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Abstract

Since willingness to communicate (WTC) has developed in second language learning and communication, individual differences and anxiety have been stressed. However, the focus on WTC with regards to personality trait, cultural trait, and situational trait, needs to be highlighted more, especially in Thai culture. The purpose of this study was, therefore, to investigate what traits affected WTC in L2 speech, whether there were any differences in WTC between cultural groups and whether their WTC changed over time. An empirical investigation was set up in 2 sessions and carried out in the Netherlands. Data was gathered by means of questionnaires and WTC-meters from 5 Thai, 5 Dutch, and 2 Chinese native speakers with English as their L2. The results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between the situational trait and WTC in L2 and there was no relationship between the cultural trait and WTC and the personality trait and WTC in session 1. In session 2, there was no relationship between the traits and WTC. The Thai subjects had lowest WTC compared to the Chinese and the Dutch subjects. Moreover, there was substantial variation between and within subjects over time. Some subjects highlighted that many issues related to their WTC performance in the experiment, for example, topics, tiredness, and self-perceived communication competence.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Sociocultural diversity, ethnicity, identity, and culture have generated great interest in sociolinguistic second language research (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009). Sociological and psychological variables are greatly involved in communication research (Burgoon, 1976) which can be used to analyse how personal, cultural and social influences are related to communication behaviours. The role of psycholinguistic and sociocultural factors in willingness to communicate (WTC) has focused on communication in a foreign language.

The concept of speaking in order to learn and communicate is the basics of WTC in a second language (L2). Some people have many difficulties when learning a foreign language. Acquiring and learning a language is related to many factors and each factor affects the other. Several studies have focused on factors increasing language learners’ communicative competence, motivation, attitude, or WTC but very few studies have focused on personal trait and cultural trait, especially and interestingly, between Asian and European speakers of English.

People speak different languages and have different cultures. How do they feel when speaking an L2? How do their cultures influence their confidence to speak an L2? With an increase of speaking a foreign language to date, it is a very important factor in communication and English is the global language and is spoken worldwide. In many countries, English is the daily language of communication and people need to learn the language to “compete in the global economic environment” (Grubbs, Chaengploy, & Worawong, 2009, p. 1). There is a need to use the English language in daily life and the use of the English language as a tool for international and intercultural communication. This may explain the participants’ great interest in WTC in English. The reasons and the effectiveness of English language learning and communication depend on a variety of factors, for example, motivation, aptitude, personal attitude. Different perspectives toward the English language can involve personal attitude and motivation to learn.

People can differ in communication behaviours. Some speak freely and actively, while others tend to speak only when needed or with particular interlocutors but are silent with others. At times, some speakers will suddenly stop taking part in a conversation when their confidence dissolves or after feeling anxious about the correctness of their grammar or pronunciation. As language learners are pressured from many possible factors in the target
language communication, there is reason to believe that different cultures in particular situations may affect WTC in L2 communication.

As a second language learner, I am a native Thai speaker and an L2 speaker of English and when I compare myself to other non Thai native learners of English, I consider myself more reluctant to speak English. I wonder if this is a personality trait or do other factors for example, culture, situation, and anxiety, also affect my WTC in L2? That is why I have been wondering for some time if Thai learners of English are more reluctant to speak up than Western non-native speakers of English. I feel the nature of Thai learners of English is that they often are shy or find it embarrassing to speak the language. Some are not confident with their English grammar or pronunciation, and are afraid to be judged that their English is not at a good level.

The (un)willingness to communicate in L2 can be caused by many possible factors. MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovon (2002) mention that there is a correlation between WTC in L1 and in L2. Some speakers are anxious, not only in their L1 but also in their L2 and this counts as their personality trait. Some may not like to speak in L2 due to lack of self-confidence or feel nervous to speak with strangers or among familiar friends and are afraid to be judged or corrected on their foreign language. Is it part of their culture to be afraid to be judge whether their foreign language is good? Or is it just their personality? Many possible factors affect their language learning and willingness to communicate in L2 and can change over time. If one can overcome one of the possible factors, another factor is also likely to be changed.

That is why the purpose of this introduction is to outline the possible contributing variables that are an influence to an individuals’ WTC in English oral production, although it is difficult to diagnose what exact factors affect individuals’ WTC. The main objective in my research is to look at Thai, Chinese and Dutch learners of English and to investigate their WTC in English as an L2 oral production depending on certain factors, to find out how factors interact with WTC. For this purpose, an empirical investigation was set up and carried out in the Netherlands, amongst a group of speakers of English as an L2. Individual differences will be examined to compare learners’ WTC and find out whether factors affect their WTC and to see whether the Thai speakers of English differ from Chinese and Dutch speakers, in order to determine whether there were any differences in the individual background that influence their WTC in L2 speech.
Since I cannot observe Thai learners of English in Thailand, I will focus on Thai speakers of English in the Netherlands. I would like to examine whether their traits may affect their WTC in English, although their attitudes towards the target language communication may change or is different from the Thai learners of English who live in Thailand as they have lived in the Netherlands and used the English language with other native speakers for a period of time. Undoubtedly, some degree of WTC to use the language may be more developed than in Thai speakers who have never studied abroad. For a clearer view, I will also investigate Chinese and Dutch speakers of English in order to find out whether cultural and personality traits have an impact on their WTC.

I will attempt to find answers to the following research questions in order to shed some light on these areas:

1. Are there differences in WTC between cultural groups?
2. Does WTC between groups change over time?
3. What is the difference within the three groups over time?
4. What is the relation between the traits and WTC?

This paper is structured as follows: In chapter 2, the effects of individual differences, such as motivation, attitudes, and WTC will be investigated. In chapter 3, we look at the definition of WTC, followed by an overview of the research on the role of WTC in SLD, for instance, McIntyre’s WTC pyramid model. Then, WTC on different time scales will be discussed. In chapter 4, cultural differences and the impact of setting and situation on WTC will be looked at. In chapter 5, after drawing up the background of the research, I will explain an account of the research design and methodology. In chapter 6, the results of the analysis will be discussed. In chapter 7 and 8, I will try to account for discussion for the results found and a conclusion of the most important points of the research will be discussed with implications for further research.
Literature review

In this literature review, I will focus on individual differences which I believe have a great influence on WTC in this research by clarifying personality traits. I will look at attitudes and motivation, communicative competence, introversion and extroversion, and emotional factors such as anxiety. In cultural traits, I will discuss the differences between the Eastern and the European cultures in general and will try to be as specific as possible in each culture. In situational means, I will look at possible factors that can impact on speakers’ performance related in this research.

Chapter 2

Individual Differences

In this section, the influence of individual differences on WTC is described. For example, motivation, aptitude, and attitude are examples of individual differences. Gardner (2001a) stresses that learning a foreign language is related to intelligence and verbal ability. WTC exhibits a constant disposition to communicate in various situations. Generally, WTC is seen as a personality trait which is associated with such variables as communication apprehension, perceived communication competence, introversion-extraversion, self-esteem, and so on (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998).

