conceptual L2 WTC model of MacIntyre et al. (1998). MacIntyre et al. (2001) proposed that social support might come from several sources such as parents, teachers, and peers, among which social support from friends might be particularly helpful for language learners’ authentic communication in the target language. Therefore, the relationships among WTC, social support, and language-learning orientations were studied both inside and outside the classroom in their study.

The findings revealed consistent and strong correlations among WTC in different language skill areas and different contexts, and this suggested that WTC was a more traitlike variable as initiated by McCroskey and associates. The language learning orientations in terms of job, travel, friendship, knowledge, and school appeared to have stronger relationship with WTC outside than inside the classroom. Specifically, knowledge appeared to be the only orientation which was consistently significantly correlated with WTC both inside and outside the classroom across different language skill areas. Friendship and knowledge orientations
were consistently correlated with WTC inside the classroom, while job, knowledge, and school orientations were always correlated with WTC outside the classroom. Social support from parents, teachers, friends, and siblings on French learning was examined as well. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the students indicated that their teacher supports them, the highest support reported among the four sources.

**WTC with Communication and Affective Variables.** A study conducted by Baker and MacIntyre (2003) employed the variables of WTC, communication apprehension, perceived competence, frequency of communication in an L2, attitude and motivation, and orientation. The participants included 71 immersion students and 124 nonimmersion students from Grades 10, 11, and 12 in Canada. All of these students spoke English as their first language and were studying French as a second language.

Oxford and Shearin (1994) have argued that there is distinction between second language and foreign language learning environments. They pointed out that foreign language learners typically received input from the target language exclusively in a classroom setting and lacked the opportunities to practice the target language on a daily basis; whereas a second language was “learned in a location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication for most people” (p. 14). Therefore, the distinction between immersion and nonimmersion learning programs could be viewed as parallel to the distinction between second and foreign language learning environments in the sense that immersion students, compared to nonimmersion students, “have more contact with the target language and the kind of stimulation necessary to better master communication in the target language” (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003, p. 68). In this case, the study of communication-related variables between immersion and nonimmersion students in their language learning could shed light on the study of communication-related variables for students learning a language as a second or a foreign language.

The study examined the differences of communication variables: willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, perceived competence, and communication frequency in L1 and L2 between two groups of students (immersion vs. nonimmersion). In addition, orientations regarding the reasons for the participants to study French were also based on the study of Clément and Kruidenier (1983)—getting a good job, traveling, meeting Francophone, and personal achievement. The findings revealed that job-related orientation had the highest mean scores for both male and female students in immersion and nonimmersion programs.
The results of correlations among the communication variables were different for groups with or without immersion experiences. Communication anxiety/apprehension was found significantly correlated with WTC in French for both groups. However, perceived competence in French did not significantly correlate with WTC in French for the immersion group, but had a strong correlation with WTC for the nonimmersion group ($r = .72$). Because the nonimmersion group, to a large degree, simulates the language context of foreign language learners, this finding may be more informative when compared to other studies conducted in foreign language learning contexts. Baker and MacIntyre (2003) used an Attitude and Motivation Index (AMI) to represent an 11-items instrument examining the participants’ attitudinal and motivational orientations. The findings showed that the correlations between WTC in French and affective variable AMI for both groups were significant.

A similar study about the differences between immersion and nonimmersion students in terms of communication and affective variables was conducted by MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan (2003). The participants of this study were 59 university students who were enrolled in first-year conversational French courses at an undergraduate university in a unilingual, Anglophone community. Communication-related variables: willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, perceived competence, and frequency of communication in French were examined between students with immersion experience and those without. The results demonstrated that willingness to communicate, perceived competence, and frequency of communication were significantly higher for the group of students with prior immersion experience, but no significant difference was found for the variable of communication apprehension between the two groups.

The correlations among each communication variable were studied to see whether these relationships differed in prior possession of immersion experience for language learners in L1 and L2. Interestingly, all the correlations were found to be significant except for the correlation between L2 communication apprehension and L2 WTC for the students without immersion experience. Given that L2 communication apprehension and L2 perceived competence were suggested to be the two most relevant influences on both L1 WTC and L2 WTC in previous research (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre and Charos, 1996), multiple regressions were operated to test how these two variables would predict L2 WTC in the two groups of students. The results were interesting in that, for the group of students without prior immersion experience, only perceived competence showed a significant regression coefficient to predict L2 WTC. Contrarily, only communication apprehension demonstrated a
significant regression coefficient in its predicting power on L2 WTC for the students possessing prior immersion experience.

In addition, the relationship between L1 and L2 WTC was examined and a non-significant relationship was reported. Given this finding, MacIntyre et al.’s (2003) argued that there is “some degree of independence between WTC in L1 and WTC in L2” (p. 600) and that “WTC does not simply transfer from one language to another” (p. 602).

The relationships between affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation) and L2 WTC were investigated in MacIntyre et al.’s (2003) study as well. Immersion experience was found having significant effect on the relationships between motivation and L2 WTC as well as integrativeness and L2 WTC. Attitudes toward the learning situation were found not correlated with any of the communication variables. By discussing the lack of significant association between L2 WTC and the affective variables for the group without immersion experience, MacIntyre et al. (2003) particularly argued that the students without prior immersion experience were learning French as a foreign language, therefore, were “short of pragmatic use of the language for interaction in the classroom” (p. 602).

The three empirical studies examining the relationships between communication variables and affective variables discussed above did not present congruent relationships among the variables. Table 2.2 shows a comparison across the three studies on their findings of the interrelationships.

A Chinese Conceptualization of L2 WTC

Wen and Clément (2003) extended MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model in a Chinese setting. They argued that cultural values were the essential factors that influence individuals’ perception and way of learning. Accordingly, in the domain of L2 language learning, a tendency of submission to authority that was valued in Chinese culture provided a significant explanation to Chinese students’ unwillingness to communicate inside the classroom. Teachers were regarded as the only authority inside the classroom in a Chinese setting, and English teachers were identified as the main source of language stimulation and a model of the target language for language learners. Therefore, in this language learning context, the value of submission to authority might impede the student’s engagement into communication interactions with their teacher and other available interlocutors.
Table 2.2  
*Relationships between Communication and Affective Variables in Second/Foreign Language Communication Cross Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA—L2 WTC</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Nonsig (NI); Sig (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC—L2 WTC</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig (NI); Insig (I)</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC—CA</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation—L2 WTC</td>
<td>Nonsig</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Nonsig (NI); Sig (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness—L2 WTC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nonsig (NI); Sig (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Nonsig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation—L2 WTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CA=Communication Competence; L2 WTC=Willingness to Communicate in L2; SPCC=Self-Perceived Communication Competence; Sig=statistically significant; Nonsig=statistically Insignificant; NI=group without immersion experiences; I=group with immersion experiences

Wen and Clément (2003) suggested that teacher support should be a variable that may issue immediate effect on WTC. They proposed that teacher support should be intervened into the interrelation between Layer III and Layer II, specifically, between WTC and desire to communicate with a specific person according to the MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) WTC model. They identified teacher support in terms of teacher involvement and teacher immediacy as one of the most effective influential factors on student engagement and effective learning in a Chinese setting. They explained that because of the valued cultural norm of submission to authority in China, there was discrimination between teachers and students. When students took teachers as a figure of authority, there came with a threat to communication interaction. However, when students perceived their teachers as approachable and facilitating, they would feel emotionally secure and sufficiently motivated in their language learning. Therefore, Wen and Clément declared that “in the Chinese English classroom, teacher involvement and immediacy can be regarded as a significant precursor of a student’s positive affect, and would be expected to increase willingness to communicate” (p. 28).

**Teacher Immediacy.** The construct of immediacy, an important concept in Wen and Clément’s (2003) study, was introduced by Mehrabian (1967), who used this term to refer to
the communication behaviors which enhanced physical and psychological closeness with another. Gorham (1988) suggested that both verbal and nonverbal immediacy contribute to students’ perceptions of teacher immediacy. After Anderson (1978, 1979) extended the concept of immediacy into the literature of instructional communication, it has received substantial attention. There are two kinds of immediacy: nonverbal and verbal. Nonverbal immediacy refers to the behaviors such as eye contact, smiling, positive use of gestures, vocal variety, forward body lean, and a relaxed body position. Verbal immediacy then indicates verbal behaviors such as using “we” and “our”, using students’ first name, and using humor in class (Frymier, 1993).

Teacher immediacy has been found to have positive influence on students. Anderson (1979) and Gorham (1988) both found that verbal and nonverbal immediacy were associated with increased affective learning. Similar positive relationships were also found between teacher immediacy and students’ motivation (Christophel, 1990; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Frymier, 1993; Richmond, 1990). Frymier’s (1993) study was conducted with 178 undergraduate students at a university. Participants were asked to evaluate the instructor of their class meeting immediately following the course in which they were completing the survey instruments. Significant relationships were detected between teacher immediacy (verbal and nonverbal) and students’ state motivation, although the teacher immediacy might have different influences on students who had low or high motivation levels. Richmond (1990) also found that teacher immediacy was positively associated with student motivation and student motivation was positively associated with affective and cognitive learning.

In another study, Christophel and Gorham (1995) utilized a test-retest method to examine the relationship between teacher immediacy and student motivation. In the same way, their findings confirmed the positive relationship claimed by previous studies. In natural settings, Christensen and Menzel (1998) also obtained a positive, linear relationship between college teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy and student state motivation, perceived cognitive, affective, and behavior learning. A recent study conducted by Allen, Witt, and Wheeless (2006) employed a meta-analysis approach to test a causal model they proposed between teacher immediacy and student learning. The results were accordant with what they had suggested that higher levels of teacher immediacy caused increased levels of student affective learning, which in turn caused increased cognitive learning.

Carrell and Menzel (1999) administered a survey in 256 undergraduate students at a small liberal arts university. They found that the instructor’s verbal immediacy behavior was
significantly and positively related to students’ willingness to talk in class. No significant relationship was detected between the instructor’s nonverbal immediacy and students’ willingness to talk. Although this study was not conducted in the context of second language communication, it implied the positive relationship between teacher immediacy and students’ communication approaching tendency.

Hsu (2005) used both qualitative and quantitative methods to examine the relationship between teacher immediacy (verbal and nonverbal) and students’ willingness to speak English in class. The study was conducted in 27 students who were learning English as a foreign language at a university in Taiwan. The study results revealed significant relationships between teacher immediacy, both verbal and nonverbal, and students’ L2 WTC.

**Empirical Studies of WTC in Cross-Linguistic Environments**

Studies which focused on first or second/foreign language communication respectively have been reviewed above. As what have been mentioned before, some studies of WTC in first language communication demonstrated their interest in cross-country/culture comparison on the relationships between communication orientations including willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence (see Table 2.1). After the research of willingness to communicate expanded its interest to the field of second language learning and acquisition, studies of willingness to communicate became more diverse not only specifically in second/foreign language communication but also in the comparison study across first and second/foreign language communication contexts. One of the main purposes of doing cross-linguistic comparison study on willingness to communicate as well as other communication orientations was to examine the trait of constancy of the communication orientations in different language-speaking settings.

Cross-linguistic studies on communication orientations focused on the predictive effect of a certain communication orientation in an individual’s first language to the person’s second/foreign language. Therefore, the correlation coefficient became a critical statistic to demonstrate whether or not there is significant relationship for a communication orientation in L1 and L2 communication contexts.

McCroskey, Fayer, and Richmond (1985) conducted a study with 357 students at the University of Puerto Rico who reported Spanish as their native language and English as the second language. The result of the study found positive and moderate significant relationship between the participants L1 and L2 communication apprehension. Therefore, as they concluded, “the predictions based on the theory of CA [communication apprehension] as a generalized trait are supported” (p. 190). Similar studies conducted in different countries also
found significant relationship between L1 and L2 communication apprehension and suggested the trait disposition of communication apprehension across different language-speaking contexts (Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003; Jung & McCroskey, 2004; McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishida, 1985).

Although a few studies were interested in the predictive effect of a person’s L1 communication apprehension on his/her L2 communication apprehension, it seems studies which focused on self-perceived communication competence were quite few. Baker and MacIntyre’s (2003) study showed that for the participants without immersion experience, the relationship between their L1 (English) and L2 (French) self-perceived communication competence was significant. However, for the participants with immersion experience, the correlation between L1 and L2 self-perceived communication competence was not significant.

The relationship between L1 WTC and L2 WTC was not consistent as was communication apprehension in first and second/foreign language-speaking contexts. Baker and MacIntyre (2003) found significant correlation between L1 WTC and L2 WTC, indicating that the level of a person’s WTC in his/her first language could predict the level of WTC in his/her second language communication. However, MacIntyre et al. (2003) found non-significant correlation between the participants’ WTC in English (L1) and French (L2) and suggested that there was some degree of independence between WTC in L1 and WTC in L2.

Studies of willingness to communicate in first language-speaking context, second/foreign language-speaking context, and cross linguistic communication context have broadened and deepened the research in this area.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Previous studies on L1 and L2 WTC have provided the framework, theoretical foundation, and research direction for the current study. The three research questions will examine 1) relationships among communicative orientations in L1 and L2 settings, 2) relationships of affective variables with L2 WTC, and 3) relationships among communication variables, affective variables, the variable of teacher immediacy, and L2 WTC. For the third research question, there were hypotheses proposed based on previous studies concerning the relationships among the variables involved. The research questions that guided this study were:

1. What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college
students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English) communication?

2. What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

3. What are the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

Hypotheses with regard to the third research question were:

Hypothesis 1: Self-perceived communication competence would directly predict WTC in English. Communication apprehension would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence.

Hypothesis 2: Teacher immediacy would have direct effect on communication apprehension, motivation, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English.

Hypothesis 3: Motivation would directly predict WTC in English. Attitudes toward learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would be indirectly related to WTC in English through their direct effect on motivation.

**Hypothesis 1**

The first hypothesis for research question 3 deals with the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English. Studies have consistently found that communication apprehension has a direct effect on self-perceived communication competence in both L1 (MacIntyre, 1994) and L2 communication (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). Therefore, a direct effect from communication apprehension to self-perceived communication competence was projected.

In the studies conducted by Baker and MacIntyre (2003), self-perceived communication competence was found to be the only variable having significant correlation with L2 WTC for the nonimmersion group of students. Similarly, MacIntyre et al. (2003) also found L2 WTC was only predicted by self-perceived communication competence for the group of students without prior immersion experience.

According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), foreign language learners typically receive input from the target language exclusively in a classroom setting and lack the opportunities to practice the target language on a daily basis; whereas a second language is “learned in a
location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication for most people” (p. 14). Baker and MacIntyre (2003) suggested the parallel relationship between second versus foreign language learning environments and immersion versus nonimmersion language learning contexts by pointing out that “like students in a second language learning environment, immersion students, compared to nonimmersion students, have more contact with the target language and the kind of stimulation necessary to better master communication in the target language” (p. 68). Given the similarity between nonimmersion students and foreign language learners, the solo direct relationship between self-perceived communication competence and L2 WTC was expected to be obtained in this study in which Chinese college students were considered as foreign language learners rather than second language learners. As a result, a direct path from self-perceived communication competence to willingness to communicate in L2 was proposed.

Hypothesis 2

Given the positive relationship between teacher immediacy and student cognitive learning through the mediation of student motivation, as confirmed by previous studies (Christophel, 1990; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Frymier, 1993; Richmond, 1990), it was assumed that there was a direct relationship between teacher immediacy and motivation. Wen and Clément (2003) suggested that in a Chinese setting, teachers were viewed as the only authority. When students perceived teachers as approachable and supportive, they would feel emotionally secure. Therefore, it was assumed that teacher immediacy would directly decrease language learners’ communication apprehension and had a positive impact on students’ self-perceived communication competence. Moreover, Wen and Clément’s (2003) study also suggested that teacher immediacy should be identified as one of the proximal influences on Chinese college students’ WTC in English. As a result, a direct impact from teacher immediacy on the participants’ WTC in English was proposed.