2.1 Personality

Personality is defined as “an individual’s characteristic pattern of thought, emotion and behaviour, together with the psychological mechanisms, hidden or not, behind those patterns” (Funder, 1997, p. 450). Individuals’ personality is one of the factors that indicate how individuals communicate with others. Personality traits originate internally and exist in habits, attitudes, beliefs and other characteristics and it is believed that personality traits connect with culture in shaping people’s lives (McCrae, 2001). MacDonald, Clément & MacIntyre (2003) mention MacIntyre & Charos’ (1996) examples of personality traits which are “extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience, influence second language learning and the willingness to communicate in that second language” (p. 4). MacDonald et al. (2003) further explain that emotional and cognitive contexts of L2 communication are also crucial, although now in any specific situation, which clarify the intergroup attitudes, communication experience, and
communicative competence. In terms of communicative competence, MacDonald et al. (2003) explains that there are many types of communicative competence, namely linguistic competence, sociocultural competence, actional competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.

Kline, Barrett, & Svaste-Xuto (1981) refer to Sharp et al.’s (1956) mention that Thai personality is described as bashful, of slow tempo, and introverted. However, their study compared Thai students with British ones and their research revealed that the Thai are more extraverted than the British sample which contrasts the view of Sharp et al. on the Thai personality described as introverted. The cultural and personal background of speakers has a significant influence on the communicative competence and performance on speaking an L2.

2.2 Communication skills

Communicative competence is an important issue which greatly involved individuals’ WTC (Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988). MacIntyre et al. (2002) state that perceptions of competence will influence WTC, without the perception of communication competence, people would be less willing to communicate or be afraid to communicate. This is related to self-confidence. It is what people think they can do, although they could not actually do, which influences their communication behaviours. Thus, they are more likely to be willing to engage in an interaction and people with a high level of WTC will be more aware of and tend to perceive their communication competence better than those with a low level of WTC.

Dornyei (2005) suggests that it is common for people to avoid having L2 communication even if they have high level of communicative skills. Therefore, WTC is partly a personality trait. It entails that the initiation of L2 communication can be embedded in nature and it is likely to be combined with psychological, linguistic, and social contextual variables. MacIntyre et al. (2002) clarify the nature of WTC that WTC is a somewhat stable personality trait in one’s first language and “resulting in a ‘global, personality-based orientation toward talking” (cited in Dornyei, 2005, p. 208). This is opposed to L2 use as the situation becomes more complex due to the level of L2 proficiency or L2 communicative competence which is an effective modifying variable. Therefore, L2 WTC is influenced by state and trait.
2.3 Attitudes and motivation

Attitude and motivation are important factors for language learners in order to learn a foreign language successfully. Gardner and Lambert (1972) mention that social psychologists point out that to master a foreign language does not depend only on intellectual capacity and attitude but also on willingness to acquire distinctive aspects of behaviour in language study. Motivation for language learning is determined by learners’ orientation to the whole process of learning a foreign language (Gardner & Lambert, 1972).

Willingness to learn and communicate seems unrelated to ability to learn. For example, students who are positive about learning might be so to compensate for limited ability. Students who believe that they can improve their skills might do better in the long run than students who do not, even when those students are better at first. Also, those who are confident that they can control the learning are usually better performing in difficult learning situations. Hence, it is likely that beliefs about language learning influence strategies (Mori, 1999).

2.4 Introversion and extraversion

Introverts are generally shy, quiet and may be anxious when it comes to communication, if compared to the extraverts. The frequency of L2 use may influence their fear to communicate. In this aspect, Burgoon (1976) reveals that introversion, self-esteem, and communication apprehension and reticence are related to unwillingness to communicate. Burgoon (1976) also indicates that “introverts engage in less interpersonal communication” (p. 61). Speakers with low self-esteem have less confidence in their communicative competence to express something. Research on WTC has studied individual traits and focused on the choice to speak. With regard to introversion – extraversion, MacIntyre (2004) discusses a study by MacIntyre, Donovan, & Standing (2004) that extraverts showed higher level of WTC than introverts in an unfamiliar situation, but within familiar, introverts reversely showed higher level of WTC than extraverts. This demonstrates the value of the volition in different situations. Research affirms the relationship between personality and social anxiety (Funder, 1997), the introversion-extraversion factor of personality appears to be related to social anxiety.
2.5 Anxiety

Anxiety is one of the powerful factors that affect effective language learning and L2 communication. Anxiety means the feeling of concern in using the target language in any contexts. It is a feeling of tension and nervousness related with the situation of learning a language. Anxious speakers tend to be unwilling to interact with others or avoid communicating if possible. Anxiety and fear are directly related to communication apprehension preventing the speakers from participating in oral communication (Burgoon, 1976). MacIntyre (2007) points out that language anxiety and motivation are vital factors in willingness to communicate in L2. WTC is an act of willing to engage in a conversation that shows self-confidence and communicative competence. In consequence, WTC consistently connects positively with perceived communicative competence and negatively with language anxiety. In this regard, communication apprehension can raise language learners’ anxiety when facing with real communication events (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1988). Burgoon (1976) clarifies that “reticence goes beyond fear of public speaking situations” which explains the apprehension about various interpersonal communication situations (pp. 61-62). McCroskey (1984) defines communication apprehension as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p. 13).

According to MacIntyre (1995), language anxiety mainly comes from social and communicative aspects of language learning. That is why it is seen as one of social anxieties. Social anxiety is defined as a result of “feelings of tension and discomfort” or “a tendency to withdraw in the presence of others” and any situation related to a second language in which individuals can become anxious in communication (MacIntyre, 1995, p. 91). Whitmore (1987) explains that anxiety includes the feelings of apprehension, uneasiness, and fear. The awakening of anxiety in a social situation can affect cognitive and behavioural effects and the reaction of individuals to their anxiety is to avoid the situation involving L2 speaking. MacIntyre (1995) also mentions that language anxiety emanates from the social and communicative aspects of language learning. Therefore, it can be seen as a form of social anxiety. Hence, people who have high levels of fear or anxiety when it comes to communication tend to avoid having a communication (Daly & McCroskey, 1984).

MacIntyre & Gardner (1991a) comment that language anxiety negatively affects listening comprehension. They also speculate that “language anxiety can have a pervasive
impact at all stages of language learning and production” (p. 296). For example, considering speakers’ nervousness, they are very concerned not only with their pronunciation but also with their listening comprehension. Thus, communicative comprehension also plays an important role in their WTC and their L2 performance can be limited. For example, learners may have anxiety problems when speaking in the target language. The negative effect is, as anticipated, that the anxiety affects the quality of L2 communication. That is why after studying English as L2 for many years, some people avoid using their L2 or only use L2 if there is no other choice. Some feels anxious when producing L2 speech. The anxiety can, therefore, be an obstacle for language learners to succeed in language learning as it hinders cognitive process ability (MacIntyre, 1995).

Another issue that can affect anxiety is how simple a given task is. The function of task difficulty can encourage individuals to increase their efforts on task performance and reduce their anxiety, or it can provoke anxiety if the task is somewhat difficult (MacIntyre, 1995). However, anxiety can also lead to better performance if L2 speakers put more effort into the quality of performance (MacIntyre, 1995).

Gardner (2001b) also mentions that in addition to motivation, language anxiety and self-confidence with the language are also very influential. At present, attitudes, motivation and anxiety are seen as influential variables and, therefore, these variables have gained much attention. In Simic & Tanaka’s article (2008), both language anxiety and perceived competence influenced WTC. They reveal that anxiety reduces WTC while perceived competence enhances WTC.
Chapter 3
Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language

3.1 Definitions and its concept

Donovan & MacIntyre (2005) present McCroskey & Baer’s (1985) definition of WTC as “the probability that an individual will choose to communicate, specifically to talk, when free to do so” (p. 420), or “the probability of initiating communication, given the opportunity, WTC integrates motivational processes with communication competencies and perceived self-confidence” (MacIntyre, 2004, p. 2). The definition of WTC from my perspective is to be willing to speak up freely without fear. The degree of WTC depends on the contexts and receivers whether individuals choose to speak up or avoid having a conversation.