Hypothesis 3

Based on Gardner’s socio-educational model (2001a), direct relationships from attitudes toward learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation to motivation were anticipated in this study. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) found that motivation was not significantly correlated with the participants’ L2 WTC. However, MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Donovan’s study (2002) found a statistically significant relationship between motivation and WTC in the participants’ L1 and L2, suggesting that people who had positive attitude and motivation were more willing to communicate. MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and
Donovan’s study (2003) made the relationships even more complicated. Their study found a significant correlation between motivation and L2 WTC for the group of students who had immersion experiences, but non-significant correlation for the students without immersion experiences. In the current study, a direct relationship between motivation and the participants’ L2 WTC was hypothesized.

**Summary**

The concept of willingness to communicate was initiated from research in the field of communication literature as the most important construct which indicates an individual’s communication approaching or avoidance tendency. After WTC was introduced into the research area of second language acquisition, it was studied as the final intention before an individual initiated a communication, specifically in a second or foreign language. People’s communication orientations, which were believed to be the only critical factors influencing a person’s L1 WTC, were then studied with affective variables and other variables in terms of their comprehensive influence on an individual’s L2 WTC in the field of second language acquisition.

The review of literature of WTC in this chapter visited the theoretical and empirical studies aimed at conceptualizing and examining the WTC construct in L1 and L2 communication settings. Previous studies which have involved a) communication variables (communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), b) affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and c) the variable of teacher immediacy provided the conceptual framework for the research design of the current study on willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in English communication.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter describes the research methods and approaches employed in the study of Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English. It starts with a discussion of the settings and participants of the study. Research instruments that were employed in data collection are introduced, following by the data collection procedures. Data analysis methods are discussed aligned with particular research questions. In conclusion, validity issues are addressed. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English) communication?

2. What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

3. What are the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

Setting

This study was conducted at a public university located in Chengdu, China. In 2006, there were 1,867 higher education institutions in China according to the Ministry of Education of China (Ministry of Education, 2007). In 2008, the public university in the current study is ranked the 94th among all the higher education institutions in China (Wu, lü, & Guo, 2008). The student enrollment at this university in 2007 was 25,314. The College of Foreign Languages and Cultures was one of the fourteen colleges in this university, and the English Program, where the current study was conducted, was offered by the Department of English Language, which was hosted by the College of Foreign Languages and Cultures. The data of the present study were collected in the Oral English class opened for sophomores and
junior students. The reasons for choosing this class were a) it was specifically designed to develop students’ communicative competence in English communication, and b) the researcher herself had taught the same course at the same university for three years and was familiar with the course content. The other courses offered by the English Program had particular focuses on listening, reading, writing, grammar, and translation respectively, and therefore did not provide a compatible intensity of communication opportunity as could the Oral English class.

The Oral English class was offered once per week in a two-hour session taught by instructors who were native English speakers. There were 125 sophomore students in the English Program, divided into 4 classes with the average class size being 31 students; 160 junior students were registered into 5 classes with an average of 32 students in each class. The instructor for the sophomores’ Oral English class was from the United States, and the instructor for the juniors was from Australia.

**Participants**

Two hundred and thirty-five (235) out of 285 sophomores and juniors majoring in the English Program at this public university participated in this study with a response rate of 82%. All of the students were native Chinese speakers who were learning English as a foreign language. The reason to choose college students who were majoring in English is because they represented a population which could receive the maximum amount of instruction in English available in China.

English is one of the core subjects in the College Entrance Examination (CEE) for the university candidates to pass in order to receive admission from universities. Specifically, students who intend to major in English Program have to obtain a comparatively higher score in the English exam in CEE compared to their peers to be accepted by the Department of English Language at the university.

Second-and third-year students who were majoring in English were chosen as the participants of the study. Because the data collection was conducted at the end of the fiscal year of study (in June), the second and third-year students who have studied English in the college for at least two years by then should have had a good understanding about their motivational and attitudinal orientations toward communication in English. Moreover, after the first two years of study, students were required to pass a national English proficiency test, Test for English Majors-Grade Four (TEM-4), and were believed to have an intermediate level of English proficiency and be capable of carrying out meaningful communication in English.
The first and fourth-year students were excluded from this study. Most of the high schools in China did not offer classes for oral communication in English and English instruction was mainly focused on developing reading and writing skills. Therefore, after one year of English study in the university, the first-year students might not yet have enough awareness of their communication orientations in English communication. During the time of the data collection (June 2008), the fourth year students were busy with thesis and job searching and were unlikely to participate in the data collection. As a result, these groups of students were not included in the present study.

**Sample Size**

Sample size is closely related to sampling error. Generally speaking, results derived within larger samples have less sampling error than within smaller samples. For the first and second research questions, the sample size \( (N=235) \) in this study is reasonable for statistical analysis methods employing Pearson correlation coefficient, t-test of mean comparison, and multiple regression (Bachman, 2005). For the third research question, which used a path analysis method, it was suggested that “the ratio of the number of cases to the number of free parameters be 20:1; a 10:1 ratio, however, may be a more realistic target” (Kline, 2005, p. 111). The number of free model parameters of the proposed path model in this study is 24. Therefore, the ratio of the number of sample cases \( (N=235) \) to the number of free parameters \( (N=24) \), which is 10:1, lies within a reasonable range of the recommended rule.

**Instruments**

The present study employed a quantitative research method using questionnaires. Perry (2005) stated that there were two advantages of using a questionnaire: 1) they are useful for collecting data from larger numbers of people in a comparatively short amount of time, and 2) they are economical to use. Considering the purpose and scope of the study, questionnaires were utilized as the primary approach so as to collect data from a large group of participants in a fairly short amount of time.

All of the measures employed were self-report scales. McCroskey (1997) pointed out that self-report measures were the most commonly used ones for measuring matters of affect and/or perception. Because affective and perceptual constructs were directed toward the cognition of individuals, they were well suited to self-report measurement if care was taken to avoid causing respondents to provide false answers.

Participants were given ten instruments (see Table 3.1) written in their native language, in this case, Chinese. A back translation method was utilized to ensure the validity of the translated version of the measures. A detailed description of the back translation procedure is
The measures employed in this study included the following: 1) Participant Background Information Questionnaire, 2) Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in Chinese/English, 3) Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) in Chinese/English, 4) Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) in Chinese/English, 5) Affective Variable Questionnaires (4 instruments captured in this questionnaire), 6) Teacher Verbal Immediacy, and 7) Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy. The instruments that aligned with the relevant research question(s), the total number of items in each scale, and the relevant internal reliability coefficient alpha of this study are listed in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Variables Involved in Research Questions</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Internal Reliability Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Variables (Question 1 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Willingness to Communicate (WTC)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (CA)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Variables (Question 2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward the learning situation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Immediacy (Question 3)</td>
<td>Verbal Immediacy Scale</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonverbal Immediacy Scale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant Background Information Questionnaire**

The participant background information questionnaire was specifically designed to collect background information concerning the participants’ gender, age, year of English learning, Chinese and English language proficiency, etc (see Appendices A & B). It was
assumed that the participants should have enough years of English learning experiences to be aware of their communication avoidance and approaching tendencies in English. Other demographic information obtained through this instrument would assist a better understanding of the participants in terms of the generalizability of the findings. An example item is “How many years have you been studying English in school?”

**Measures Related to Communication Variables**

Measures related to communication variables included the scales of Willingness to Communicate, Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, and Self-Perceived Communication Competence. Each of them was adapted from different studies conducted in the particular domain of interest. In order to answer the first research question, the three instruments were utilized to examine the participants’ willingness to communicate both in their first language (Chinese) and foreign language (English). The directions for answering the questionnaires clarified whether the participants were to answer each item in a scenario in which they were communicating in English or Chinese.

**Willingness to Communicate (WTC).** The current study used the WTC scale published in McCroskey’s (1992) study. This scale was designed as a direct measure of the respondent’s predisposition toward approaching or avoiding the initiation of communication (see Appendices G, H, S, & T). The scale has 20 items, of which 12 items are related to four types of communication contexts (i.e., public, meeting, group, and dyad) and three types of receivers (i.e., strangers, acquaintances, and friends). The other 8 items are filler items. Participants were asked, using a number between 0 and 100, to indicate the percentage of time they would choose to communicate in each type of situation when completely free to do so. An example item is “Talk in a large meeting of friends”. The Cronbach alpha of this instrument is .97.

**Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC).** This 12-item questionnaire was designed to measure subjects’ perceptions of their communication competence (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). Similar to the WTC scale, the items in the SPCC questionnaire reflect four basic communication contexts and three types of receivers (see Appendices E, F, Q, & R). Subjects were asked to estimate their communication competence on a 0-100 scale. Example items are “Present a talk to a group of stranger”, and “Talk with a friend”. The Cronbach alpha of this instrument is .94.

**Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24).** This questionnaire includes 24 items specifying four different communication situations (public, meeting/class, group, and dyad) (see Appendices C, D, O, & P). Each situation has 6 items (Jung &
McCroskey, 2004). The questionnaire uses a 5-step Likert-type response format ranging from 1 to 5 representing strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items are “I dislike participate in group discussions”, and “Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations”. The Cronbach alpha of this instrument is .90.

**Measures Related to Affective Variables**

A package of questionnaires encompassed four measures of a series of attitudinal and motivational variables that were adapted from MacIntyre and Charos’s (1996) study (see Appendices I & J). All ratings are made on a 7-point Likert-type scale. The data in MacIntyre and Charos and Charos were collected from 92 adult Anglophone students taking introductory-level conversational French in Ottawa, a bilingual city in Canada. All of the participants spoke English as their native language and only possessed a minimal level of French competence. Because MacIntyre and Charos used the measures to examine the participants affective variables in French communication, all of the measures concerning French were changed to English in the current study. For instance, the item in MacIntyre and Charos’s study “If I were to rate my feelings about learning French in order to interact with members of the English speaking community, I would say that it is: Weak—Strong” was changed to “If I were to rate my feelings about learning English in order to interact with members of the English speaking community, I would say that it is: Weak—Strong”.

**Integrativeness.** The measure of integrativeness is composed of three items (items 1, 2, and 3) dedicated to examine integrative orientation, attitude toward the target language group, and interest in foreign language. An example item is “If I were to rate my feelings about learning English in order to interact with members of the English speaking community, I would say that it is: Weak—Strong”. The Cronbach alpha of these three items in this instrument is .57.

**Attitudes toward the Learning Situation.** This variable was measured by two items—attitude toward the English teacher and attitude toward the English course (items 4 and 5). An example item is “If I were to rate my attitude toward my English instructor, I would say that it is: Unfavorable—Favorable”. The Cronbach alpha for the two items in this instrument is .71.

**Motivation.** Because the construct of motivation involves desire, effort, and positive affect toward language learning according to Gardner (1985), the questionnaires about motivation includes three items (items 6, 7, and 8) that examine motivational intensity, desire to learn English, and attitude toward learning English. An example item is “If I were to rate
how hard I work at learning English, I would characterize it as: Very Little—Very much”. The Cronbach alpha for the three items in this instrument is .80.

**Instrumental Orientation.** This measure was adapted from Hashimoto (2002). The original measure had only one item, indicating studying English for employment. According to a pilot study conducted by the current researcher among 55 freshman students in February 2007, future career (76%) and getting a good job (71%) were rated as the top two reasons for studying English. Therefore, both future career and a good job were included in this measure (items 9 and 10). An example item is “If I were to rate how important it is for me to learn English for my future career, I would say that it is: Very Low—Very High”. The Cronbach alpha for the two items in this instrument is .79.

**Measures Related to Teacher Immediacy**

Data about teacher immediacy were collected with two scales: the verbal immediacy scale and the non-verbal immediacy scale. Participants were asked to indicate the frequency with which their teachers performed each immediacy behavior on both verbal and nonverbal scales. The questionnaires use a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 with the score of 1 indicating teachers have never been observed using a specific immediacy behavior, while the score of 5 referring to a “very often” frequency.

**Verbal Immediacy Scale.** It was adapted from Gorham (1988). This instrument includes 20 items, measuring students’ perception of teachers’ verbal communication behaviors (See Appendices M & N). It provides the respondents with items that describe individual verbal immediacy behaviors. Students were asked to indicate which of the five response options best described the teacher. An example item is “Gets into discussions based on something a student brings up even when this does not seem to be part of his/her lecture plan.” Items 12, 15, 18 were considered as non-immediate behaviors, so they were reverse coded before summing up for a total. In this case, the original scores of these three items were reversed, ranging from never = 5 to very often = 1. This scale demonstrated a Cronbach alpha of .79.

**Nonverbal Immediacy Scale.** It was adapted from Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987). This measure includes 14 items that describes teachers’ nonverbal communication behaviors in class (See Appendices K & L). An example item is “Sits behind the desk while teaching.” Followed the suggestion of Hsu (2006), one explanation “such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, etc” was added to item 7 in the Chinese translation of the instrument. Items 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, and 11 were presumed to be non-immediate, so they were reverse coded before summing up for a total. The Cronbach alpha of this scale is .82.


There were three arrangements of binding the instruments together in a different sequence to avoid unwanted sequence effects during data collection. All of the arrangements had the students’ background questionnaires as the first instrument. Measures that are related to communication variables, affective variables, and the variable of teacher immediacy were switched in order as Table 3.2 shows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Arrangement I</th>
<th>Arrangement II</th>
<th>Arrangement III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Participant Background Information Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participant Background Information Questionnaire</td>
<td>Participant Background Information Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Measures Related to Communication Variables</td>
<td>Measures Related to Affective Variables</td>
<td>Measures Related to Teacher Immediacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Measures Related to Affective Variables</td>
<td>Measures Related to Teacher Immediacy</td>
<td>Measures Related to Communication Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Measures Related to Teacher Immediacy</td>
<td>Measures Related to Communication Variable</td>
<td>Measures Related to Affective Variables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedure**

Permission for data collection was granted from the Dean of the College of Foreign Languages and Cultures at the university in China. All of the second- and third-year students who were majoring in English were treated as the target participants. The purpose and procedure of conducting this study were explained to the instructors of the Oral English classes offered to the sophomore and junior students through emails. The researcher consulted the department office and obtained the schedules of each Oral English class. She emailed the two instructors who were teaching the Oral English class and scheduled the best time for data collection in each class according to the instructors’ syllabus.

All of the data collection was conducted during the class time inside the classroom. Before the delivery of the questionnaires, the researcher explained the basic concepts involved in this research to the participants. The intention and purpose of this study were also clarified at the beginning. The participants were informed that they would complete
questionnaires about their communication orientations in both English and Chinese, their attitudinal and motivational tendencies in English learning, and their evaluation about teacher immediacy, respectively.

The researcher also informed the participants that the participation was voluntary and their responses would be kept anonymous and confidential. A consent form written in Chinese was delivered after the previous explanations (Appendix W). The researcher first explained the consent form and about 5 minutes were given to the participants to read the consent form and to raise questions about the study and the questionnaires. Only the students who were willing to participate in the project were delivered the questionnaires after they signed the consent form. The approximate time of the data collection for each class was about 40 minutes.

Before the delivery of the questionnaires to the students who have signed the consent form, the students were divided evenly into three groups and each group was given the questionnaire instruments bond in a different sequence to avoid possible influence of sequence effects.

**Data Analysis**

For the data analysis of the first research question (What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language [Chinese] and second language [English]?), statistical analysis software SPSS 14.0 for Windows was used to conduct the Pearson correlation analysis among the target variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to indicate the relationships among different variables: communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate in Chinese and English respectively.

For the second research question (What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?), the statistical method of multiple regression was utilized to analyze the relationships of the different affective variables with willingness to communicate in English. According to Glass and Hopkins (1996), multiple regression is the statistical method most commonly employed for predicting a dependent variable from two or more independent variables. SPSS 14.0 for Windows was the primary statistical analysis tool which facilitated the data analysis.

For the third research question (What are the relationships among communication variables [communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence],
affective variables [integrativeness, attitudes toward learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation], and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?), a path model was proposed to examine the relationships among different variables and their influences on WTC in English. According to Kline (2005), path analysis was a possible technique when “there is only a single measure of each theoretical variable and the researcher has prior hypothesis about causal relations among these variables” (p. 66). A statistical program Mplus 4.1 for Windows was used to complete the statistical analysis of the path model. Mplus is a software package for estimating models with observed and unobserved (latent) variables (Kline, 2005).

The Proposed Path Model

According to Kline (2005), a path model is a type of structural equation model, and it is treated as a structural model for observed variables. Observed variables are represented with rectangles. A single arrow line (→) represents a hypothesized direct effect of one variable on another. The arrowhead points to the presumed effect and the line originates from a presumed cause. Direct effects are also called paths, and statistical estimates of direct effects are path coefficients. Kline (2005) lists six basic steps of employing path analysis techniques, which includes the following: 1) specify the model, 2) determine whether the model is identified, 3) select measures of the variables represented in the model, 4) use a computer program to estimate the model, 5) if necessary, respecify the model and evaluate the fit of the revised model to the same date; and 6) given a satisfactory model, accurately and completely describe the analysis in written reports. The first three steps are addressed below. Steps four to six are discussed in the next chapter where the findings of the data analysis are presented.

Step 1: specify the model. Model specification means that the hypothesized relationships among variables will be expressed in the form of a path model. Three hypotheses were proposed to specify the relationships among different variables.

Hypothesis 1: Self-perceived communication competence would directly predict WTC in English. Communication apprehension would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence.

Hypothesis 2: Teacher immediacy would have direct effect on communication apprehension, motivation, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English.

Hypothesis 3: Motivation would directly predict WTC in English. Attitudes toward learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would be indirectly related to WTC in English through their direct effect on motivation.
Kline (2005) pointed out that many researchers usually began the process of model specification by drawing a diagram of a model based on their proposition of the presumed relationships among variables. A path model was proposed based on the above three hypotheses by applying findings and assumptions of previous research related to the context of the present study. A diagram describing an integrated picture of a path model representing each hypothesized relationship among variables is in Figure 3.4.

**Hypothesis 1.** The first hypothesis was about the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English. Based on MacIntyre’s (1994) study and MacIntyre and Charos’s (1996) study, communication apprehension had a direct effect on self-perceived communication competence. Given the similarity between nonimmersion students and foreign language learners, a solo direct relationship between self-perceived communication competence and WTC in English was expected to be obtained in the study in which Chinese college students were considered as foreign language learners rather than second language learners (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre et al., 2003) (see Figure 3.1).

![Figure 3.1. Proposed relationships between CA, SPCC, and WTC in English](image)

**Hypothesis 2.** A direct relationship between teacher immediacy and motivation was proposed as suggested by previous studies (Christophel, 1990; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Frymier, 1993; Richmond, 1990). Meanwhile, it was posited that teacher immediacy would directly decrease language learners’ communication apprehension and have a positive impact on students’ self-perceived communication competence based on Wen and Clément’s (2003) study. Moreover, Wen and Clément also suggested that teacher immediacy should be identified as one of the proximal influences on
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Chinese college students’ WTC in English. Therefore, a direct impact from teacher immediacy on the participants’ WTC in English is proposed (see Figure 3.2).

**Hypothesis 3.** Based on Gardner’s Socio-Educational Model (2001a), direct relationships from attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation to motivation were anticipated in this study. Although the previous studies did not suggest a consistent relationship between motivation and L2 WTC (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996), a direct relationship between motivation and the participants’ WTC in English was hypothesized in the study (see Figure 3.3).

*Figure 3.2. Proposed relationships between teacher immediacy, motivation, communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English*

*Figure 3.3. Proposed relationships between affective variables and WTC in English*

Figure 3.4 below illustrates a path model comprising the presumed relationships among all of the variables involved in this study based on the three hypotheses.
Step 2: determine whether the model is identified. There are two basic requirements for the identification of any kind of structural equation model: 1) there must be at least as many observations as free model parameters $$(df \geq 0)$$, and 2) every unobserved (latent) variable must be assigned a scale (Kline, 2005). The proposed path model in this study would be identified only if the two requirements were met.

Figure 3.4. The proposed initial path model

Note. CA=Communication Apprehension; SPCC=Self-Perceived Communication Competence; ATLS=Attitude toward Learning Situation; WTC_English=Willingness to Communicate in English

With 8 observed variables, there are $$8(9)/2=36$$ observations. The number of free model parameters of the proposed path model is 24, including the variances of 4 exogenous variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, instrumental orientation, and teacher immediacy), 6 covariance of exogenous variables, 4 disturbances of the endogenous variables (communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, motivation, and WTC in English), and 10 direct effects/paths.

If an equation, degree of freedom $$(df) = \text{observation-parameter}$$ is used, then $$df$$ of the proposed path model is $$36-(4+6+4+10)=12>0$$. The first requirement of model identification is met. In the proposed path model, the only unobserved variables are the disturbances of the 4 endogenous variables. Disturbances are the only kind of latent variable in path models. According to Kline (2005), scales are usually assigned to disturbances through a unit loading identification (ULI) constraint, which means the path coefficient for the direct effect of a disturbance was fixed to equal 1. Returning to the model identification, it was clear that the
proposed path model in this study was identified since the two requirements of model identification were met.

Step 3: select measures of the variables represented in the model. The measures used in the proposed path model have already been discussed in the section of instruments above. The Cronbach alpha which was used to estimate reliability of a test concerning the internal consistency of the items within the instrument was also reported (see Table 3.1). Kline (2005) provided a rough guideline to evaluate the Cronbach alpha. Therefore, a Cronbach alpha around .90 are considered “excellent”, values around .80 are “very good”, and values around .70 are considered “adequate”. The Cronbach alphas reported in each instrument all indicated a good internal consistency of the instrument items (alphas>.70), except for the scale of integrativeness (alpha=.57).

The rest of the data analysis steps (step 4 to step 6) for testing a path model referred to the actual data analysis process. Therefore, these steps are discussed in the next chapter of findings.

Validity Issues

Issues to be considered in this study concerned both the validity of the instruments and data collection procedures. In this case, validity referred to the ability of an instrument and measurement procedures to accurately obtain data needed to answer a research question (Perry, 2005). To address this issue, construct validity was taken into consideration with regards to the measurement.

Construct validity dealt with the question as to how accurately the instrument measures the construct or the concept under investigation. Specifically, this accuracy depended on the definition of the construct being measured. Perry (2005) gave an example of construct validity. He mentioned that if language proficiency was defined as the summation of grammar, vocabulary knowledge, and reading and listening comprehension, then an approach should be used to measure all of these components to accurately measure the construct as defined. In the present study, all of the constructs under investigation have been well defined by previous studies and scholars. The measures were specifically designed to test the constructs and actually provided the operational definitions of these constructs.

Another concern related to construct validity was whether the measures would be used for the right purpose, in other words, whether the measures were used for what they originally were intended for. For example, TOEFL is designed to measure language proficiency that develops over long periods of time. However, if TOEFL is used to measure the effects of a treatment over a 2-week training project, this could be invalid. In the present
study, all of the measures were used for the purposes of testing the constructs they were originally designed to test.

As far as the predictive validity was concerned, previous studies on L2 WTC have suggested a positive relationship between L2 WTC and communication frequency (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2003; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996), indicating that L2 WTC could serve to predict communication frequency in the target language. However, the current study aimed to examine the relationships among the proposed variables which are presumed to be influential on the participants’ willingness to communicate in English. Therefore, no relationship between L2 WTC and any different forms of performance were to be examined. This could be a limitation concerning the predictive validity of the current study.

Three specific actions were taken in order to increase the validity during the data collection procedure. First, to increase the students’ willingness to participate in the study and obtain a larger sample size to ensure higher statistical validity, the researcher explained the design and purpose of this present study before delivering the measures to the participants. This procedure was expected to increase the participants’ understanding about the study and making them recognize that the purpose of this study was to understand their willingness to communicate in English and to help improve the English learning and instruction.

Second, as McCroskey (1997) pointed out, self-report measures were most appropriate when they were directed toward matters of affect and/or perception in circumstances in which the respondent had no reason to fear negative consequences from any answer given. Accordingly, the participants were ensured that their identity would be kept anonymous and confidential in the process of the research.

Finally, all of the instruments involved in this study were translated into the participants’ native language—Chinese. A back translation method was employed to verify the compatibility of item translations from English to Chinese. Back translation, as defined by the American Psychological Association (2002), refers to a method of translation in which “a text is translated into another language and then back into the first to ensure that it is equivalent enough that results can be compared.” (p. 20). Glidden-Tracey and Greenwood (1997) suggested that by comparing the original and the back-translated versions of the measure in the source language, researchers were permitted to determine whether the intended meaning of scale items has been changed or lost in the translation. Therefore, one independent individual who was bilingual in both English and Chinese and have studied in the United States for four years translated all of the instruments from English into Chinese.
The Chinese version was then translated back into English by another independent bilingual individual who had never had any experience of living outside of China. The original English version and the back-translated English version of the measures were compared to examine the possible discrepancies during the translation. The two independent translators as well as the researcher herself then reviewed all of the translations to monitor the retention of the original meaning. Lastly, the translated version was refined based on a group discussion of the three individuals to make sure that the translations reflected the meaning and intentions of the original measures.

Summary

This study was conducted at a public university in China. Participants involved sophomore and junior students majoring in English at this university. A quantitative research method using questionnaire instruments was employed in order to study Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English. Ten instruments were utilized to examine the participants’ general background information, communication and affective orientations, as well as their perceived teacher immediacy behaviors. Validity issues concerned validation degree of the instruments, predictive validity, and data collection procedures.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The study examined English language learners’ willingness to communicate in a context where English was learned as a foreign language. This chapter is a presentation of findings drawn from 235 Chinese native speakers majoring in English at a public university in China. A description of the sample’s demographics, particularly their ability in Chinese/English skills and their self-described orientations for learning English, provides a context for summarizing the study’s findings. Statistical analysis results are reported aligned with each research question. The hypothesized relationships in research question 3 are examined at the end.

Ten instruments were employed to collect data that addressed ten different aspects or variables: participant background information, teacher immediacy (verbal), teacher immediacy (nonverbal), willingness to communicate in Chinese, willingness to communicate in English, self-perceived communication competence in Chinese, self-perceived communication competence in English, communication apprehension in Chinese, communication apprehension in English, and participants attitudinal and motivational orientations. Statistical analysis of the data provided answers to the following three research questions:

1. What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English) communication?

2. What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

3. What are the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

Pearson correlation coefficient, multiple regression, and a path model were employed as particular statistical analysis methods in line with each research question. A path model
representing the predicted relationships among variables was proposed to assist the analysis of research question 3 based on three hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Self-perceived communication competence would directly predict WTC in English. Communication apprehension would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence.

Hypothesis 2: Teacher immediacy would have direct effect on communication apprehension, motivation, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English.

Hypothesis 3: Motivation would directly predict WTC in English. Attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would be indirectly related to WTC in English through their direct effect on motivation.

Demographic Information of the Participants

College students majoring in English at a public university in China participated in this study. All of the 235 participants were in their second or third year of school at the time of data collection. The data were collected in the last month of the spring semester (June 2008), so all of the participants had already finished at least two years of systematic English study at the university as native speakers of Chinese.

The majority of the students who participated in the study were female (82%) while only 18% were male. The participants’ age ranged from 18 to 25, with the mean of 21. Most (40%) of the students were 21 years old, while 22 was the second biggest age group (26%). The years of studying English as a foreign language in schools ranged from 7 to 15, with the mean being 9 years. This broad range indicated that some of the students started to learn English from primary school while others from middle school (7th grade).

The participants were also asked to indicate whether they had visited any English-speaking country. Only two out of the 235 (less than 1%) students reported “yes.” A rating scale ranging from 1 to 7 (1= influent/unable to understand/not comfortable at all, 7=fluent/perfectly able to understand/very comfortable) was used to assess the participants’ self-reported ability in Chinese and English speaking and speech comprehension as well as their comfort level of expressing themselves in English and Chinese (See Appendices C and D). As demonstrated in Table 4.1, the means of the participants’ self-reported ability in Chinese speaking, speech comprehension, and comfort level of expressing themselves were exclusively higher than their English ability in the counterparts. A t-test using SPSS 14.0 for Windows indicated that the participants’ abilities in Chinese speaking, speech
comprehension, and their comfort level expressing themselves in Chinese were significantly higher than their abilities and comfort level in English (p< .01).

Table 4.1
*Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Ability in Chinese/English Skills*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese speaking ability</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese speech comprehension ability</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level in Chinese expression</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English speaking Ability</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English speech comprehension ability</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort level in English expression</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked to select the orientations/reasons for them to learn English. Nine orientations/reasons for learning English were provided for the students to choose from. Table 4.2 shows the orientations and the percentages of the students’ choices. Pragmatic reasons “Career in the future” (67%) and “Getting a good job” (66%) were selected to be the top two orientations of English learning by the students.

Table 4.2
*Orientations of English Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will need English for my career in the future.</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be useful in getting a good job.</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me if I travel.</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make me a more knowledgeable person.</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a required academic course in the school.</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me understand the culture related to English-speaking countries.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to go to study in English-speaking countries.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be friends with some English-speaking people.</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will help me please my parents.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings of the Research Questions

Descriptive Statistics

There were ten indicator variables in the study. For each variable, the mean score, minimum and maximum values, and the standard deviation of the sample data are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Statistics I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRCA_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>11.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>10.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>15.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>12.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.57</td>
<td>15.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>23.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>3.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>2.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>3.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>2.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>119.02</td>
<td>15.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PRCA_C=personal report of communication apprehension in Chinese; SPCC_C=self-reported communication competence in Chinese; WTC_C=willingness to communicate in Chinese; WTC_E=willingness to communicate in English; PRCA_E=personal report of communication apprehension in English; SPCC_E=self-reported communication competence in English; Integrative=integrativeness; Attitudes=attitudes toward the learning situation; Motive=motivation; Instrumental=instrumental orientation; TI=teacher immediacy

McCroskey (1992) provided the norms for the instrument of testing willingness to communicate (WTC). The values 82 and 52 were used as the two cut-points for high WTC and low WTC spectrums. Although the Chinese college students’ WTC mean scores in Chinese (M=74.78) is higher than that of English (M=60.85), the two scores appeared to be either high or low according to the standards (see Table 4.4).

According to McCroskey and McCroskey (1988), the total score of the instrument Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC) would be considered high if a subject scores higher than 87, and low if lower than 59. The Chinese college students’ SPCC mean
scores in Chinese (M=82.56) and English (M=68.57) communication were between the two cut points and located around the middle area (see Table 4.4).

A subject’s score on the instrument Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) was considered low if it was below 51 and high if it was higher than 80 (McCroskey, 1982b). The Chinese college students’ scores for communication apprehension in Chinese (M=67.39) and English (M=74.09) were neither high nor low according to these standards (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4
Descriptive Statistics II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mean Scores for the Participants</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC (Chinese)</td>
<td>&lt;52</td>
<td>M=74.78</td>
<td>&gt;82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC (English)</td>
<td>&lt;52</td>
<td>M=60.85</td>
<td>&gt;82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC (Chinese)</td>
<td>&lt;59</td>
<td>M=82.56</td>
<td>&gt;87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC (English)</td>
<td>&lt;59</td>
<td>M=68.57</td>
<td>&gt;87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA (Chinese)</td>
<td>&lt;51</td>
<td>M=67.39</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA (English)</td>
<td>&lt;51</td>
<td>M=74.09</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The First Research Question

Question 1: What are the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English) communication?

Statistical analysis software SPSS 14.0 for Windows was used to conduct the Pearson correlation coefficient analysis between the target variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationships between the variables: communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate in Chinese and English respectively. Before examining the correlation coefficient between the variables, a histogram of each variable was checked. All of the variables demonstrated a normal distribution with the Skewness statistic less than the absolute value 2. Linear relationships between variables were also checked by inspecting the scatter plot for each pair of variables. No indication of a nonlinear relationship was found.
Table 4.5 shows the descriptive statistics for the six communication variables. The sample pool included 235 valid cases. The mean values of the self-perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate in Chinese were higher than the corresponding variables in English communication. Meanwhile, the students appeared to be less apprehensive in Chinese communication than in English.

Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics for Communication Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRCA_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>11.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>10.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC_C</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>15.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>12.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68.57</td>
<td>15.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC_E</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>23.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PRCA_C=personal report of communication apprehension in Chinese; SPCC_C=self-reported communication competence in Chinese; WTC_C=willingness to communicate in Chinese; PRCA_E=personal report of communication apprehension in English; SPCC_E=self-reported communication competence in English; WTC_E=willingness to communicate in English.

The correlation coefficients between the communication variables for the students are presented in Table 4.6. All of the variables were significantly correlated with each other at the .01 level. In both Chinese and English, correlation between self-perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate were higher than the correlation between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate, suggesting that self-perceived communication competence was a better predictor to the students’ willingness to communicate than was communication apprehension.