The concept of WTC is an individual’s “readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using an L2” (MacIntyre et al., 2002, p. 547) or “an individual’s general personality orientation towards talking” (p. 188) which is related to interpersonal communication and the amount of talk they want to engage in (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). Peng (2007) also refers to McCroskey and his associates’ statement that WTC is “a personality-based construct representing such regularity in individuals’ predisposition toward verbal communication” (p. 37) and, therefore, WTC construct can pertain to the SLA and L2 communication context.

3.2 Willingness to communicate as a dynamic system

Learning a second language is important in order to communicate with people who speak other languages for social interaction. Some learners are more willing to engage or communicate in a second language than others. Inevitably, learning performance also depends on cultural, social, individual, motivational, situational, attitudinal, and pedagogical issues. Because of this interaction, learning a language can be seen as a dynamic system. De Bot (2008) also mentions that language is a complex system comprising of different interacting subsystems and is easily affected by different factors which influence language development and that is why it can be seen as a dynamic system. In MacIntyre’s study (2004), the process of volition, the act of willing, can show how motivational propensities are represented in the moment-to-moment options and understand how the motivational
processes affect actions such as choosing to speak up or avoid participating a conversation.

Dynamic systems theory (DST) is a theory of any complex system which comprises a set of interrelated variables, characterised as a complete interconnectedness, that constantly influence each other and change over time and if one variable changes, that variable will affect all variables that are part of the system (De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007). Dynamic Systems Theory can be used as an umbrella theory in language development (De Bot et al, 2007). In this case, it is used to understand subsystems connected to WTC in oral production. The theory of DST can help to explain my questions why some people are willing or reluctant to speak English.

When DST is applied to first language (L1) or L2 communication, the main feature of a DS is its change over time (De Bot et al, 2007). That is, each variable can ebb and flow as each factor of language development or language learning is not entirely stable. Therefore, the development over time cannot be predicted and stable because small changes in the initial state give very different outcomes, for example, social and environment factors or individual differences, which result in communicative behaviours. Consequently, DST monitors the relation between behaviours and how the whole form changes over time (De Bot et al., 2007).

There are four features of DST in De Bot et al’s view (2007). First, dynamic systems change over time in which each state is a transformation of a previous state. Second, dynamic systems have a complete interconnectedness where the variables in the system are connected and affect each other. Third, dynamic systems are self-organising into preferred states or so-called ‘attractor states’ and states that will not be preferred called ‘repeller states’. When variables influence the system, change is to be anticipated. Fourth, the systems possess non-linearity or so-called ‘the butterfly effect’. In short, even small changes in one part of the system may have great influence in the whole system. Communication in terms of DST perspective leads us to understand WTC such as “sensitive dependence on initial conditions, complete interconnectedness of subsystems, the emergence of attractor states in development over time and variation both in and among individuals” (De Bot et al, 2007, p. 7).

To investigate learners’ performance on WTC, it is crucial to explore the structure of dynamic system theory, social psychology, individual differences in language learning and communication to develop an instrument in order to assess learners’ traits and WTC in L2. Different time scales are a concern in this study in order to apprehend what happens and changes in WTC from moment to moment. What happens on one time scale will impact the
process of the system on another time scale. For example, an anxious speaker who is afraid to speak English in class, once he or she tries to speak up and keeps practicing, his or her WTC will increase. The time scale changes when he or she starts to speak up and keeps practicing and the anxiety decreases, then the WTC and the use of the English gradually increases. Barraclough et al. (1988) explain that a given time and context, how one feels at that moment, how the person they talk to looks like or even the previous communication may temporarily affect on WTC.

In the present research, the changes during the time span of L2 communication and the participants’ rationale for the changes will be described as well as the fluctuations in their moment by moment rating of WTC by using the WTC-meter. The traits measured by the questionnaires will be analysed with regards to their role in WTC. The instruments used in this study will be discussed in the Method section. The goal is to account for the fluctuations in WTC over a short period of time.

### 3.3 Research on the role of WTC in second language development

MacIntyre (1995), who investigated the WTC model, identified several major areas of learners’ communicative competence and WTC and developed his method to investigate anxiety in L2 communication by using an axometer to measure anxiety in his experiment. The pyramid model described in MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels’ (1998) may explain the assumption why L2 speakers are reluctant to speak and what factors significantly impact on their willingness to communicate in L2 speech. The model suggested by MacIntyre et al. (1998) points out that L2 speakers’ approach to understand L2 use directly influences the degree of WTC in L2 speech. The analytical WTC model by MacIntyre et al. (1998) provides a possibility to understand L2 communication from their conceptual model of variables influencing WTC.

The multi-layered pyramid, as shown in Figure 1, has six layers which exemplify the possible influences on WTC in L2 and can be divided into two parts: situational influences (layer I, II, and III) and enduring influences (layer IV, V, and VI). WTC is a trait-like disposition transferred from one situation to another, although the conceptual WTC pyramid model below shows WTC as a state, not as a trait. It is an implication that suggests a matter of choice to communicate at a particular moment in time.
The top three layers (I, II, and III) denote communication behaviour, behavioural intention, and situated antecedents which comprise of situational factors that the willingness to communicate with a specific person and communicative self-confidence refer to situational influences at a given moment in time which indicate L2 use. This implies that these variables depend on a particular situation in which an individual performs at a certain time and fluctuate in different contexts. The influence is, therefore, transitory and temporary. Layer 1 is communication behaviour and is related to a wide range of communication types including speaking up in class, reading a newspaper, or watching TV in L2. Layer 2 is willingness to communicate and influences situation-specific factors. Layer 3 consists of two situated antecedents of WTC: The desire to communicate with a specific interlocutor and state communicative self-confidence. Desire to communicate with a specific person consists of interindividual and intergroup motivations and state communicative self-confidence. MacIntyre et al. (1998) refer to Lippa’s (1994) suggestion that affiliation happens to those who are similar to speakers in various ways. Regarding the state of communicative self-confidence, MacIntyre et al. (1998) includes 2 constructs: perceived competence and a lack of anxiety. Self-perceived competence concerns the perceived ability to communicate at a particular time and this leads to higher degree of WTC, while anxiety lessens WTC and fluctuates over time.
The bottom three layers (IV, V, and VI) are social and individual context, affective and cognitive context, and motivational propensities. These are believed to have more stable influences on WTC, e.g. personality. Layer 4 is motivational propensities, which comprises of interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation, and L2 self-confidence, based on affective and cognitive contexts of intergroup interaction and WTC with a particular person. Layer 5 is affective - cognitive context, combined with intergroup attitudes, social situation, and communicative competence. These variables are from prior experience. Lastly, Layer 6 portrays intergroup climate and personality, and involves the interaction of the society and the individual. MacIntyre et al. (1998) point out that the societal context associates with the intergroup climate, whereas the individual context refers to enduring personality traits. As a result, good relationships at the intergroup level can increase WTC while bad relationships can decrease WTC. As explained in DST, the variables in the development of the system are connected and affect each other. The Dynamic System is related to time scales.