Communication apprehension was negatively correlated with willingness to communicate in both languages, indicating that the more apprehensive students felt, the less willing they would be to communicate. The correlation between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate in Chinese was moderate ($r=-.286$) while the same relationship in English was stronger ($r=-.367$), suggesting that communication apprehension had larger negative effect on students’ willingness to communicate in English than in Chinese. In other words, students tended to feel more nervous when they communicated in English.
Self-perceived communication competence was positively correlated with willingness to communicate in both languages (r=.534 for Chinese, r=.504 for English), which suggested that the students who perceived themselves competent in communication tended to be more willing to communicate.

The correlation between communication apprehension in Chinese and English was the highest (r=.683) among all of the relationships, indicating that if students felt apprehensive in their communication in Chinese, they were more likely to feel nervous in the communication in English. The correlation between self-perceived communication competence in Chinese and English was moderately strong (r=.47), implying that the extent to which students perceived their communication competence in Chinese had fairly strong predictive effect on how they would view their communication competence in English. Willingness to communicate in Chinese and English were moderately correlated with each other (r=.324), indicating that willingness to communicate was somewhat a constant communication orientation cross first and second/foreign language-speaking contexts.

Table 4.6
Correlation Matrix for Communication Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (n=235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PRCA_C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SPCC_C</td>
<td>-.363(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. WTC_C</td>
<td>-.286(**)</td>
<td>.534(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PRCA_E</td>
<td>.683(**)</td>
<td>-.267(**)</td>
<td>-.217(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SPCC_E</td>
<td>-.292(**)</td>
<td>.470(**)</td>
<td>.575(**)</td>
<td>-.491(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WTC_E</td>
<td>-.264(**)</td>
<td>.270(**)</td>
<td>.324(**)</td>
<td>-.367(**)</td>
<td>.504(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PRCA_C=personal report of communication apprehension in Chinese; SPCC_C=self-reported communication competence in Chinese; WTC_C=willingness to communicate in Chinese; PRCA_E=personal report of communication apprehension in English; SPCC_E=self-reported communication competence in English; WTC_E=willingness to communicate in English.

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

The relationships between communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence in both Chinese and English communication were moderately to strongly negative. The correlation between communication apprehension and self-perceived
communication competence in Chinese was slightly lower than the corresponding correlation in English (r=-.363 vs. r=-.491), which suggested that students were more apprehensive when they felt incapable of communicating in a foreign language than they did in their native language.

**The Second Research Question**

Question 2: What are the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

Relationships among the affective variables and WTC in English were examined using Pearson correlation coefficient. In order to examine which affective variable had the strongest unique predictive power on the students’ willingness to communicate in English, statistical method multiple regressions was utilized.

Normal distribution of each variable was checked. The Skewness statistics for all of the variables were less than the absolute value of 2, indicating normal distributions. Scatter plots between variables were also examined to look for a linear relationship. The scatter plot matrix demonstrated that all of the bivariate relationships between variables were linear.

Table 4.7 presents the correlation coefficients between the variables. All of the variables were significantly correlated with each other at the .05 level. The highest correlation occurred between motivation and integrativeness (r=.464). Willingness to communicate in English had the highest correlation with attitudes toward the learning situation (r=.264) and the lowest correlation with instrumental orientation (r=.14).

In order to examine the individual predictive power of each affective variable on the students’ willingness to communicate in English, multiple regression analysis was conducted. The F test results for the overall predictive power of the model, which included integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation, on the dependent variable willingness to communicate in English produced a significant p value (p<.01), which indicated that at least one of the affective variables had predictive power on WTC in English (see Table 4.8). The beta weights (standardized coefficients) for the four affective variables indicated that attitudes toward the learning situation was the best predictor of WTC in English (beta=.192) among the four predictors. Instrumental orientation barely showed any predictive power on WTC in English with the beta=-.003. Of the four affective variables, only attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation showed a significant regression coefficient (p=.009 for attitude, p=.036 for
Table 4.7
Correlation Matrix for Affective Variables and L2 WTC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (n=235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. WTC_E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrativeness</td>
<td>.182(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attitudes toward the learning situation</td>
<td>.264(**)</td>
<td>.451(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Motivation</td>
<td>.246(**)</td>
<td>.464(**)</td>
<td>.389(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instrumental Orientation</td>
<td>.140(*)</td>
<td>.339(**)</td>
<td>.331(**)</td>
<td>.445(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.8
F Test Results for the Multiple Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>11669.120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2917.280</td>
<td>5.935</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>112570.907</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>491.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124240.027</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Predictors: instrumental orientation, attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, motivation
Dependent Variable: WTC in English

Table 4.9
T-Test for Individual Slope of Each Affective Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>26.453</td>
<td>8.938</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental orientation</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent Variable: WTC in English
motivation) at the .05 level, which implied that only these two variables had significant predictive power on WTC in English among the four predictors (see Table 4.9).

Table 4.10  
*Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.306(a)</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>22.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The index $R^2$ is an indicator of model fit for multiple regressions. It refers to the percentage of variance of the dependent variable explained by the model. In this case, by checking the value of $R^2$, the percentage of variance in willingness to communicate in English explained by the four affective variables could be obtained. As presented in Table 4.10, the $R^2$ value for this multiple regression model was .094, which meant only approximately 10% of the variance in willingness to communicate in English was explained by the four affective variables. In other words, the four affective variables did not do a good job in predicting the students’ willingness to communicate in English. The collinearity statistic VIF for the four predictors were all less than 2, indicating that there were no collinearity issues between predictors.

Up to this point, the first research question indicated that, in English communication, both communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were good predictors of willingness to communicate in English with the significant correlation coefficients of -.367 and .504 respectively. The second research question was aimed to examine the relationship between affective variables and willingness to communicate in English. Results suggested that affective variables involved in the study were not good predictors for willingness to communicate in English.

The third research question involved the variables included in the first two research questions—communication variables and affective variables, and a new variable of teacher immediacy. The third research question aimed to understand the relationships among the communication variables (communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and teacher immediacy as well as the overall predictive effects from these variables on willingness to communicate in English.
The Third Research Question

Question 3: What are the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and the variable of teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English?

The communication variables and affective variables were investigated in the first and second research questions concerning their relationships with WTC in English. A new variable, teacher immediacy, was added into the overall model in the third research question. Teacher immediacy was computed by summing teacher verbal immediacy and nonverbal immediacy. The correlation between teacher immediacy and WTC in English was significant at the .05 level. The correlation coefficients between variables involved in the third research question were provided in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11
Correlation Matrix of Variables in Research Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (n=235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. WTC_E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PRCA_E</td>
<td>-.367**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SPCC_E</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>-.491**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integrativeness</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>-.285**</td>
<td>.233**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attitudes</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>-.237**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motivation</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>-.358**</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instrumental</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>-.202**</td>
<td>.186**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TI</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>-.202**</td>
<td>.202**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.137*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. WTC_E=willingness to communicate in English; PRCA_E=personal report of communication apprehension in English; SPCC_E=self-reported communication competence in English; Attitudes=attitudes toward the learning situation; Instrumental=instrumental orientation; TI=teacher immediacy

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

In order to examine the overall relationships among different variables and their influences on WTC in English, a path model was proposed in Figure 4.1 based on the following hypotheses. It was hypothesized that 1) self-perceived communication competence
(SPCC) would directly affect WTC in English; communication apprehension (CA) would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence; 2) teacher immediacy would have direct effects on communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, motivation, and WTC in English; 3) motivation would directly affect WTC in English; attitudes toward the learning situation (ATLS), integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would have indirect effects on WTC in English through their direct effects on motivation.

According to Kline (2005), there were six basic steps to a path model analysis. The first three steps (i.e., specify the model; determine whether the model is identified; select measures of the variables represented in the model) have been discussed in the data analysis section in chapter three. Therefore, steps four to six (i.e., use a computer program to estimate the model; if necessary, respecify the model and evaluate the fit of the revised model to the same date; given a satisfactory model, accurately and completely describe the analysis in written reports) are examined through as following:

![Figure 4.1. The proposed initial path model](image)

**Note.** CA=Communication Apprehension; SPCC=Self-Perceived Communication Competence; ATLS=Attitudes toward the Learning Situation; WTC_E=Willingness to Communicate in English

**Model estimate.** Statistical computer program Mplus 4.1 was used to test the proposed path model. The path model was estimated by using Maximum likelihood estimates. The fit statistics for the hypothesized model indicated the degree to which the model fit the data. Path analysis indicated that the model was not a very good fit to the data on the basis of the
goodness of fit statistic chi-square (chi-square=53.807, df=12, p<.01). For an overidentified model, such as the current proposed path model, chi-square tests the null hypothesis that a model has a perfect fit in the population. Therefore, the larger the p value is, the better the model fit. In other words, the researcher would like to gain a large p value and not to reject the null hypothesis. However, the chi-square value is also largely affected by sample size. According to Kline (2005), some researchers divided the chi-square value by the degrees of freedom, which generally resulted in a lower value called the normed chi-square (NC).

Bollen (1989) pointed out that the values of normed chi-square of 2.0, 3.0, or even as high as 5.0 have been used as indicators of reasonable model fit. In this study, the normed chi-square value was 4.48 (chi-square of 53.807 divided by 12 degrees of freedom), which represented a reasonable model fit.

More sophisticated fit indexes were recommended by Kline (2005) which were less affected by sample size and had interpretive norms. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is a parsimony-adjusted index. When RMSEA =0, it indicates a perfect model fit. A rule of thumb is that RMSEA ≤ .05 indicates close approximate fit, values between .05 and .08 suggest reasonable error of approximation, and RMSEA ≥ .10 indicates poor fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The RMSEA statistic of the proposed path model was .122, which indicated a poor model fit.

Another fit statistic that is widely used in structural equation model is the comparative fit index (CFI), which assesses the relative improvement in fit of the researcher’s model compared with a baseline model/null model (Kline, 2005). A rule of thumb for the CFI is that values greater than roughly .90 indicate a reasonably good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). A CFI value closer to 1 indicates a better model fit. The CFI statistic for the proposed path model was .909, which indicated a good model fit.

Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) is a measure of the mean absolute correlation residual (error), the overall difference between the observed and predicted correlations. Ideally, all these residuals/errors should be about zero to indicate a good model fit. Values of the SRMR less than .10 were generally considered favorable, the closer to zero the better (Kline, 2005). The SRMR statistic for the proposed path model was .072, showing a reasonable index of good model fit. Table 4.12 shows a comparison between the statistic values of each index of model fit and the corresponding cut-off rule indicating good model fit.

Because Chi-square is sensitive to sample size (n=235), normed chi-square (NC) was employed as a better index for model fit than chi-square in this study. Based on the indexes
provided in Table 4.12, only one out of four model fit statistics did not meet the criterion for
good model fit (i.e., RSMEA was larger than the cut-off rule of .08). In this case, the
researcher’s conclusion was that the proposed path model was barely a good fit to the data.
As a result, model modification was suggested.

Table 4.12
Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Fit Index</th>
<th>Cut-off Criterion</th>
<th>Statistics of the Proposed Path Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-significant p value</td>
<td>significant p value (p&lt;.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p&gt;.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>&lt;5 (NC=.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Chi-Square (NC)</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
<td>&gt;.08 (RMSEA=.122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
<td>&gt;.90 (CFI=.909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>&lt;.10 (SRMR=.072)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tests of alternative models.** According to Kline (2005), the fifth step to path analysis is
to respecify the model and evaluate the fit of the revised model to the same date. Usually,
model modification starts by deleting the non-significant paths in the original-proposed
model and adding paths as an exploratory procedure to search for better data fit of the model.
Such path-adding procedure are regarded as “data driven” at the first place. Then the new
tentative relationships between variables would provide potential interesting avenues for
further investigation.

**First model modification.** The first model modification started by deleting the
nonsignificant paths in the originally proposed model. There were four nonsignificant paths
in the proposed model, which meant that four relationships between variables were not
statistically significant. Figure 4.2 shows the path model with path coefficients. The
relationships between teacher immediacy and SPCC (λ=.04), teacher immediacy and
motivation (λ=.02), teacher immediacy and WTC_E (λ=.05), motivation and WTC_E (β=.05)
were not statistically significant.

After deleting the four nonsignificant paths, additional paths were added to the
originally proposed path model one at a time, until the model fit indices showed a good fit to
the data. Mplus 4.1 model modification indices suggested that the model could be improved
by adding an additional path with self-perceived communication competence (SPCC) depending on motivation. The model fit for the first-modified model was slightly improved (chi-square=48.698, p<.01, df=15; NC=3.24, RMSEA=.098; CFI=.927; SRMR=.056; AIC=11146.197; BIC=11184.206) (see Figure 4.3).

**Figure 4.2.** Original-proposed path model with non-significant paths

*Note.* Dotted lines indicate nonsignificant paths.

**Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.**

**Figure 4.3.** The first-modified model

Two groups of indices were used to compare model fit between models during the process of model modification to indicate model improvement. For hierarchical models,
chi-square difference ($\chi^2$) was used to inspect significant model fit improvement. For nonhierarchical models, the indicators Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) were used to select between competing nonhierarchical models estimated with the same data. Although the first-modified model had fewer paths than the original-proposed model, the first-modified model could not be considered as a hierarchical version of the original model, because the added path from motivation to SPCC could not be found in the original model. Therefore, indicators AIC and BIC were chosen to examine model improvement before the original model and the first-modified model. Relatively smaller values of AIC and BIC are favorable for model improvement. The AIC and BIC values for the first-modified model were 11146.197 and 11184.206, which were both smaller than the AIC and BIC statistics in the original model (i.e., AIC=11157.306; BIC=11205.681), indicating the first-modified model had a better model fit than the original model, although the difference was small.

**Second model modification.** Model modification indices from the output of the first-modified model provided by Mplus 4.1 suggested that a direct path from communication apprehension to WTC in English would improve the model fit. Therefore, the second model modification applied the relationship suggested by Mplus 4.1 for a better model fit (see Figure 4.4). The results of the model fit statistics indicated that the model fit for the second-modified model was significantly improved at the .05 level (Chi-square=43.037 with the $p<.01$, $df=14$; NC=3.07; RMSEA=.094; CFI=.937; SRMR=.052; chi-square difference=5.661, $p<.05$, $df=1$).

All of the relationships in the first-modified model could be found in the second-modified model. Therefore, these two models were considered hierarchical models. The indicator for significant improvement between hierarchical models was the chi-square difference ($\chi^2$). The chi-square difference statistic can be used to test the statistical significance of the decrement in overall fit as paths are eliminated or the improvement in fit as paths are added (Kline, 2005). Chi-square difference statistic tests the null hypothesis of identical fit of two hierarchical models in the population. In other words, if chi-square difference statistic between two models was significant, then the null hypothesis of identical fit of two hierarchical models in the population would be rejected. Therefore, the model with lower chi-square statistic would have a significantly better fit than the model with higher chi-square value. The chi-square difference between the first-modified and second-modified models was 5.661, significant at the .05 level ($p<.05$, $df=1$). In other words, the second-modified model with one additional path from communication apprehension to WTC
in English showed statistically better model fit than that of the first-modified model at the .05 level.

**Figure 4.4.** The second-modified model

**Third model modification.** A path from motivation to communication apprehension was added to the second-modified model according to the Mplus 4.1 modification indices (see Figure 4.5). Model fit statistics showed that the model was significantly improved at the .01 level with the additional path added (Chi-square=28.955 with the p<.01; NC=2.23; RMSEA=.072; CFI=.965; SRMR=.04; chi-square difference=14.082 with the p<.01, df=1).

**Figure 4.5.** The third-modified model
Fourth model modification. The Mplus 4.1 output of the third-modified model suggested that there should be direct effect between teacher immediacy and self-perceived communication competence. The model modification indices provided by Mplus 4.1 indicated that the chi-square statistic would drop 9 points if a direct effect was added from teacher immediacy to self-perceived communication competence. Therefore, in the fourth-modified model, a direct path from teacher immediacy to SPCC was added (see Figure 4.6). Model fit indices indicated a significant improvement in the overall model fit by adding the path (Chi-square=19.897 with the p>.01; NC=1.66; RSMEA=.053; CFI=.98; SRMR=.023; chi-square difference=9.058 with the p<.01, df=1).