The idea of time scales, a characteristic of a Dynamic System, is that within a time scale, e.g. how changes in one minute can impact on hour, there is variation in the development of WTC. For example, a language learner can undergo strong ebbs and flows in his or her WTC over time. The WTC can change at different time scales. The systems of the time scales also operate in the same way the Dynamic System does. What changes in one time scale will affect the development of the system on another time scale. The system of time scales also shows in the WTC pyramid. If compare to the development of L2 communication, once language learners are motivated to learn L2, then they will want to speak L2. After this stage, learners will practice by speaking L2. By doing this, learners reach Layer 1 as they use L2. From this point, the time scale is moving to the now, which is the actual use and the rest of stages learners get through until Layer 1 is what behind using L2. The higher the learners are in the pyramid, the time framework will become stricter. This demonstrates that there is an interaction between levels and to what extent different layers reflect different time scales. Moreover, there is also a top-down effect, when learners use L2 (Layer 1), it means they are willing to use L2 (Layer 2), then they also desire to communicate with a specific person and their communicative self-confidence will also increase. This shows a possibility of a top-down effect that the variables can also operate in reverse.
3.4 WTC as a static or a dynamic trait

Interest based on learner’s feelings, knowledge, and value for particular content, evolves over time through interactions with others, in different activities and environment. The ongoing changes of WTC over time are seen as a dynamic factor that shows continuous fluctuation and going through certain variables. To be more specific about the variables, I will focus on WTC on different time scales in this research by explaining WTC as a static or dynamic trait.

Considering the importance of WTC for language learners of English, I question what significantly influences individuals’ WTC in English communication and whether there is any individual difference in each nationality and within nationality. Some bilinguals may feel nervous when speaking a foreign language and are afraid if they can understand what the interlocutor says. Regarding the impact of culture on WTC, it is seen more as a trait than as a state. However, individual differences in communication behaviours are accounted by context rather than cultural diversity.

Most research examine WTC as a trait-like ability, Richmond & Roach (1992) state that WTC is the overpowering communication personality construct which pervades in a person’s life. Kang (2005) believes that WTC is “an individual's volitional inclination towards actively engaging in the act of communication in a specific situation, which can vary according to interlocutor(s), topic, and conversational context, among other potential situational variables” (p. 291). Kang (2005) also explains that situational WTC can ebb and flow from moment to moment in a conversation by the influence of psychological conditions such as excitement, responsibility, and security (emotional) while each of these variables is related to situational variables such as topics, interlocutors, and conversational contexts. Kang’s findings propose WTC as a dynamic situational concept that changes from moment to moment, not as a trait-like.

Although in Kim’s (2004) research on Korean students it is indicated that WTC is more likely to be trait-like rather than a situational factor as students with low WTC in English appeared to be somewhat less successful at English learning due to a lack of attitudes, motivation, and confidence in English communication, MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that WTC is not a trait-like, but a state as presented in the pyramid model in the next section. However, Donovan & MacIntyre (2005) believe that WTC is seen as stable and trait-like and, therefore, the WTC level is affected by situation. From my point of view, WTC can be both a state and trait-like as it is individuals’ behaviour and preference as well as
situational factor which an individual can choose to communicate only with a specific person or in a particular situation.
Chapter 4
Cultural Differences and the Impact of Setting and Situation on Willingness to Communicate

Social psychology and second language learning are related in terms of the complexities of language in social life (Gardner, 1985). To look at social psychology, most individuals’ behaviour takes place in a social context which embodies linguistically and is settled by cognitive processes (Gardner, 1985). Individuals’ language behaviours can demonstrate how individuals cognitively show their social and psychological characteristics in terms of culture, attitude towards communication in a second language or situational trait. Heller (1987) suggests that the language learners choose to speak a language over another is a reflection of which social group they want to belong to.

Understanding communication behaviours across cultures is important in order to evoke individuals’ WTC. Because cultures shape human communication behaviours (Samovar & Porter, 1997), the role of communication orientations such as WTC, communication apprehension, and communication competence can significantly impact on interpersonal intercultural communication. Barracough et al. (1988) recommend that the amount of interaction individuals get engaged in partly aids individuals’ cultural orientation. Therefore, frequency of language use is a key in the act of WTC whether speakers will speak up or avoid engaging in an interaction.

In research on L2, WTC has received considerable attention in the past decade and L2 WTC can be concerned with social support, personality traits, and gender (Peng, 2007). In Peng’s study (2007), Chinese culture showed an influence on Chinese learners’ L2 WTC. Chinese culture concerns aspects of interpersonal relations, for example face protected orientation and other-directed self. This submissive culture strongly influences WTC in L2 (Simic & Tanaka, 2008). Although Asian researchers have been immensely interested in the involvement of culture (Wen & Clément, 2003), the theories are still unclear whether it can be applied empirically.

One of the investigations has studied Chinese natives, and shame is seen as “a socially oriented emotion” (Funder, 1997, p. 451) which influences people from different cultures and shame is revealed to be linked to differences between cultures and ideologies. Furthermore, shame has different roles in different cultures, shame is, in Eastern culture, considered as
shame culture, whereas in Western culture it is seen as guilt culture (Funder, 1997). This means that Eastern people are afraid to make mistakes and what other people believe is much more important than in the guilt culture.

Most studies on WTC are about learning strategies and style in general, but are not specifically related to L2 on Thai customs and culture. A study on Thai customs and culture would be helpful for the study of individual behaviours of L2 speakers, because L2 communication is a specific kind of learning. Although the English language is considered as an important part of Thai school curriculum and most Thai university students have studied English for many years as part of most study program curriculums, their English ability is still rather weak. (Grubbs, Chaengploy, & Worawong, 2009). Grubbs et al. (2009) mention research that found that Thai students had confidence in their reading ability but they lacked confidence in speaking skills. The reasons for the lack of confidence in their English speaking skills were insufficient knowledge, nervousness, and preferring to listen rather than to speak.

In the Thai pedagogical system, teachers will lecture and students will have to listen. According to my experience, Thai students barely have a chance to speak up, especially in a language class. This suggests why Thai learners of English never raise their hands to answer a question in classroom or try to avoid participating in group discussions. Hinenoya & Gatbonton (2000) argue that cross-cultural understanding improves communication and aids L2 learning. There is a small number of applied linguistics literature that makes a division between East Asian and Western cultures (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000). In Hinenoya & Gatbonton’s (2000) study, a Japanese sample was examined, Japanese culture is described as “traditional, homogeneous and group oriented”, whereas Western culture is characterized as “self-expression, creativity, and critical thinking” (p. 227). I personally strongly believe that Japanese culture is relatively similar to the Thai and the Chinese culture, although there is no hard evidence related to the Thai culture in this matter.

Cultural traits may influence aspects of WTC in L2 such as shyness, introversion or group-orientedness. Hinenoya & Gatbonton (2000) denote that the cultural traits can imply both cultural and personality traits. Kline, Barrett, & Svaste-Xuto (1981) describe the Thai as being shy, introverted to express themselves in L2. “Shy people cannot express themselves or behave as they would like, whereas inward people can express themselves, but prefer not to” (Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000, p. 229). Therefore, the shy and introverted learners are unlikely to benefit from opportunities to interact with people in the target language apart from
their own language. This also may decrease their opportunities of interpersonal contact. In addition to being shy, the Asian are also seen as introverted.

Situational trait is another important factor that can influence individual’s willingness to communicate. Situational variables, for example, topics, interlocutors, and conversational context of the communication, can determine L2 WTC (Kang, 2005). Types of situations speakers are in and types of interlocutors speakers talk with can affect level of WTC. One may feel uncomfortable speaking up in L2 with a stranger or among familiar friends. One may be afraid that people will judge their language ability. It often happens that English learners feel anxious when teachers are present. Also, speakers may feel more reluctant to speak in public than in a small group.