![Figure 4.6](image)

*Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

The chi-square difference between the third and fourth modifications of the model was statistically significant at the .01 level, which is to say, the fourth-modified model was significantly better than the third one. All of the paths in the fourth-modified model were statistically significant at the .05 level (see Table 4.13). The largest contribution to the predictive power on willingness to communicate in English was self-perceived communication competence with the path coefficient equals to .45. Another direct effect on willingness to communicate in English was from the communication apprehension (β=-.15). The R square (R²) of the willingness to communicate was .303, indicating that 30 percent of the variance of willingness to communicate was explained by the model (see Figure 4.6).

Table 4.14 presents the cut-off criteria for model fit indices and model fit statistics for each model modification in this study. The model modifications were conducted based on
data indices and research literature. Kline (2005) pointed out that a perfect model fit did not mean that the model was theoretically grounded. Therefore, when the further suggested addition of paths based on Mplus 4.1 model modification indices could not be supported by existing theory bases, additional cultivation on the model fit improvement was ceased. As a result, the fourth-modified model was treated as the final model as it exhibited good model-fit and plausible relationships among variables according to previous research and tentative hypothesis (see Figure 4.6).

Table 4.13
Factor Loadings for the Final WTC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure and Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Est./SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TI—CA</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-6.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI—SPCC</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>3.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA—SPCC</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-7.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPCC_E—WTC_E</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>7.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA—WTC_E</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-2.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLS—Motivation</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>2.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrativeness—Motivation</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>4.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Orientation—Motivation</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>4.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation—CA</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-3.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation—SPCC</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>3.925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14
Model Modifications and Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>RSMEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>$\chi^2_{diff}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original model</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.81</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>11157.3</td>
<td>111205.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($p&lt;.01$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1^{st}$-modified model</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.70</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>11146.2</td>
<td>11184.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($p&lt;.01$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14 -- continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RSMEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
<th>Δχ² diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd-modified</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>p&lt;.01, df=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-modified</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>p&lt;.01, df=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-modified</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>p&lt;.01, df=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. df = degree of freedom; χ² = chi-square; NC = normed chi-square; RSMEA = root mean square error of approximation; CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = Standardized root mean square residual; AIC = Information Criterion (AIC); BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; χ²_diff = chi-square difference

The test of hypotheses. Three hypotheses were tested by using the final path model. Most of the relationships proposed in the hypotheses were obtained except for the relationships between teacher immediacy with WTC in English, teacher immediacy and motivation, and between motivation and WTC in English. Three new relationships were supported by the data, which were direct relationships from motivation to communication apprehension, motivation to self-perceived communication competence, and communication apprehension to WTC in English (see Figure 4.7).

Hypothesis 1: Self-perceived communication competence would directly predict WTC in English. Communication apprehension would be indirectly related to WTC in English through self-perceived communication competence.

The hypothesized relationships between communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence as well as self-perceived communication competence and WTC in English were supported in the final model. Self-perceived communication competence had the largest direct effect on WTC in English. At the same time, communication apprehension had indirect effect on WTC in English through its negative effect on self-perceived communication competence. One additional relationship beyond the hypothesis was supported between communication apprehension and WTC in English.
Hypothesis 2: Teacher immediacy would have direct effect on communication apprehension, motivation, self-perceived communication competence, and WTC in English. The hypothesized direct relationships between teacher immediacy and communication apprehension as well as self-perceived communication competence were supported. The relationship between teacher immediacy and communication apprehension was the strongest among all of the bivariate relationships. However, teacher immediacy did not show direct predictive power on motivation and WTC in English. WTC in English was indirectly dependent on teacher immediacy through the mediation of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

Hypothesis 3: Motivation would directly predict WTC in English. Attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation would be indirectly related to WTC in English through their direct effect on motivation.

Attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation were found to be directly related to motivation as suggested in the hypothesis. The $R^2$ of motivation predicted by the three variables was .65, indicating that the three variables were good predictors of motivation and 65 percent of the variation in motivation were explained by the three variables. However, a direct relationship between motivation and WTC in English was not supported by the data. Instead, motivation was connected to WTC in English through the mediation of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication
competence. Therefore, attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation were indirectly related to WTC in English through motivation, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence.

**Summary**

To better understand English language learners’ willingness to communicate in English, communication and affective variables as well as the variable of teacher immediacy were examined by using questionnaire instruments. Aligned with the three research questions identified in this study, three statistical analysis methods, correlation coefficient, multiple regression, and path analysis were employed. The relationships among communication variables in and between Chinese and English communication were examined by using correlation coefficient. Multiple regression facilitated the analysis of the unique contribution of each individual affective variable on willingness to communicate in English. A path model was used to test on three hypotheses regarding the relationships among variables based on the data. After model specification, the final path model demonstrated a good fit to the data. The final path model showed that three hypothesized bivariate relationships between variables were not supported by the data. Meanwhile, three new relationships between variables were identified. A brief summary of the results and corresponding discussions are provided in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The objective of the present study was to examine English language learners’ willingness to communicate in the context where English was learned as a foreign language at a university in China. Quantitative research methods were employed in the data collection and analysis processes. This chapter presents a summary of the findings in line with the research questions, a discussion of the findings in relation to the previous studies in the field, the pedagogical implications and the limitations of the study, and the recommendations for future research on the relevant subjects.

The Summary of Findings

The First Research Question

The first research question examined the relationships among communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate for Chinese college students in first language (Chinese) and second language (English).

All of the communication variables (willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence) were significantly correlated with each other at the .01 level in both languages. The college students in this study had higher willingness to communicate and self-perceived communication competence in Chinese than in English. Meanwhile, the students were less apprehensive in Chinese communication than in English communication.

Self-perceived communication competence was positively correlated with willingness to communicate and was a better predictor of the students’ willingness to communicate than was communication apprehension in both languages. The students’ self-perceived communication competence had a similar strength of effect on willingness to communicate in both Chinese and English.

Communication apprehension was negatively correlated with willingness to communicate in both languages, suggesting that the more apprehensive the students felt, the less willingness they would have to communicate. Communication apprehension had larger negative correlation with the students’ willingness to communicate in English than in Chinese, indicating that the students tended to feel more nervous in their English communication than communicating in their native language.
Communication apprehension in Chinese and English were highly correlated. Therefore, if a student tended to feel nervous in native language communication, it would be more likely for him/her to feel apprehensive in English communication. Self-perceived communication competence in Chinese and English were moderately correlated, indicating that the way a student perceived his/her capability in native language communication would fairly affect how he/she recognized the capability in English communication. Willingness to communicate orientation in the students’ Chinese and English communication were also significantly correlated with each other, suggesting that the students’ WTC in the native language had predictive effect on their WTC in English.

Relationships between communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were negative in both languages. The correlation coefficient for the relationship between the two orientations in English communication was higher than in a Chinese communication setting. In other words, students tended to feel more nervous if they perceived themselves incapable of communicating in English than they did in Chinese.

The Second Research Question

The second research question examined the relationships of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation with Chinese college students’ WTC in English.

All of the four affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation) and the variable of willingness to communicate in English were significantly correlated with each other at the .05 level. Willingness to communicate in English had the highest correlation with attitudes toward the learning situation and the lowest correlation with instrumental orientation.

Multiple regression analysis demonstrated that the overall predictive power from the four affective variables on willingness to communicate in English was statistically significant. However, only attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation contributed significant predicative power to WTC in English. In other words, integrativeness and instrumental orientation had no significant effect on the participants’ willingness to communicate in English.

The R² value of the multiple regression model was .094, which means only approximately 10% of the variance in willingness to communicate in English was explained by the four affective variables. In other words, the four affective variables did not do a good job in predicting the students’ willingness to communicate in English directly. As a result, more important variables were in need to have a better predictive power on WTC.
The Third Research Question

The third research question examined the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, motivation, and instrumental orientation), and the variable of teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effect on Chinese college students’ WTC in English.

A path model was proposed based on three hypotheses regarding the relationships among variables involved in the third research question. A path analysis, using a maximum likelihood solution from Mplus 4.1 was conducted on the raw data. Most of the hypothesized relationships were supported by the final path model except for three relationships: the non-significant paths from teacher immediacy to WTC in English, teacher immediacy to motivation, and motivation to WTC in English. Three additional relationships were added to the original-proposed model. They were the direct paths from communication apprehension to WTC in English, motivation to communication apprehension, and motivation to self-perceived communication competence (see Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1. The final model showing both non-significant and significant paths

Note. Solid lines indicate significant paths; dotted lines indicate non-significant hypothesized path relationships

* Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

Communication apprehension had direct effect on WTC in English, and at the same time, it also had indirect effect on WTC in English through its negative effect on self-perceived
communication competence. Self-perceived communication competence had the largest
direct effect on WTC in English.

Teacher immediacy had negative direct effect on communication apprehension and
positive direct effect on self-perceived communication competence. The relationship between
teacher immediacy and communication apprehension was the strongest among all of the
bivariate relationships. Teacher immediacy did not show direct predictive power on
motivation and WTC in English as what had been hypothesized. However, WTC in English
was indirectly dependent on teacher immediacy through the mediation of communication
apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

Motivation had direct effect on communication apprehension and self-perceived
communication competence. The relationship between communication apprehension and
motivation was negative, indicating that the more students were motivated to learn English,
the less apprehension they would have. Motivation had positive effect on self-perceived
communication competence. Therefore, motivated students tended to view themselves more
capable in English communication. The hypothesized predictive relationships from attitudes
toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation to motivation were
supported. Motivation had indirect relationship with WTC in English through the mediation
of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence (see Figure
5.2).

* Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.

Figure 5.2. The final WTC model showing all significant paths
Discussion

The Relationship among Communication Apprehension, Self-Perceived Communication Competence, and Willingness to Communicate

In a first language communication setting. The Chinese college students' willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence in first language communication were all around the middle levels, neither high nor low according to the rating norms of each instrument. Cross-cultural studies on the interrelationship of communication orientations in native language have been carried out by researchers in different countries: the United States (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986a, 1986b, 1986c), Australia (Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey, 1988), Sweden (McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, & Richmond, 1990), Micronesia (Burroughs & Marie, 1990; Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003), and Finland (Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1991).

Table 5.1
Correlations among Communication Variables cross Countries in Native Language Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Place of the Study</th>
<th>CA and WTC</th>
<th>SPCC and WTC</th>
<th>CA and SPCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCroskey and McCroskey (1986a, 1986b, 1986c); McCroskey &amp; Baer (1985)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>-.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barraclough, Christophel, and McCroskey (1988)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCroskey, Burroughs, Daun, &amp; Richmond (1990)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs &amp; Marie (1990)</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sallinen-Kuparinen, McCroskey, and Richmond (1991)</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burroughs, Marie, &amp; McCroskey (2003)</td>
<td>Micronesia</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current study on Chinese college students’ communication orientations (2008)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level.
Table 5.1 presents a comparison of the relationships among communication variables (WTC, CA, and SPCC) across different countries including the current study. All of these studies were conducted with college students for the purpose of cross-country comparison. Although most of these studies have revealed that people in different countries did have somewhat different levels of communication orientations, a similar pattern was observed all through the studies with regard to the relationships among the communication variables. The pattern was demonstrated by a general significant negative correlation between willingness to communicate and communication apprehension, communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence, as well as a common significant positive relationship between willingness to communicate and self-perceived communication competence.

The Chinese college students in this study showed the same relationship patterns among the three communication variables in their native language communication: communication apprehension was negatively correlated with self-perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate; self-perceived communication competence was positively correlated with willingness to communicate. Although the relationships between variables were all statistically significant, the relationship between communication apprehension and WTC for the Chinese college students appeared to be the weakest among all of the studies involved. Similarly, communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence also had the smallest correlation across the different countries.

**In a second/foreign language communication setting.** Similar to the situations in native language communication, the Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence in English communication were also around the middle levels, neither high nor low according to the norms of each instrument. Studies conducted in different countries which examined the relationships among willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence were also conducted in language learners’ second/foreign language communication. Different from the native communication setting, the relationships between the communication variables in second/foreign language communication setting were not consistently significant across studies. For instance, the relationships between CA and WTC as well as CA and SPCC were not significant in Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu’ (2004) study in Japan. Table 5.2 presents the correlation coefficients between variables in language learners’ second/foreign language communication in different studies.
In the current study, the relationship pattern (positive vs. negative relationship) among communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, and self-perceived communication competence in the second/foreign language communication setting remained consistent with other studies conducted in different countries. However, as far as the significance of correlations was concerned, the inconsistent statistical significant relationships between variables in a second/foreign communication context may imply that in an L2 communication context, there was a more complex manner with those variables that influenced L1 communication. In other words, when language learners used a second/foreign language to communicate, there might be other critical variables which could affect their willingness to communicate other than communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence.

Table 5.2
Correlations among Communication Variables cross Countries in Second/Foreign Language Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Place the Study Conducted</th>
<th>CA and WTC</th>
<th>SPCC and WTC</th>
<th>CA and SPCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacIntyre &amp; Charos (1996)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>-.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yashima (2002)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker &amp; MacIntyre (2003)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-.29** (NI)</td>
<td>.72** (NI)</td>
<td>-.36** (NI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.44** (I)</td>
<td>.17 (I)</td>
<td>-.25** (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacIntyre et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-.18 (NI)</td>
<td>.53* (NI)</td>
<td>-.52* (NI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.62* (I)</td>
<td>.40* (I)</td>
<td>-.51* (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, &amp; Shimizu (2004)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current study on Chinese college students’ communication orientations (2008)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NI=group without immersion experience; I=group with immersion experience
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Across the first and second/foreign language communication settings. The findings of the current study showed that the correlations between Chinese and English for communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate were all positive and statistically significant, suggesting that the level of an individual’s communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, or willingness to communicate in his or her first language was predictive to the level of the corresponding communication orientation in his or her second/foreign language. Therefore, communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate all appeared to have a trait-like predisposition which remained constant across languages used in communication settings.

The trait-like predisposition of communication apprehension was consistent with the result in McCroskey, Fayer, and Richmond’s (1985) study, in which they found that positive and moderate correlation was obtained between Spanish and English for the participants’ communication apprehension; thus, “the predictions based on the theory of CA [communication apprehension] as a generalized trait are supported” (p. 190). Similar consistent relationship for communication apprehension in first and second languages was also reported from studies conducted with Japanese students (McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishida, 1985), Micronesian adult students (Burroughs, Marie, & McCroskey, 2003), and international students who were attending a university in the United States (Jung & McCroskey, 2004). Therefore, communication apprehension in one’s native language might be the primary determinate of the minimal level of communication apprehension in the person’s second/foreign language. Thus, it suggests that first language communication apprehension determines the level of second language communication apprehension.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) proposed that willingness to communicate did not simply transfer from one language to another. It was assumed that L1 WTC would not generalize to L2 WTC. MacIntyre et al. (2003) found non-significant correlation between the participants’ WTC in English (L1) and French (L2) and suggested that there was some degree of independence between WTC in L1 and WTC in L2. However, another study conducted by Baker and MacIntyre in the same year (2003) found that the participants’ WTC in first language (English) and second language (French) were significantly correlated for both groups with or without immersion experience. Similarly, in the current study, as mentioned above, moderate significant correlation was found between the Chinese college students’ WTC in Chinese and English, indicating that the level of a person’s L1 WTC could fairly predict his/her level of L2 WTC. The inconsistency of the results concerning the significant
relationship between L1 WTC and L2 WTC suggested that there was somewhat of a
pre-disposition trait existing in a person’s willingness to communicate. Therefore, if an
individual is always willing to communicate in his or her first language, he/she is more likely
to communicate in another language providing necessary communication competence. On the
other hand, there might be situational variables which could affect a person’s willingness to
communicate and hence lead to discrepancy between the person’s L1 WTC and L2 WTC
orientations.