MacIntyre (2004) mentions WTC in communication partly depends on the topic, whether it is easy or difficult. Task content, structure or topic, group size, composition of learner group, participants and time can influence WTC. A more difficult task can trigger higher anxiety. Therefore, difficulty of task can influence the effectiveness of communication.
Chapter 5

Willingness to Communicate in English Speech as a Second Language: A Study of Thai, Chinese, and Dutch Samples

While studies are numerous in the areas of personality traits and WTC, very few are on Thai traits. Therefore, more research is needed on these factors in cultural contexts where different cultures impact in willingness to communicate in L2. In this research, we will investigate the dynamic changes of participants’ WTC during a short period of time using a WTC-meter which designed to measure WTC moment-to-moment changes during a conversation and questionnaires to measure participants’ personal, cultural, and situational traits. The focal areas of this research were subjects’ personality trait, cultural trait and situational trait in WTC in English speech. The analysis of these perspectives was based on the individual differences that influence their WTC with Thai, Chinese, and Dutch subjects.

In this experiment, data is gathered from Thai, Chinese, and Dutch samples and to examine carefully the personality, situational, and cultural trait of the items in the questionnaires which should shed some light on the problem of (un)willingness to communicate. The aim of this study is to see whether the subjects demonstrate the same degree of WTC in L2 speech and whether the Thai speakers of English are more reluctant to engage in a conversation and whether personal, cultural, and situational matter play a role in this study. Undoubtedly, while most language learners want to be able to speak English effectively, individual differences influence L2 learners differently. Therefore, L2 speakers of English with different traits are expected to show different degrees in WTC.

5.1 The purpose of this study

This section provides a detailed explanation of an empirical study carried out in the Netherlands in April and May 2010. This is a quantitative study. Questionnaires and WTC-meters will be used in answering the research questions (see Appendix A and B). The purpose of the experiment is to assess whether the influence of those traits play a significant role in WTC. Discussion of some of the findings from this research focuses on the traits that influence WTC and the implications it could have for language learners with cross-cultural linguistics concerns.
Four research questions inspire this study:

1. Are there differences in WTC between cultural groups?
2. Does WTC between groups change over time?
3. What is the difference within the three groups over time?
4. What is the relation between the traits and WTC?

5.2 Method

Since the intention of this study was to reveal insights of the willingness to communicate in L2 speech of the Thai, Chinese, and Dutch speakers of English, a quantitative research approach was selected for the investigation. With a quantitative introspective method, participants were required to reflect on their own language behaviour (De Bot, Lowie & Verspoor, 2005). They were asked questions in a survey to determine how each statement accorded with their own experiences, traits, or perspectives.

5.2.1 Subjects

Twelve subjects took part in this experiment: 5 Thai native speakers, 2 Chinese speakers and 5 Dutch native speakers. They were grouped into 4 groups as shown in Table 1. I chose Chinese and Dutch native speakers of English in order to compare their communicative competence in English with the Thai natives. In terms of culture, the variation of the nationality was expected to demonstrate differences in willingness to communicate in L2. The participants have a minimal level of English proficiency and their level of educational background is similar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of subjects and Nationality (age, gender)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Thai (28, F); 1 Dutch (31, F); 1 Chinese (24, F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Thai (33, F); 1 Dutch (21, F); 1 Chinese (29, F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Dutch natives (35, M; 32, M; 25, M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Thai natives (28, F; 26, F; 21, M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to make the test reliable, it was necessary to assess subjects’ English proficiency level before they took part in the experiment. The author did not require the subjects to take a proficiency test as they all have higher education degree which means that the Thai and Chinese subjects were required to have English proficiency at least between B2-C1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages to enter a university. Therefore, they were expected to have sufficient knowledge of English as they were required to have good English language proficiency before entering universities. As for the Dutch subjects, the author personally knows them, thus, their proficiency level can be estimated.

5.2.2 Materials
An audio recorder was used to record the group discussions and interview the subjects individually after the discussions. There were two types of instruments used: questionnaires and WTC-meter. Three types of questionnaires and WTC-meter were administered to all participants. Questionnaires were used to measure participants’ personality trait, situational trait, and cultural trait. Before the experiment started, the subjects were required to fill in the questionnaires to measure their personal trait, situational trait, and cultural trait (see Appendix A). A willingness to communicate thermometer (WTC-meter) was also used during the experiment (see Appendix B).

The questions in the questionnaires allowed the subjects to have choices of responses, which rated the subjects’ opinions on their personal trait, situational trait, and cultural trait, to indicate their level of agreement with what was stated. The level of agreement with the statements was measured on a ten-point scale where “1” indicated that the subject strongly disagreed and “10” indicated that the subject strongly agreed. The WTC-meter was used to measure their willingness to engage in the conversation at a particular moment, several times in each session of the experiment. The idea of the WTC-meter with a thermometer shaped figure is from Waninge’s (2010) motometer to measure motivation in her study. The instruments will be discussed in more detail below.

INSTRUMENT 1 SELF-ASSESSMENT SCALE OF INDIVIDUAL TRAITS
a) Willingness to communicate or situational trait questionnaire
In this questionnaire, the WTC scale, measuring the situational trait, was a 13-item scale containing three types of interlocutor with four types of communication context (see Table 2).
One item was a filler in order to disguise the scale’s purpose. Twelve items were scored as part of the scale. Also, some changes were made in this questionnaire to make it more appropriate for the participants in this research. The data from the filler item was not analysed. This method was shown to have strong content validity, and there was some support for its construct and predictive validity (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990, p. 73). I adapted McCroskey’s (1992) WTC questionnaire, which was designed as a direct measure of the informants’ WTC in L2. This scale was expected to measure the feelings of intrusion, extroversion, alienation or other orientations which might be associated with approaching or avoiding communication. With this instrument, the informants were aware of their own tendencies. Participants were instructed to indicate on a 10-point scale, as it was more refined than a 5-point Likert scale where 1= strongly disagree and 10= strongly agree, the degree to which were willing to communicate in each situation. An example item was ‘Talk in English with a large meeting of English speaking friends’.

Table 2 Three types of interactants with four types of communication context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of communication context</th>
<th>Type of interactants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal conversations</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Personality trait questionnaire
The 15-item personality trait questionnaire was based on McCroskey (1982). The items were made with a connection to introversion-extroversion and anxiety in communication. Participants were instructed to indicate on a 10-point scale, where 1= strongly disagree and 10= strongly agree, the degree to which were related each statement. An example item was ‘I feel tense and nervous when engaging in the group discussion in English with new people’.

c) Cultural trait questionnaire
I designed the 13-item cultural trait, measuring beliefs, cultures, and self-esteem. Participants were, again, instructed to indicate on a 10-point scale, where 1= strongly disagree and 10= strongly agree, the degree to which were related each statement. An example item was ‘In a discussion, I do not like to stand out by giving my opinions or asking questions’.
INSTRUMENT 2 SELF-ASSESSMENT SCALE OF WTC
This measure was based on MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1991b) state anxiety thermometer (anxometer) and Waninge’s (2010) motometer. Participants were presented with the image of a thermometer labeled “0” at the bottom and “100” at the top about 10 centimetres long. They were instructed to consider to what extent they were willing to engage in the discussion. They were asked to draw a horizontal line across the thermometer to indicate their level of willingness to communicate during that particular time. There were two sessions of the experiment. The WTC-meter was aimed to measure the actual task performance at that particular moment. The WTC-meter was designed to give global impression of WTC. The WTC on the WTC meter was formulated as follows: 1) How much am I willing to engage in the discussion at the moment? 2) How much do I participate in the conversation at that moment? 3) How much effort do I put into participating in the discussion?