The Relationship between Affective Variables and Willingness to Communicate

Baker and MacIntyre (2003) examined the relationship between motivation/attitudinal
variables and WTC in French (L2) with 195 high school students in Canada. The findings
showed that the participants’ L2 WTC was significantly correlated with their attitude and
motivation of language learning. A similar study was conducted by MacIntyre et al. (2003)
with 59 university students in Canada who were learning French as a second language. The
relationships between affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning
situation, and motivation) and L2 WTC were investigated. However, completely contrary to
the findings in Baker and MacIntyre’s (2003) study, the results showed that none of the
affective variables were significantly correlated with L2 WTC for the group of participants
without prior immersion experience. Considering the similarities between language learners
without immersion experience and language learners’ who study a language as a foreign
language, as both of them are short of pragmatic use of the language outside the classroom, it
is more reasonable to compare the results of the current study with the findings of the
non-immersion group of participants in MacIntyre et al.’s (2003) study.

Although none of the affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning
situation, and motivation) were found significantly correlated with the non-immersion
participants’ L2 WTC in MacIntyre et al.’s (2003) study, the four affective variables in the
current study (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, instrumental
orientation, and motivation) were all found to be significantly correlated with the students’
willingness to communicate in English. However, multiple regression analysis suggested that
only attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation had significant contribution to the
prediction of WTC in English among the four affective variables. In other words,
instrumental orientation and integrativeness did not have significant unique predictive power
on WTC in English in the current study in spite of their significant correlations with the WTC
in English.
According to Gardner and Lambert (1959, 1972), instrumental orientation reflects practical and utilitarian purposes of learning a language. In the current study, instrumental orientation was assumed to be the most influential variable to affect the students’ WTC in English since the background information questionnaire showed that “getting a good job” and “future career” were reported as the top two orientations for the students to learn English. However, the results pointed out that instrumental orientation had the lowest correlation with the students’ WTC in English and did not show significant predictive power to the students’ WTC in English when controlling the other three affective variables.

There might be several reasons to explain the weak connection between instrumental orientation and WTC in English in the current study. Firstly, the WTC concept examined in the present study merely referred to the oral communication willingness. Therefore, if students’ expectation to future jobs or career was not related to a scenario requiring proficient oral English communication, they might not have the willingness to communicate in English even if opportunities were given in their English learning process. Secondly, the college students at the university majoring in English were required to pass a proficiency test called TEM 4, standing for Test for English Majors (Level 4), to be able to graduate. This proficiency test is a pencil and paper test without any evaluation of oral English communication ability. Therefore, students might just need a high score of TEM 4 to prove their English proficiency to the employers in order to get a good job. Thus, English communication was probably not a main concern for them to ensure a bright future.

Not only instrumental orientation was not significantly contributed to the prediction of the students’ L2 WTC, integrativeness did not do a good job either, despite the significant correlation between integrativeness and WTC in English. Gardner (2001b) defined integrativeness as a “genuine interest in learning the second language in order to come closer psychologically to the other language community” (p. 8). Therefore, integrativeness involves emotional identification with another language and cultural group. The college students in China were studying English as a foreign language, which means that they would not use English for pragmatic communication on a daily basis, neither could they have direct contact with the people who speak English as a native language. Moreover, considering that the orientation “I would like to be friends with some English-speaking people” received one of the lowest agreements from the students in the background information questionnaire, it was not unreasonable that integrativeness could not serve to encourage students to initiate communication in English in a setting that English is learned as a foreign language (EFL).
Although, statistically speaking, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation had significant predicative power on the students’ WTC in English, these two predictors together only explained 10 percent of the variance of WTC in English. In this case, it implied that all of the four affective variables were not good predictors to the students’ WTC in English and there must be other variables which need to be involved for a better prediction to the students’ WTC in English. As it was already demonstrated beforehand, communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were two significant predictors to willingness to communicate in both first and second/foreign languages. Therefore, the third research question involved the variables examined in the first two research questions as well as a new variable of teacher immediacy, which was suggested to be influential in Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English (Wen & Clément, 2003), to examine their overall predictive relationships with the students’ WTC in English.

The Relationship among Communication Variables, Affective Variables, and Teacher Immediacy

The third research question examined the relationships among communication variables (communicative apprehension and self-perceived communication competence), affective variables (integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, instrumental orientation, and motivation), and teacher immediacy with regard to their predictive effects on the Chinese college students’ WTC in English. This question was represented by three hypotheses on the relationships among the variables. Figure 5.2 shows the final path model representing the relationships among the variables. All of the paths in the final model were statistically significant, and the model demonstrated a good fit to the data.

Among all of the hypothesized direct effects on WTC in English, only the direct influence exerted from self-perceived communication competence to WTC in English was obtained in the final model. A new path from communication apprehension to WTC in English was supported by the final model. These results were accordant with some of the previous studies about the relationships among willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence (Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004).

Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were the only two direct predictors of WTC in English in the current study. Self-perceived communication competence appeared to be a better predictor of WTC in English than was communication apprehension. This suggested that in order to encourage students to be more willing to communicate in English, language teachers should have the primary concern on
how to help students improve confidence in viewing their communication competence instead of merely decreasing their anxiety level in English communication.

The hypothesized relationship between motivation and WTC in English was not supported by the data. This was consistent with the findings in MacIntyre and Charos’ (1996) model, in which they found motivation had no direct relationship with willingness to communicate in a second language. Similarly, Yashima’s (2002) study and Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu’s (2004) study did not support a direct path from motivation to willingness to communicate in L2. In the current study, motivation influenced WTC in English through communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. Therefore, it appeared that merely having the motivation to learn a language did not necessarily cause an individual to have the willingness to communicate in the language. Instead, the positive relationship between motivation and self-perceived communication competence and the negative relationship between motivation and communication apprehension indicated that motivation could decrease an individual’s communication apprehension and increase the person’s confidence in viewing his/her capability in communication, and thus enhance the person’s willingness to communicate in the target language.

Gardner’s socio-educational model was supported in that attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation directly predicted motivation to learn English. Among the three predictors, instrumental orientation had the strongest predictive power to motivation, which was consistent with the results of background information questionnaire regarding the students’ English learning orientation. Instrumental orientation “getting a good job” and “future career” was reported as the top reasons to learn English by the students. Therefore, pragmatic teaching material related to real job and career would increase students’ motivation to learn English. Integrativeness had a lower influence on motivation. This may due to the few opportunities the students had to really contact with people who speak English as a native language. Considering higher motivation may cause higher self-perceived communication competence and lower communication apprehension, students’ willingness to communicate would be indirectly amplified through positive influence on attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation.

Teacher immediacy was examined for the first time with other variables in the current study to investigate its hypothesized relationship with WTC in English based on Wen & Clément’s (2003) suggestions. The hypothesized relationship from teacher immediacy to
communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were obtained. It suggested that when students perceived their teachers as approachable and supportive, they would feel emotionally secure and less nervous in communication. Compared to the influence exerted from teacher immediacy to self-perceived communication competence, the influence from teacher immediacy to communication apprehension was two-times stronger. Therefore, the degree of physical and psychological closeness teachers established with students would be more critical to the level of communication apprehension the students might have in English communication.

Although previous research suggested that teacher immediacy was positively related to students’ motivation (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Christensen & Menzel, 1998) and willingness to communicate (Carrell & Menzel, 1999; Hsu, 2005), these two relationships were found non-significant in the current study. Wen and Clément’s (2003) study suggested that because of the valued cultural norm of submission to authority in China, there was discrimination between teachers and students. When students took teachers as a figure of authority, there was a threat to communication interaction. On the other hand, when students perceived their teachers as approachable and facilitating, they would feel emotionally secure and sufficiently motivated in their language learning. As a result, Wen and Clément posited that teacher immediacy should be identified as one of the proximal influences on Chinese college students’ WTC in English.

In the current study, the hypothesized relationship between teacher immediacy and WTC in English based on Wen and Clément’s suggestion was not supported by the data. More likely, teacher immediacy seemed to indirectly affect students’ willingness to communicate in English through decreasing students’ communication apprehension and raising their beliefs in their communication competence.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) proposed a heuristic model to present the conceptualization of WTC in an L2 communication setting (Figure 5.3). The shape of pyramid stands for proximal and distal factors which could operate potential influences on initiating communication in an L2. From then on, the conceptual model of L2 WTC became a starting point to inspire research on L2 WTC in different linguistic environments.
The current study provided empirical support to the MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) conceptual model. The affective variables (attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, instrumental orientation, and motivation) included in the study could be situated in Layer V to interpret the factor of Intergroup Attitudes in the conceptual model. Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were usually combined together to represent the factor of L2 Self-Confidence in Layer IV (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004).

Teacher immediacy was not mentioned in MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) conceptual model. However, since teacher immediacy in the current study particular referred to teachers’ communication behaviors which aimed to enhance physical and psychological closeness with students, it could be understood as teachers’ tendency to establish a particular stable social relationship with students in a regular English communication environment (i.e., classroom). In the long run, the social relationship established on the teacher immediacy orientation could be counted as a stable factor in a particular setting of communication and affect students’ language communication orientations in a general way. As a result, the research of the present study suggested that teacher immediacy be put in Layer V of MacIntyre et al.’s conceptual model as an interpretation of the factor of Social Situation.

The final path model showed that communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence in Layer IV had a closer relationship with willingness to communicate than the affective variables and teacher immediacy in Layer V. Thus, the
results of the current empirical study supported MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) heuristic WTC model accounting for variables influencing WTC in an L2 communication setting.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The results of the current study showed that communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate were correlated in Chinese and English communication settings respectively. In other words, these communication variables remained consistent to some degree across different linguistic contexts. The predictive relationships of communication orientations between first and second/foreign language-speaking contexts discovered in the current study should serve to raise language teachers’ concerns about how an individual’s communication orientations in first language communication could affect the person’s second/foreign language communication.

On the other hand, the final model suggested that both communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence exerted direct effects on WTC in English. Meanwhile, communication apprehension had a negative predictive effect on self-perceived communication competence. Therefore, if a language learner experiences a high level of communication apprehension in his/her first language communication, it is reasonable to believe that this person would perceive him/herself having low communication competence and therefore demonstrate avoidance toward communication, or in other words, have low willingness to communicate in first language. Based on the predictive relationships of the communication orientations in a person’s first language to a second/foreign language, it is critical that language teachers take the language learner’s communication apprehension in first language into consideration before any measures to be taken to improve the individual’s willingness to communicate in a second/foreign language.

Because communication apprehension in one’s native language might be the primary determinate of the minimal level of communication apprehension in the person’s second language, language teachers should firstly have concerns about language learners’ communication apprehension level in first language communication context. The awareness of an individual’s communication apprehension level in first language would help language teachers understand and predict the “possible” level and range of the individual’s communication apprehension in a second/foreign communication setting. Based on the understanding and expectation, language teachers could take more effective measures aimed to reduce the person’s communication apprehension in L2 when his/her communication apprehension in L1 has been taken into consideration and fairly understood. For instance,
task-based pair work is usually suggested as a more effective way to reduce language learners’ communication anxiety in L2 compared to class-fronted activities. However, for an individual who always has high communication apprehension in first language communication, simply putting him/her into a pair conversation may not be enough to reduce his/her communication apprehension in L2. Further considerations may need to be given to the pair interaction such as the language proficiency levels of the paired learners and the nature of the task-based conversation. For example, teachers could arrange a conversation partner with higher or lower proficiency level with the targeted student in the pair work and observe which way could decrease the person’s high anxiety in communication. Having an awareness of the students’ communication apprehension in L1 could help teachers incorporate anxiety reduction strategies more effectively.

The results of the study showed that communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence were the only two direct predictors to WTC in English for Chinese college students. Apparently, simply reducing communication apprehension is not enough to improve language learner’s willingness to communicate. Compared to communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence appeared to be a better predictor to the students’ willingness to communicate in English in the current study. It has been clarified that self-perceived communication competence is not the actual communication competence an individual has but how he/she believes his/her competence is. It is not unusual that a person with high communication competence in a second/foreign language may perceive him/herself incapable of communication and hence lack a willingness to communicate in the target language. Therefore, how to help language learners have belief in their communication competence is also critical for language teachers. For instance, it is highly possible that frequent error check and grammatical corrective feedback in a conversation with language learners would decrease their confidence in communication competence and hence impede their communication willingness.

Teacher immediacy is an important variable in the current study since no prior study has ever examined its relationship with willingness to communication in a second/foreign language in a path model. Teacher immediacy refers to the degree of physical and psychological closeness teachers could establish with students. Wen and Clément (2003) suggested that teacher immediacy should be identified as one of the proximal influences on Chinese college students’ WTC in English due to the highly appreciated social norm of submission to authority in a Chinese society. They encouraged empirical studies to test the hypothesized predictive relationship between teacher immediacy and willingness to
communication in L2 in a Chinese setting. The current study did not find statistical support for the direct relationship between teacher immediacy and Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English. However, teacher immediacy was suggested to be influential to WTC in English through mediation of communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. As a result, teacher immediacy would indirectly affect students’ willingness to communicate in English through decreasing students’ communication apprehension and raise their belief in their own communication competence. The significant predictive power of teacher immediacy on communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence should draw language teachers’ attention if improving language learners’ willingness to communicate in a target language is set as a goal for effective language teaching and learning.

The teacher-student relationship in Chinese classrooms is highly influenced by the values of Confucianism and collectivism (Wen & Clément, 2003). Classroom teaching is dominantly established on a teacher-centered rationale. Teachers, especially second/foreign language teachers, are usually treated as the only authority in the classroom, therefore, unequal social status and large power distance between teachers and students may cause students’ reluctance to participate in communication activities. In most of the cases, communication in a language classroom is dominantly initiated by the teacher with students being a passive receiver whose learning is exclusively from the teacher.

Teacher immediacy, which shows the efforts from teachers to establish connection with students, serves as a vital factor to change the large social and power distance between teachers and students. It is generally understood that language learning is established on meaningful communication interaction. To facilitate mutual communication interaction between teachers and students or among students themselves, teachers should have awareness on their verbal and nonverbal behaviors which could influence students’ communication apprehension and recognition of communication competence. For example, using “we” and “our” in teachers’ verbal expression instead of “you” may increase the mutual identification of a closer social distance between teachers and students and therefore reduce students’ anxiety in L2 communication. Body gestures implying teachers’ concerns about students such as smiling, nodding and encouraging padding on the shoulder may work to increase students’ confidence in their communication competence.

The Chinese college students’ motivation to learn English was suggested to have no direct relationship with their willingness to communicate in English in the current study. Motivation could influence students’ willingness to communicate in English through its
negative effect on communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence. Therefore, for a motivated student, it is likely that he/she has less communication anxiety and perceived him/herself as more competent in English communication. The current study suggested three variables which could directly affect an individual’s language learning motivation: attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, and instrumental orientation.

Attitudes toward the learning situation in the current study specifically examined students’ attitudes toward the Oral English class and their teachers in the class. Apparently, positive attitudes toward classes and teachers would provide improvement in students’ motivation. Therefore, language teachers should have concerns about the factors which could help students develop positive attitudes toward the learning situation. Factors such as classroom management, teacher-student relationship, teaching materials, teaching behaviors, etc. could be influential on students’ positive attitude development.

Integrativeness involves emotional identification with another language and cultural group. Gardner (2001) suggested that integrativeness would be reflected in an integrative orientation toward leaning a second language, a favorable attitude toward the language community, and openness to other groups in general. In China where English is learned as a foreign language, it is not easy for language learners to have direct contact with the English language and culture in daily life. Classroom becomes the main context for students to use English for meaningful communication. Therefore, inside the classroom, language teachers should facilitate to improve students’ genuine interest in English and develop their positive identification and attitudes with the language and culture. Teaching materials and activities which could increase students’ interest and identification with English are encouraged to use inside the classroom. On the other hand, outside classroom activities which aimed to enhance students’ understanding and contact with English and English-related culture should also be promoted. For instance, teachers could use internet or other online tools to create opportunities for students to get in touch with people who speak English as a native language if a real-life contact is not available.

Instrumental orientation refers to the pragmatic reasons of learning a language. The background information questionnaire in the current study showed that “getting a good job” and “future career” were selected as the top pragmatic reasons for the Chinese college students to learn English. It is also supported by the final model that instrumental orientation had the strongest predictive power on the students’ motivation to learn English. This might because English is usually only used as a language tool in people’s work dealing with
international business or affairs but people’s everyday life communication in China. To enhance instrumental orientation of language learners, it would be helpful for teachers to make their teaching materials and classroom activities more utilitarian and practical and geared towards students’ future jobs and career. Materials of English for specific purposes could be adapted to facilitate students’ particular interests in future jobs and career. Task-based conversation activities could also be designed more relevant to students’ instrumental reasons for English learning.