5.2.3 Procedures
The participants were grouped, as shown in Table 1, to discuss the given topics per session, examples of topics are: 1) Your attitude towards Dutch people 2) Learning Dutch language for foreign students (see Appendix C). It was understood that their results would be mentioned anonymously in order to get their self-report as honest as possible. There were 2 sessions in this experiment. Initially, the subjects were briefed about the purpose of this study to ensure that they fully understood what they had to do in this experiment before the questionnaires took place in order to receive straightforward outcome from the questionnaires. In session 1, the subjects were required to fill in three questionnaires before the discussion started to measure their personality trait, cultural trait, and situational trait. The survey took about 10 minutes to administer. After that, the WTC-meter handout was given to each subject and they were instructed about what they had to do in the experiment. The subjects were then told to start a conversation to discuss the given topics. They were explained that the discussion would take 20 minutes. After the discussion started, I beeped, by using a mobile phone, every 5 minute and they were required to draw a horizontal line across the thermometer to measure their feelings towards their participation in the L2 conversation at that moment.

During the discussion, the conversation was recorded with an audio recorder. After the experiment, the participants were interviewed about their feelings during the discussion on their ideas of their performance and explanation of their results on their WTC-meters what
affected the degree of their engagement in the discussion. The individual interview took place after the experiment in order to receive deeper details. The interviews were also recorded. The given topics were designed to be about something that can stimulate the discussion within the group, not individual talk, in order to balance the task challenge to open participants’ communication skills during the discussion. Various topics, but still within their knowledge, also offered opportunities for the participants’ attention to focus on the task and find the topics fundamentally interesting. If the participants got stuck or went silent on any topic, then the author would participate in the discussion in order to help the conversation flow or lead them to a new topic.

In session 2, the personality trait, situational trait, and cultural trait questionnaires were administrated to the twelve participants again. The participants answered questions in the questionnaires regarding their traits and responded to the WTC-meter as in session 1. The instruction was also the same as in session 1; however, they were given a new list of topics to discuss in this second session.

The settings where the experiment took place varied depending on subjects’ preference of time and place. It mostly took place in the canteen at the university, in classroom after class hour, or one of the participants’ houses. For the purpose of completing the questionnaires and the conversational experiment, the settings were rather quiet with some noise but not too noisy in order to avoid being distracted by noises during the conversations. Regarding this issue, Hansen Edwards & Zampini (2008) propose that L2 speakers can distinguish pronunciation and understand each other better and more easily in a quiet setting. About 3-6 dB is the level of background noise to real life situations which increases the anxiety of the oral production. They, therefore, suggest to test speech input in a quiet environment. However, I argue that it was better to test speaking and listening in a setting with some noise as it was similar to everyday conversational situations, because we usually do not speak in a very quiet place and L2 speakers might feel more anxious and restricted to the situation they were in. In a quiet environment, L2 speakers could feel worried about detecting their speaking errors.

The purpose of the experiment was to get the subjects engaged in a conversation which implied their WTC in participating in the group discussion. I was present during the experiment to observe the actual communication behaviours and consequences. The data were then examined and coded on Excel spreadsheets for further analysis, and then
transferred into an SPSS file. In order to check the reliability and validity of the instruments, the available data was analysed by Reliability Analysis on SPSS.

5.2.4 Analyses

In this study, the approach to WTC was quantitative and retrospective. The purpose of the experiment was to assess whether the influence of the traits plays a significant role in WTC. The data from the questionnaires, the WTC-meter, and the descriptions from the interviews were analysed. The results of the questionnaires and the WTC-meters were analysed by using SPSS version 16.0, statistical analysis software.

First, I used a Reliability Analysis to examine the personality trait, cultural trait, and situational trait questionnaires in which the subjects responded at the beginning of the first and the second session in the experiment to measure the subjects’ traits in relation to their L2 communication. The Cronbach Reliability Analysis coefficient was used to check whether the questionnaires were reliable to measure the target traits. All instruments showed strong consistency as the alpha should be .65 or above, although I had to delete question items 5 and 7 in the cultural trait questionnaire as they correlated negatively with the total: session 1 = .53 and session 2 = .63. After question items 5 and 7 were omitted, the alpha became reasonable as shown in Table 3. If we look at the reliability of the cultural trait questionnaire and question why it was not reliable at first and when some items were removed the questionnaire became reliable.

Table 3 Reliability coefficient of the research instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Situational trait</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Cultural trait</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then I checked if the traits and the WTC-meter in session 1 and 2 were correlated, I ran Pearson’s correlation (2-tailed). The alpha level was set at 0.05 and found the results were very high correlated. The traits and the WTC were correlated which means that the scales in session 1 and 2 were correlated and reliable (see Table 4).
Table 4 The correlation of the instruments between session 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments between session 1 and 2</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6
Results
The research questions targeted the relationship between the traits and WTC in group, nationally, and we will analyse the results individually, if possible.

Research question 1
Are there differences in WTC between cultural groups?

Means are presented in Table 5. In order to examine whether there were any differences in WTC between the cultural groups, an Independent Samples T-Test was run. The analysis revealed that there was a significant difference between the Thai subjects in session 1 (t (10) = 2.76; p < 0.05) and the Dutch subjects in session 2 (t (10) = -2.41; p < 0.05). The differences of the WTC of the Dutch subjects in session 1 (t (10) = -1.74; p > 0.05), the WTC of the Thai subjects in session 2 (t (10) = 2.15; p > 0.05), and the Chinese subjects in session 1 (t (10) = -.14; p > 0.05) and session 2 (t (10) = -.12; p > 0.05) were not significant.

Table 5 Mean with standard deviation in the parenthesis of WTC of the subjects in 2 sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>61.75 (15.14)</td>
<td>79.17 (29.45)</td>
<td>88.22 (12.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>61.22 (30.12)</td>
<td>80.19 (15.29)</td>
<td>94.97 (4.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 2
Does WTC between groups change over time?

To find out whether the WTC changed over time in this experiment, an Independent Samples T-Test was run. The means of their WTC scores in session 1 and 2 were investigated. As shown in Table 5, the Thai subjects scored lower than the Chinese and the Dutch subjects in both sessions. Unsurprisingly, the Dutch subjects scored highest amongst the group at 88.22 in session 1 and at 94.97 in session 2. If compared the Thai to the Chinese subjects who are also from Asian culture, although not the same culture but similarly, the Chinese subjects’ WTC was higher than the Thai subjects’. Then, an Independent Samples T-Test was run, the analysis revealed that the WTC in the Dutch subjects in session 1 (M = 88.22, SE = 12.97)
and session 2 (M = 94.97, SE = 4.91) scored higher than the Thai and the Chinese subjects’ WTC. The Thai subjects also scored lowest on WTC in session 1 (M = 61.75, SE = 15.14) and session 2 (M = 61.22, SE = 30.12).

Remarkably, the WTC of the Dutch participants increased significantly in session 2 as shown in Figure 2. The Chinese subjects’ WTC also slightly heightened in session 2, which contrasted the WTC of the Thai subjects that it slightly declined from session 1.