In 1992, a new functional curriculum of English teaching issued by the Ministry of Education (the then State Education Development Commission) in China set “being able to use English to communicate” as one of the major English teaching goals (Yu, 2001). Given a long-term debate on the superiority of communicative language teaching approach to traditional grammar-centered teaching methods in China, language teachers and researchers have been searching for methods to implement the communicative language teaching approach inside the classroom effectively (Liao, 2000; Yu, 2001). This study endeavored to develop teachers’ understanding of language learners’ willingness to communicate and the effects of communication and affective orientations as well as teacher verbal and nonverbal behaviors on learners’ communication orientations. As a result, language teachers may improve their teaching methods and curriculum design in English teaching by applying a communicative language teaching approach effectively in English classrooms. In a general way, by examining willingness to communicate, which was suggested as the final intention before initiating a communication, this study can help language teachers find a better way to develop language learners’ communication willingness in the target language, increase their engagement in the communication, and facilitate their second or foreign language learning and acquisition.

**Limitations of the Study**

Several limitations of the current study needed to be addressed here. First, the sample of the current study was college students who were majoring in English program in a Chinese public university. Although the researcher chose English majors as the participants of the study because they would have more opportunities for English communication, this exclusion may affect the generalizability of the results in the current study to other Chinese college students who were not English majors. Therefore, the results of the study should be utilized with caution.

Second, the measurements employed in the current study were all self-reported questionnaire instruments. Although the validity and reliability of the instruments have been
checked to satisfy the requirements of data collection (except for the questionnaire of Integrativeness, alpha=.57), the depth of the information that the instruments could collect are limited due to the simple and straight-forward nature of questionnaire instruments and the restricted administrative time. This is a general drawback of quantitative research methods using questionnaire instruments. Therefore, in order to obtain deeper and versatile information of the target issue, qualitative methods such as interview and observation could be employed to complement and verify the final data.

The third limitation is also about the instruments utilized in the current study. Some of the questionnaires involved communication situations which had not been encountered by the participants in their real lives. For instance, the instrument of Willingness to Communicate was used to examine the participants’ willingness to communicate in English in different situations and with different people. Some of the occasions, for example “Talk with a physician” and “Talk with a resident assistant,” appeared to be highly impossible for the participants to experience in China where English is not used as a daily communication tool. Therefore, some answers to the instrument questions were largely dependent on the participants’ understanding of the instrument items and their thoughts and beliefs in what way they would react on an imaginary occasion.

The fourth limitation refers to the design of the scope of the current study. The study of the Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate focused on communication orientations in a general situation with long-term properties and moderately stable relationship with other people. Meanwhile, the relationships among different variables involved in the study were also investigated on a general basis. In other words, the current study did not aim to examine communication orientations and various predictive relationships with willingness to communicate on a particular occasion or with specific people at a given time. Although the results supported MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) heuristic conceptual model of WTC in an L2 communication setting, it has to be pointed out that the Layer III of the conceptual model which involved situated influential variables on particular occasions or with specific people was not addressed in the current study.

Suggestions for Future Studies

The suggestions for future studies draw in part from aspects related to the limitations of this study and needs based on the current research literature on WTC. Different research methods, study scopes in terms of participants and linguistic environments, and study designs were recommended for further studies on willingness to communicate in a second/foreign language communication context.
Questionnaire, as one of the commonly used quantitative research methods, obviously has its advantage of collecting a broad range of data in a relatively short period of time and among a large group of people. However due to its general limitation on depth of information collected, qualitative research methods are suggested to further enrich and verify the data of the target issue. For research topic regarding attitudinal and motivation orientations, interview would be an appropriate way to obtain more detailed information of the target population. Observation is a good complementary method to understand an individual’s communication orientations and behaviors. Therefore, the researcher suggests that future studies on similar topic to the current study utilize both quantitative and qualitative research methods for a more thorough investigation.

The current study was an empirical study aimed to examine the construction of willingness to communicate in a foreign language communication context. It contributes to the conceptualization of the WTC construct in a Chinese EFL setting. Therefore, studies which focus on the same topic are strongly suggested to be conducted in different linguistic and cultural settings to test and verify the results of the current study.

The participants of the current study were English learners with intermediate level of English proficiency. Comparison studies could be conducted with language learners with other different proficiency levels. Gender differences could also be a concern in comparison studies. Experimental studies are also in need to examine the relationships between willingness to communicate in L2 and actual L2 language use, willingness to communicate in L2 and oral communication proficiency, and willingness to communication in L2 and L2 learning achievement. Empirical longitudinal study of willingness to communicate is very few in the research field. Future studies designed to examine longitudinal effect of willingness to communicate on language learning will definitely contribute significantly to the language teaching and learning programs and pedagogy.

Studies which are more closely related to teaching activities would be beneficial to classroom language teachers. Therefore, willingness to communicate in a L2 needs to be examined in specific situations or with particular people. For example, willingness to communicate in a L2 could be investigated with language learners in different communication environments (i.e., pair work conversation, task-based group work, class-fronted discussion, etc.). Future studies could also examine the willingness to communicate of language learners when they are facing conversation partners with different language proficiency level (i.e., beginner vs. advanced).
Conclusion

Language use, to a large degree, refers to using the language to communicate for meaningful purposes. Students who are learning English as a foreign language usually lack authentic language communication environments and opportunities. This drawback is usually identified as the primary reason for foreign language learners’ low communicative competence in the target language. Creating more opportunities for language learners to conduct pragmatic communication in the target language, therefore, are usually advanced as the primary resolution to solve the target language communication problem by many language teachers.

However, it is also the case that students who are given ample chances of doing L2 communication are not willing to participate and initiate communication in the target language. For instance, Oral English class is aimed to provide English majors communication opportunities in English. However, despite the sufficient opportunities provided, many students still demonstrate avoiding tendency toward the communication, in other words, have low willingness to communicate in English.

This study examined possible variables (communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence, attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness, instrumental orientation, motivation, and teacher immediacy) which could affect Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in English based on previous studies on willingness to communicate subject. Two hundred and thirty-five (235) sophomores and juniors majoring in the English Program at a public university in China participated in this study. A quantitative research method using questionnaires was employed. Statistical data analysis methods of correlation coefficient, multiple regressions, path analysis were utilized in line with three research questions.

The significance of this study lies in its theoretical contributions to the WTC construct and the pedagogical implications in second language teaching and learning. Willingness to communicate was examined in China where English was learned as a foreign language. Therefore, the different linguistic and language speaking environments in the current study enriched the scholarship of the WTC research. The variable of teacher immediacy was involved into a path model with affective and communication variables at the first time in WTC research, which theoretically extended the conceptualization of WTC construct to a broader range.

This study has pedagogical implications for English teaching and learning as well. MacIntyre, Clement, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) argued that the ultimate goal of the second
or foreign language learning should be to “engender in language students the willingness to seek out communication opportunities and the willingness actually to communicate in them” (p. 547). A better understanding of students’ WTC in the target language may help language teachers improve their communicative language teaching methods and curriculum design to provide more communication opportunities for language learners, more importantly, encourage actual engagement into communication behaviors, and finally, facilitate second/foreign language learning and acquisition.
APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS BACKGROUND INFORMATION (ENGLISH VERSION)

1. Gender:
   Male
   Female

2. Age

3. How many years have you been studying English in the school (elementary to college)?

4. Have you ever been to any English-speaking country?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

5. What's your Orientation (reasons) of studying English?
   - It will be useful in getting a good job.
   - It will help me understand the culture related to English-speaking countries.
   - I will need English for my career in the future.
   - I would like to go to study in English-speaking countries.
   - I would like to be friends with some English-speaking people.
   - It will make me a more knowledgeable person.
   - It will help me if I travel.
   - It is a required academic course in the school.
   - It will help me to please my parents.

   Other reasons:
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

Rate your Chinese skills

1. Please rate your Chinese reading proficiency.
   Not literate   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Literate

2. Please rate your Chinese writing proficiency.
   Not literate   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Literate
3. Please rate your Chinese speaking ability.
Not fluent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Fluent
4. Please rate your Chinese speech comprehension ability.
Unable to understand 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Perfectly able to understand
5. Please rate how comfortable you feel expressing yourself in Chinese:
Not comfortable at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very comfortable

Rate your English skills

1. Please rate your English reading proficiency.
Not literate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Literate
2. Please rate your English writing proficiency.
Not literate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Literate
3. Please rate your English speaking ability.
Not fluent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Fluent
4. Please rate your English speech comprehension ability.
Unable to understand 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Perfectly able to understand
5. Please rate how comfortable you feel expressing yourself in English:
Not comfortable at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very comfortable

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS BACKGROUND INFORMATION (CHINESE VERSION)

背景资料调查

1. 性别：
   ______ 男
   ______ 女

2. 年龄 ______

3. 你学习英语有多少年了（小学到大学）？

4. 你去过没有去过把英语作为母语的国家？
   ______ 有
   ______ 没有

5. 你学习英语原因是什么（多选）？

   ______ 学英语能帮助我找到一份好工作
   ______ 学英语能帮助我了解英语国家的文化
   ______ 我今后的事业需要英语
   ______ 我想去说英语的国家留学
   ______ 我想和讲英语的人成为朋友
   ______ 英语能帮助我成为一个更有知识的人
   ______ 英语能在我出门旅行的时候有所帮助
   ______ 英语是学校的一门必修课
   ______ 学英语能让我的父母感到高兴
   ______
   ______ 其他原因：______________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________
评估你的中文技能:

1. 请评估你的中文阅读能力:
   强
   弱
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. 请评估你的中文写作能力:
   强
   弱
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. 请评估你的中文口头表达能力:
   不流利
   非常流利
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. 请评估你中文听力理解能力:
   不能理解
   完全能理解
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. 请评估你用中文表达时的舒适程度:
   一点都不舒适
   非常舒适
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

评估你的英文技能:

1. 请评估你的英文阅读能力:
   强
   弱
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. 请评估你的英文写作能力:
   强
   弱
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. 请评估你的英文口头表达能力:
   不流利
   非常流利
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. 请评估你英文听力理解能力:

   不能理解
   完全能理解
5. 请评估你用英文表达时的舒适程度：

一点都不舒适                            非常舒适
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX C

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN CHINESE
(ENGLISH VERSION)

This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning feelings about communicating with others in Chinese. You may not have experienced some of the situations. If that is the case, please make the best guess and indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Are Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. I dislike participating in group discussion.
2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.
3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussion.
4. I like to get involved in group discussions.
5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussion.
7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
8. Usually, I am comfortable when I have to participate in a meeting.
9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.
19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forgot facts I really know.
APPENDIX D

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN CHINESE
(ChINESE VERSION)

中文交流焦虑的个人报告

这个问卷包括 24 道关于和他人用中文交流时的感觉的描述。你有可能还没有经历过其中的一些情形。如果是那样，请根据你自己的情况做出最有可能的推测，并且标注你最认同的适合程度。

1. 非常不同意
2. 不同意
3. 介于不同意和同意之间
4. 同意
5. 非常同意

1. 我不喜欢参与集体讨论。
2. 总的来说，我参与集体讨论的时候很自在。
3. 参与集体讨论让我觉得很紧张。
4. 我喜欢参与集体讨论。
5. 和不认识的人进行集体讨论让我觉得紧张不安。
6. 参与集体讨论的时候我很平静也很放松。
7. 总的来说，当我要参加一个会议时，我感到很紧张。
8. 通常我对必须要参加一个会议感觉自在。
9. 如果我在会议上被点名发言，我会很平静和放松。
10. 我害怕在会议上发表自己的言论。
11. 在会议上和他人交流总是让我感到不自在。
12. 如果在会议上回答问题，我感到很放松。
13. 我在和刚认识的人交谈时很紧张。
14. 我在和人交谈的时候不害怕表达自己的想法。
15. 基本上我在和人交谈时非常紧张不安。
16. 基本上我在和人交谈时非常平静和放松。
17. 我在和陌生人交谈时感觉很放松。
18. 我在和人交谈时害怕说出自己的想法。
19. 我不害怕做公众演讲。
20. 当我在做公众演讲时，我会感觉身体的某些部位很紧张。
21. 我在做公众演讲的时候感觉很放松。
22. 我在做公众演讲的时候，思维变得混乱无序。
23. 我对于做公众演讲很有信心。
24. 我在做公众演讲时会紧张得忘记我本来知道的东西。
APPENDIX E

SELF-PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE IN CHINESE
(ENGLISH VERSION)

Below are twelve situations in which you might need to communicate. People’s abilities to communicate effectively vary a lot, and sometimes the same person is more competent to communicate in one situation than in another. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in Chinese in each of the situations described below by using a scale from 0-100. Indicate in the space provided at the left of each item your estimate of your competence.

0 = completely incompetent
100 = competent

1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
2. Talk with an acquaintance.
3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
4. Talk in a small group of strangers.
5. Talk with a friend.
6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
7. Talk with a stranger.
8. Present a talk to a group of friends.
9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
11. Talk in a small group of friends.
12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.
APPENDIX F

SELF-PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE IN CHINESE
(CHINESE VERSION)

自我认同的中文交流能力

下列是 12 项你有可能碰上交流情形。每个人的交流能力都不一样，而有些时候即使是同一个人，他/她也会在不同的情形下表现出不一样的交流能力。请分别用 0-100 的数值来衡量你认为你在下列不同情形下用中文交流的能力。

0 = 完全没有交流能力
100 = 有完全的交流能力

1. 对一群陌生人发表言论。
2. 和一个熟人交谈。
3. 在一大群朋友的聚会中交谈。
4. 在一小群陌生人中交谈。
5. 和一个朋友交谈。
6. 在一大群熟人的聚会中交谈。
7. 和一个陌生人交谈。
8. 对一群朋友发表言论。
9. 在一小群熟人中交谈。
10. 在一大群陌生人的聚会中交谈。
11. 在一小群朋友中交谈。
12. 对一群熟人发表言论。
APPENDIX G

WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN CHINESE
(ENGLISH VERSION)

Directions:
Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice and indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in Chinese in each type of situation by using a scale from 0-100. You may not have experienced some of the situations. If that is the case, please make the best guess. Indicate in the space at the left of the item what percent of the time you would choose to communicate.

0 = Never
100= Always

1. Talk with a resident assistant.
2. Talk with a physician.
3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.
6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
7. Talk with a police officer.
8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.
11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
13. Talk with an advisor in your department.
14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
16. Talk with a garbage collector.
17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
18. Talk with your girl/boyfriend.
19. Talk in a small group of friends.
20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.
APPENDIX H
WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN CHINESE (CHINESE VERSION)

中文交流意愿
下列是20项你有可能与他人交流的情形。假设你有充分的自由做出交谈与否的决定，请用0-100的数值来衡量有多大的可能你会选择在该情形下和他人用中文交谈。你有可能还没有经历过其中的一些情形。如果是那样，请根据你自己的情况做出最有可能的推测。请在每个选项的左边划线处填上相应的数值。
0 = 不会
100 = 总是会

1. 和宿舍管理员交谈
2. 和医生交谈。
3. 向一群陌生人发表言论。
4. 在排队的时候和熟人交谈。
5. 和商店里的售货员交谈。
6. 在一大群朋友的聚会中交谈。
7. 和警察交谈。
8. 在一小群陌生人中交谈。
9. 在排队时和朋友交谈。
10. 和餐馆里的服务人员交谈。
11. 在一大群熟人的聚会中交谈。
12. 在排队时和陌生人交谈。
13. 和系里的辅导员交谈。
14. 向一群朋友发表言论。
15. 在一小群熟人中交谈。
16. 和拾荒者交谈。
17. 在一大群陌生人的聚会中交谈。
18. 和你的男/女朋友交谈。
19. 在一小群朋友中交谈。
20. 向一群熟人发表言论。
APPENDIX I

AFFECTIVE VARIABLE QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

Directions: Please indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an X that best describes the extent to which you believe the statement applies to you.

1. If I were to rate my feelings about learning English in order to interact with members of the English speaking community, I would say that it is:
   Weak ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Strong

2. If I were to rate my interest in foreign languages, I would say that it is:
   Very Low ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Very High

3. If I were to rate my attitude toward members of the second language community, I would say that it is:
   Unfavorable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Favorable

4. If I were to rate my attitude toward my English instructor, I would say that it is:
   Unfavorable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Favorable

5. If I were to rate my attitude toward my English course, I would say that it is:
   Unfavorable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Favorable

6. If I were to rate how hard I work at learning English, I would say that it is:
   Very Little ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Very Much

7. If I were to rate my desire to learn English, I would say that it is:
   Very Low ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Very High

8. If I were to rate my attitude toward learning English, I would say that it is:
   Unfavorable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Favorable

9. If I were to rate how important it is for me to learn English for getting a good job, I would say that it is:
   Very Low ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Very High

10. If I were to rate how important it is for me to learn English for my future career, I would say that it is:
    Very Low ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Very High
APPENDIX J

AFFECTIVE VARIABLE QUESTIONNAIRE (CHINESE VERSION)

态度及动机问卷

请根据你自己的实际情况在下列各项表述中用“X”标注你最认同的适合程度。

1. 如果说我学习英语是想和讲英语的国家的人交往，那么我认为这种意愿程度应该是：
   弱 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 强

2. 如果我要评估我对于外语（不仅限于英语）的兴趣程度，我觉得应该是：
   很低 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很高

3. 如果我要评估我对于讲英语的国家的人的态度，我觉得应该是：
   不喜欢 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很喜欢

4. 如果我要评估我对于我的英语老师的态度，我觉得应该是：
   不喜欢 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很喜欢

5. 如果我要评估我对于我的英语课的态度，我觉得应该是：
   不喜欢 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很喜欢

6. 如果我要评估我学习英语努力的程度，我觉得应该是：
   很少努力 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 非常努力

7. 如果我要评估我想学习英语的欲望，我觉得应该是：
   很低 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很高

8. 如果我要评估我对于学习英语的态度，我觉得应该是：
   不喜欢 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很喜欢

9. 如果我要评估学习英语对我找到一个好工作的重要程度，我觉得应该是：
   很低 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很高

10. 如果我要评估学习英语对我将来职业生涯的重要程度，我觉得应该是：
    很低 __:__:__:__:__:__:__ 很高
APPENDIX K

TEACHER IMMEDIACY (NONVERBAL) (ENGLISH VERSION)

Below are a series of descriptions of things some teachers have been observed saying in some classes. Please respond to each of the statements in terms of the way you perceive your teacher communicating towards you or others in your class. For each item, use the scale 1-5 which indicates the behavior of your teacher.

Scale: 1=Never  
2=Rarely  
3=Occasionally  
4=Often  
5=Very Often

1. Sits behind the desk while teaching.  
2. Gestures while talking to the class.  
3. Uses monotone/dull voice when talking to the class.  
4. Looks at the class while talking.  
5. Smiles at the class while talking.  
6. Has a very tense body position while talking to the class.  
7. Touches students in the class.  
8. Moves around the classroom while teaching.  
9. Sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching.  
10. Looks at board or notes while talking to the class.  
11. Stands behind podium or desk while teaching.  
12. Has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.  
13. Smiles at individual students in the class.  
14. Uses a variety of vocal expressions when talking to the class.
APPENDIX L

TEACHER IMMEDIACY (NONVERBAL) (CHINESE VERSION)

教师非语言即时行为

以下是关于老师在课堂上举止的描述。请就任课老师对你及班上其他同学的沟通方式勾选出你认为最符合的描述。数字 1 到 5 分别对应该老师做出下列行为的频率。

1=从未
2=很少
3=有时
4=时常
5=经常

1. 坐在课桌后面讲课。
2. 讲课时以手势辅助。
3. 讲课时使用单调平淡的语气。
4. 说话时看着班上的同学。
5. 说话时，面带微笑对着全班同学。
6. 讲课时，身体姿势僵硬。
7. 在班上和学生有肢体上的互动（比如拍肩膀或握手等）。
8. 上课时，会在教室里四处走动。
9. 坐在桌子或椅子上讲课。
10. 看着黑板或讲义讲课。
11. 站在讲桌后面讲课。
12. 讲课时，身体姿势很轻松自然。
13. 课堂上会与每个同学微笑着交流。
14. 讲课时，会用不同的语调来表达。
APPENDIX M

TEACHER IMMEDIACY (VERBAL) (ENGLISH VERSION)

Below are a series of descriptions of things some teachers have been observed saying in some classes. Please respond to each of the statements in terms of the way you perceive your teacher communicating towards you or others in your class. For each item, use the scale 1-5 which indicates the behavior of your teacher.

Scale: 1=Never
      2=Rarely
      3=Occasionally
      4=Often
      5=Very Often

1. Uses personal examples or talks about experiences she/he has had outside of class.
2. Asks questions or encourages students to talk.
3. Gets into discussions based on something a student brings up even when this does not seem to be part of his/her lecture plan.
4. Uses humor in class.
5. Addresses students by name.
6. Addresses me by name.
7. Gets into conversations with individual students before or after class.
8. Has initiated conversations with me before, after or outside of class.
9. Refers to class as “my” class or what “I” am doing.
10. Refers to class as “our” class or what “we” are doing.
11. Provides feedback on my individual work through comments on papers, oral discussions, etc.
12. Calls on students to answer questions even if they have not indicated that they want to talk.
13. Asks how students feel about an assignment, due date or discussion topic.
14. Invites student to telephone or meet with him/her outside of class if they have questions or want to discuss something.
15. Asks questions that have specific, correct answers.
16. Asks questions that solicit viewpoints or opinions.
17. Praise students’ work, actions or comments.
18. Criticizes or points out faults in students’ work, actions, or comments.
19. Will have discussions about things unrelated to class with individual students or with the class as a whole.
20. Is addressed by his/her first name by the students.
APPENDIX N

TEACHER IMMEDIACY (VERBAL) (CHINESE VERSION)

教师言语即时行为

以下是关于老师在课堂上言语行为的表达。请就任课老师对你及班上其他同学的言语沟通行为勾选出你认为最符合的选项。数字 1 到 5 分别对应该老师做出下列行为的频率。

1=从未
2=很少
3=有时
4=时常
5=经常

1. 会以自己本身作例子，或谈论他（她）在课堂以外的经历。
2. 会问问题或鼓励学生发言。
3. 会根据学生所提出的话题进行讨论，即使该话题不在他（她）的教学计划内。
4. 上课时幽默风趣。
5. 会以名字称呼学生。
6. 会以我的名字称呼我。
7. 课前或课后会与学生个别谈话。
8. 曾经在课前，课后，或课堂外主动与我交谈。
9. 提到班级时，会用“我的”班，或“我”在做什么等字眼。
10. 提到班级时，会用“我们”班，或“我们”在做什么等字眼。
11. 对我个人的作业提供他（她）的回馈，例如通过书面评语或者与我口头讨论。
12. 即使学生没有主动表示想发言，他（她）也会点名叫他们发言。
13. 关于作业，提交日期，或讨论主题，会询问学生的意见和看法。
14. 如果学生有问题或要谈论某事，会邀请学生电话联络或在课堂之外见面。
15. 会问有特定的或正确答案的问题。
16. 会问一些能引发学生发表自己观点或意见的问题。
17. 会赞美学生的表现，行为，或观点。
18. 批评或者指出学生表现，行为，或观点中的错误。
19. 会与个别学生或全班谈论与课程无关的事情。
20. 学生直接称呼老师的名字。
APPENDIX O

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN ENGLISH
(ENGLISH VERSION)

This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning feelings about communicating with others in English. You may not have experienced some of the situations. If that is the case, please make the best guess and indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Are Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. I dislike participating in group discussion.

2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.

3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussion.

4. I like to get involved in group discussions.

5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.

6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussion.

7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.

8. Usually, I am comfortable when I have to participate in a meeting.

9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.

10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.

11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.

12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.

13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.

14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.

15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.

16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.

17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.

18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.

19. I have no fear of giving a speech.

20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.

21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.

22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.

24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forgot facts I really know.
APPENDIX P

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN ENGLISH (CHINESE VERSION)

英文交流焦虑的个人报告

这个问卷包括 24 道关于和他人用英文交流时的感觉的描述。你有可能还没有经历过其中的一些情形。如果是那样，请根据你自己的情况做出最有可能的推测，并根据自己的情况标注你最认同的适合程度。

1 = 非常不同意
2 = 不同意
3 = 介于不同意和同意之间
4 = 同意
5 = 非常同意

1. 我不喜欢参与集体讨论。
2. 总的来说，我参与集体讨论的时候很自在。
3. 参与集体讨论让我觉得很紧张。
4. 我喜欢参与集体讨论。
5. 和不认识的人进行集体讨论让我觉得紧张不安。
6. 参与集体讨论的时候我很平静也很放松。
7. 总的来说，当我必须要参加一个会议时我感到很紧张。
8. 通常我对必须要参加一个会议感觉自在。
9. 如果我在会议上被点名发言，我会很平静和放松，
10. 我害怕在会议上发表自己的言论。
11. 在会议上和他人交流总是让我感到不自在。
12. 如果在会议上回答问题，我感到很放松。
13. 我在和刚认识的人交谈时很紧张。
14. 我在和人交谈的时候不害怕表达自己的想法。
15. 基本上我在和人交谈时非常紧张不安。
16. 基本上我在和人交谈时非常平静和放松。
17. 我在和陌生人交谈时感觉很放松。
18. 我在和人交谈时害怕说出自己的想法。
19. 我不害怕做公众演讲。
20. 当我在做公众演讲时，我会感觉身体的某些部位很紧张。
21. 我在做公众演讲的时候感觉很放松。
22. 我在做公众演讲的时候，思维变得混乱无序。
23. 我对于做公众演讲很有信心。
24. 我在做公众演讲时会紧张得忘记我本来知道的东西。
APPENDIX Q

SELF-PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH
(ENGLISH VERSION)

Below are twelve situations in which you might need to communicate. People’s abilities to communicate effectively vary a lot, and sometimes the same person is more competent to communicate in one situation than in another. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in English in each of the situations described below by using a scale from 0-100. Indicate in the space provided at the left of each item your estimate of your competence.
0 = completely incompetent
100 = competent

1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.

2. Talk with an acquaintance.

3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.

4. Talk in a small group of strangers.

5. Talk with a friend.

6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.

7. Talk with a stranger.

8. Present a talk to a group of friends.

9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.

10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.

11. Talk in a small group of friends.

12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.
APPENDIX R

SELF-PERCEIVED COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH
(CHINESE VERSION)

自我认同的英语交流能力

下列是12项你有可能碰上的交流情形。每个人的交流能力都不一样，而有些时候即使是同一个人，他/她也会在不同的情形下表现出不一样的交流能力。请分别用0-100的数值来衡量你认为你在下列不同情形下用英文交流的能力。

0 = 完全没有交流能力
100 = 有完全的交流能力

1. 对一群陌生人发表言论。
2. 和一个熟人交谈。
3. 在一大群朋友的聚会中交谈。
4. 在一小群陌生人中交谈。
5. 和一个朋友交谈。
6. 在一大群熟人的聚会中交谈。
7. 和一个陌生人交谈。
8. 对一群朋友发表言论。
9. 在一小群熟人中交谈。
10. 在一大群陌生人的聚会中交谈。
11. 在一小群朋友中交谈。
12. 对一群熟人发表言论。
APPENDIX S
WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN ENGLISH
(ENGLISH VERSION)

Directions:
Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice and you are studying in an English-speaking country. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in English in each type of situation by using a scale from 0-100. You may not have experienced some of the situations. If that is the case, please make the best guess. Indicate in the space at the left of the item what percent of the time you would choose to communicate.

0 = Never
100 = Always

1. Talk with a resident assistant.
2. Talk with a physician.
3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.
6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
7. Talk with a police officer.
8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.
11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
13. Talk with an advisor in your department.
14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
16. Talk with a garbage collector.
17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
18. Talk with your girl/boyfriend.
19. Talk in a small group of friends.
20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.
APPENDIX T

WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN ENGLISH
(CHINESE VERSION)

英语交流意愿

下列是 20 项你有可能与他人交流的情形。假设你有充分的自由做出交谈与否的决定，并且在一个说英语的国家上学，请用 0-100 的数值来衡量有多大可能性你会选择在该情形下和他人用英文交谈。你有可能还没有经历过其中的一些情形。如果是那样，请根据自己的情况做出最有可能的推测。请在每个选项的左边划线处填上相应的数值。

0 = 不会
100 = 总是会

1. 和宿舍管理员交谈
2. 和医生交谈。
3. 向一群陌生人发表言论。
4. 在排队的时候和熟人交谈。
5. 和商店里的售货员交谈。
6. 在一大群朋友的聚会中交谈。
7. 和警察交谈。
8. 在一小群陌生人中交谈。
9. 在排队时和朋友交谈。
10. 和餐馆里的服务人员交谈。
11. 在一大群熟人的聚会中交谈。
12. 在排队时和陌生人交谈。
13. 和系里的辅导员交谈。
14. 向一群朋友发表言论。
15. 在一小群熟人中交谈。
16. 和拾荒者交谈。
17. 在一大群陌生人的聚会中交谈。
18. 和你的男/女朋友交谈。
19. 在一小群朋友中交谈。
20. 向一群熟人发表言论。
APPENDIX U

HUMAN SUBJECT INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)
APPROVAL LETTER AND CONSENT FORMS

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 5/9/2008

To: Miao Yu

Address: 172 Brittain Dr. Apt 12
Dept.: MIDDLE AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Willingness to Communicate in a Chinese EFL Setting

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 5/8/2009 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chair of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.
This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Susan Wood, Advisor
HSC No. 2008.1333
LETTER OF INFORMED CONSENT

Dear participant:
I am a doctoral student in the Department of Middle and Secondary Education of the College of Education at Florida State University. I am conducting a study about Chinese College Students’ willingness to communicate and I would like you to take part in this study.

The study will be conducted in your classroom during the second session of the class time. You will be asked to fill out one package of questionnaires for this study. The expected duration of your participation is 30 minutes. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts if you agree to participate in this study. You will participate only if you want to. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

By participating in this study you will be giving researchers and educators valuable information regarding Chinese college students’ willingness to communicate in both first and second languages. In addition to that, this study can serve to improve instructional methods and approaches in the teaching of foreign languages in China.

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report the researcher might publish, she will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records.

If you have any questions concerning this study, you can contact the researcher at 1-850-980-5649 or my03c@fsu.edu. You can also contact the researcher’s major professor Dr. Susan Wood at 1-850-644-1909 or wood@coe.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher and her major professor, you are encouraged to contact the FSU Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board at 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-8633, or by email at jccoper@fsu.edu.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Miao Yu

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

__________________________ (signature) __________________________ (date)

同意书

大家好：
我是佛罗里达州立大学教育学院多语言多文化教育专业的一名博士生。我现在在做一个关于中国大学生交流意愿的研究。我希望你能参加我的这个研究。

关于这个研究的数据收集会在你的课堂时间完成，预计完成时间为半个小时。你要完成一套问卷。整个数据收集对你不会产生任何不利的影响。只有在你自己同意的情况下我才会对你发放问卷，而且你可以在中途任何时候退出，并且这对你没有任何影响。在整个研究过程中所收集的数据将会被严格保密。

通过参加这个研究项目，你将为教育者和研究人员对中国大学生交流意愿及语言学习的研究提供宝贵的数据资料。不仅如此，这项研究还将服务于改善中国外语教学的方法。

我明白该研究人员会要求我完成关于交流意愿的问卷。这些问卷将被保存在该研究人员家里带锁的文件柜中。我明白只有该研究人员和她的指导教授能接触这些问卷，并且所有问卷都将在二零一七年五月三十一日前被销毁。

如果你对这项研究有任何问题，请你联系该研究人员：1-850-980-5649 或者发送电子邮件 my03c@fsu.edu 你也可以联系该研究人员的指导教授 Dr. Susan Wood：1-850-644-1909 或者 wood@coe.fsu.edu 非常感谢你的参与。

如果你对你参加这个研究项目的权益有任何的问题，或者你觉得你的权益有受到威胁，请通过副校长研究办公室联系 Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, 2010 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, 主任 1-850-644-8633 或者 jiccoper@fsu.edu。

谢谢你的参与！

余淼

HSC#:2008.1333.2
我已经阅读并理解了上述内容，并且询问了相关问题也得到了解答。我同意参与这项研究的数据收集。

__________________________ (签名) ________________ (日期)
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