![Figure 2 The interaction between sessions and groups (meanWTC = session 1, meanWT CB = session 2).](image)

To look at how the WTC changed over time, the subjects exhibited variation between nationalities. In figure 3 and 4, the graphs showed several interesting features of the degree of WTC of each nationality over time in session 1 and 2. The bandwidths of the WTC scores obviously did not remain at one level. In figure 3, the Dutch subjects’ WTC slightly decreased the level of overall WTC to about 1.5 from 89.2 to 87.7 during minute 5 to 10. Then, it increased again, from 91.7 to 93.6, from minute 10 onwards until the end of the first session. For session 2, the graph in Figure 4 demonstrated that the Dutch subjects’ WTC was rather stable throughout this session, although their WTC slightly developed from minute 15 to the end of the session from 95.6 to 96.7. The Chinese subjects also showed a similar stable degree of WTC. The fluctuation of WTC can be clearly seen in WTC scores of the Thai and the Chinese subjects.
There was a bigger variation of WTC, as shown in Figure 3 and 4, with the Thai and the Chinese than with the Dutch subjects in session 1 and 2. As clearly seen in Figure 3, the Chinese subjects’ WTC also slightly decreased in session 1 from minute 5 to 10 to about 4.75 from 78.25 to 73.5. After minute 10, their WTC gradually strengthened until the end of the session. In session 2, their WTC scores increasingly developed from the beginning until the end of the experiment from 78 to 82.75, however, their WTC did not show as much variation as the Thai subjects’ WTC did.

The Thai subjects demonstrated opposite results to other groups in the first session. Their WTC gradually decreased from minute 5 till the end of the session with a difference of 13.3. In session 2, their WTC level declined again from minute 5 and then went up until minute 20. Between minute 10 and 20, the biggest range was clearly shown and the WTC level varied from 54.3 to 69.6. Among three nationalities, The Thai subjects presented the most fluctuation than the Chinese and the Dutch subjects.

Figure 3 The variation of WTC of each nationality changed over time in session 1.
Research question 3

What is the difference within the three groups over time?

Table 6 Means of WTC within groups in session 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>Thai Mixed group</th>
<th>Thai group</th>
<th>Chinese Mixed group</th>
<th>Dutch Mixed group</th>
<th>Dutch group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>70.50</td>
<td>55.92</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>98.19</td>
<td>85.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>82.37</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>80.19</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>93.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To analyse how individuals behaved in the experiment, means of WTC within groups in 2 sessions were calculated. In Table 6, Thai subjects had lowest WTC in average. When having a look at the fluctuation of WTC over time, the results from the Thai group gave a clearer view of their degree in WTC.

When having a closer look, within the Thai subjects, the means in Table 6 showed that the Thai subjects in the mixed group were more willing to engage in the discussion than the Thai subjects in the Thai group. This indicated that if the Thai people were in the mixed group, the gain WTC would be much higher than in the Thai group.

As shown in the answers for the research question 1 and 2, the Thai subjects generally had lowest scores on WTC compared to the Chinese and the Dutch subjects. Furthermore, the Thai subjects in the Thai group showed greater fluctuation in WTC which caused the WTC of
the Thai subjects in general to be lower than others, all in all, the mean of WTC of the Thai subjects in the mixed groups (mean = 11.87, SD = 7.78) was higher than the Thai subjects in the Thai group (mean = -8.79, SD = 15.84). As shown in Figure 5, one subject in the mixed group scored 17.37 and another one had 6.37, while the Thai subjects in the Thai group had 9.5, -17.75, and -18.12, respectively. One subject in the Thai group had higher score than the other two and more than one subject in the mixed group. For a clearer view, I will discuss the variation of WTC of the Thai subjects in the Thai group changed over time.

![Means of gain WTC in Thai subjects](image)

*Figure 5 Means of gain WTC of Thai subjects in the mixed groups and the Thai group (number 1, 2, and 3 represent the number of the subjects).*

Figure 6 depicts the variation of WTC in Thai group over time in session 1. As seen in the graph, there was a fluctuation throughout the first session, especially in the Thai subject, Poom, whose WTC first slightly decreased after minute 5 and then abruptly went down after minute 10 to 15, from 97 to 20, and his WTC became stabilized.
Figure 6 The variation of WTC in Thai group changed over time in session 1.

Table 7 Means and standard deviation of the Thai subjects in Thai group in 2 sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peeraya</th>
<th>Poom</th>
<th>Sally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>45.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In session 2 (see figure 7), Poom, again, engaged in the discussion most of the time as his WTC level was the highest during the first 5 minutes, then his WTC level suddenly decreased from minute 5 to 10 and slightly went down again from minute 10 to 15 which presented the biggest range in this group, dropped from 83 to 6.5 from minute 5 to 15. His WTC level increased again in the last 5 minutes. He explained the ebb and flow of the fluctuation of his WTC that he was feeling unwell and tired as the experiment took part somewhat late.

Peeraya showed the lowest mean of her WTC in both session 1 and 2. However, the degree of her WTC gradually increased from minute 5 to 20 which revealed no decrease of her WTC in the second session. The data from the interview revealed that her low degree of
WTC to engage in the conversation was caused by the fact that she had very little knowledge of the topics in this session such as sports, Dutch Queen’s day, Dutch media or Dutch music as she has just been here for only a few months, while Poom has lived in the Netherlands for about 7 years and Sally has lived in the Netherlands for 10 months. Therefore, she had no clue what to say much regarding the topics. This perhaps gave Sally the chance to speak up and engage in the discussion most of the time in this session as Poom was also feeling unwell.

When looking at Sally’s WTC, the bandwidth of the scores did not remain at one level, although it did not show such fluctuation as Poom’s and Peeraya’s scores. It fluctuated from 78.5 to 74 from minute 5 to 10. Then, it gradually went up to 76.5 from minute 10 to 15, and slightly increased still to 81 until minute 20.

![The variation of WTC of Thai subjects in Thai group changed over time in session 2](image)

*Figure 7 The variation of WTC in Thai group changed over time in session 2.*

Generally, for most groups the WTC level went up during the last 5 minutes perhaps because it was almost the end of the session. Hence, they felt more relaxed and eased with the topic and the discussion.

For the Chinese subjects, there was a variation of WTC between the subjects in 2 sessions as seen in Figure 8. There was a contradiction between these two subjects as the WTC of another went down and the other went up. It indicates that Sandra had higher WTC in session 1 and it declined in session 2, while Lydia had lower WTC in session 1 and her WTC increased in session 2.
Figure 8 Means of WTC of the Chinese subjects in mixed groups in 2 sessions.

When looking at the Chinese subjects’ WTC in session 1 as shown in Figure 9, the bandwidth showed that Sandra’s WTC had not changed over time but there was the ebb and flow of Lydia’s WTC. Her WTC started relatively low at 56.5, then it decreased after minute 5 to 10. After that minute 10, Lydia’s WTC gradually went up, from 47 to 71, until the end of the first session.

Figure 9 WTC of the Chinese subjects in mixed groups changed over time in session 1

In session 2, Figure 10 revealed a difference between the two subjects. At the beginning of session 2, their WTC started almost at the same degree and the fluctuation
started after minute 5. Sandra’s WTC gradually went up from minute 6 to 20, while Lydia’s WTC slightly went down after minute 5, from 79 to 65.5, until the end of this session.

![WTC of the Chinese subjects changed over time in session 2](image)

*Figure 10 WTC of the Chinese subjects in mixed groups changed over time in session 2.*

There was also a variation within the Dutch subjects. In Figure 11, there was a difference between the Dutch subjects in the mixed groups and in the Dutch group. The Dutch subjects in the mixed group had higher WTC than the Dutch subjects in the Dutch group.

![Means of WTC of the Dutch subjects in mixed group and Dutch group](image)

*Figure 11 Means of WTC of the Dutch subjects in mixed groups and Dutch group.*
As the WTC of the Dutch subjects in the mixed group did not show much variation within the group in 2 sessions, we will have a closer look at the Dutch subjects in the Dutch group. In Figure 12, there was a difference between the subjects in session 1 from minute 5 to 10. After that, the bandwidth showed only an increase of individuals’ WTC from minute 10 to 20.

![The variation of WTC of Dutch subjects in Dutch group changed over time in session 1](image)

*Figure 12 WTC of the Dutch subjects in Dutch group changed over time in session 1.*

For session 2, Figure 13 depicts a somewhat smooth bandwidth. Jan’s WTC was almost stable as his WTC only slightly decreased after minute 5 to 10 from 98 to 97. After minute 10, Jan’s WTC increased to 99 at the end of the session. There was a slight ebb and flow in Tom’s and Jeroen’s WTC. Tom’s WTC went down after minute 5 to 10 from 92 to 89 and after that his WTC became stable. Jeroen’s WTC started at the lowest degree than the other two subjects, at 87. Then, his WTC went up to 94 after minute 5 and slightly dropped to 91 and began to climb up again after minute 15.
Research question 4

What is the relation between the traits and WTC?

In order to have clearer understanding what traits generally influenced the subjects’ WTC, means of each variable of each nationality of 2 sessions were calculated as shown in Table 7. The Thai subjects had lowest mean of WTC in 2 sessions. Unexpectedly, the Thai subjects had lowest mean in cultural trait, which it was expected to be higher than the Chinese and the Dutch subjects. On the contrary, the Chinese had highest mean in cultural trait and lowest mean in situational trait. For the Dutch subjects, it appeared that they had highest means of personality trait and situational trait as clearly seen in figure 14.

Table 7 Means with standard deviation in parenthesis of each variable of each nationality of 2 sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>Situational trait</th>
<th>Cultural trait</th>
<th>Personality trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>61.49 (22.39)</td>
<td>5.85 (2.14)</td>
<td>4.52 (2.01)</td>
<td>5.94 (2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>79.68 (22.37)</td>
<td>4.42 (2.06)</td>
<td>5.82 (0.96)</td>
<td>5.42 (2.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>91.59 (8.17)</td>
<td>8.22 (1.16)</td>
<td>5.14 (0.69)</td>
<td>8.04 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To find out the influences of individual traits on WTC in session 1 and 2, the mean of each trait was calculated for different nationalities as shown in Table 8.

**Table 8 Means of traits and WTC in session 1 and 2 divided by nationalities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trait</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>61.75</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>88.22</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>76.65</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To find out whether there was a correlation between each trait and L2 WTC, Pearson’s correlation coefficient (2-tailed) was calculated. The analysis revealed that there was a statistically significant positive relationship between the situational trait and WTC ($r (12) = .61; p < 0.05$). For the cultural trait and the personality trait, the analysis yielded no
significant correlation between the cultural trait and WTC \( (r (12) = .48; \ p > 0.05) \), and no correlation between the personality trait and WTC \( (r (12) = .31; \ p > 0.05) \).

To have a closer look at the relationship between the traits and WTC, the results of the relation between the traits and WTC in English in 2 sessions will be analysed separately. In the first session, Pearson’s correlation coefficient (2-tailed) was calculated between WTC in English oral production and the three related factors, situational trait, cultural trait, and personality trait (for the complete correlation matrix see Appendix G). The analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between WTC in English and the situational trait \( (r (12) = .61; \ p < 0.05) \). For the cultural and personality traits, the analysis showed that there was no statistically significant correlation between the cultural trait and WTC in English \( (r (12) = .32; \ p > 0.05) \). No significant relationship was found between the personality trait and L2 WTC \( (r (12) = .41; \ p > 0.05) \).

The analysis of the traits and WTC in the second session revealed that there was no significant relationship between the situational trait and WTC in English \( (r (12) = .51; \ p > 0.05) \), between the cultural trait and WTC \( (r (12) = .57; \ p > 0.05) \), and between the personality trait and WTC \( (r (12) = .22; \ p > 0.05) \).

As only the situational trait demonstrated the significant positive relationship with WTC in English in session 1, the different types of situation and interlocutor that affect WTC will be observed. Figure 15 and 16 suggest that there might be differences in types of setting and interlocutor; however, the differences are small.

![WTC in different types of situation](image)

*Figure 15 The L2 WTC of the subjects in different types of situation in session 1.*
Figure 16 The L2 WTC of the subjects in different types of interlocutor in session 1.
Chapter 7

Discussion

Research question 1

Are there differences in WTC between cultural groups? Why do the Thai subjects have the lowest WTC amongst the Chinese and the Dutch subjects? Why is the Thai subjects’ WTC in session 2 lower than in session 1, while the Chinese and the Dutch subjects increase their WTC in session 2?

Expectedly, the Thai subjects were more reluctant to speak English than the Chinese and the Dutch subjects as the Thai subjects exhibited the lowest scores on WTC amongst the Chinese and the Dutch subjects. There is evidence from past research (Samovar & Porter, 1997; Hinenoya & Gatbonton, 2000) suggesting that cultures shape human communication behaviours which may explain why the Thai subjects had lower scores on WTC than others. Furthermore, it has been mentioned that WTC is seen as a personality trait which associated with communication apprehension, perceived communication competence, introversion-extraversion, and self-esteem (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovon, 2002).

There might be some reasons why the Thai subjects appeared to be less willing to speak. Previous findings (Kline, Barrett, & Svaste-Xuto, 1981; Grubbs, Chaengploy, & Worawong, 2009) describe Thai personality as introverted in expressing themselves in L2. Moreover, a study in Thai students by Grubbs et al. (2009) gives a reason for the lack of confidence in their speaking skills is insufficient knowledge, nervousness and preferring to listen rather than to speak, although in this study the Thai subjects did not show any nervousness in the experiment. The results in this study are a contrast to Kline et al. (1981) who mentioned Sharp et al.’s (1956) study that the Thai are more extraverted than the British as a European sample.

For more explanation, the discussion of research question 2 will describe how the subjects’ WTC changed over time and the discussion on research question 3 will clarify why the Thai subjects’ WTC decreased in session 2 while the Chinese and the Dutch subjects’ WTC in session 2 increased and the reason why the Thai subjects had lowest scores on WTC.
will be also given in deeper details. The changes in the Chinese and the Dutch subjects’ WTC will also be discussed.

**Research question 2**

*Does WTC between groups change over time?*

There was a variation between the groups. As mentioned in the discussion of research question 1, the Thai group in session 2 demonstrated negative changes in WTC in English oral production as their WTC decreased in session 2, while the Chinese and the Dutch subjects’ WTC increased in session 2. This explains the DST that the willingness can ebb and flow over time due to various possible factors and that the main feature of a DS is its change over time (De Bot, Lowie, & Verspoor, 2007).

**Research question 3**

*What is the difference within the three groups over time?*

As the Thai subjects showed the lowest WTC and had substantial variation within the Thai subjects, I will have a closer look at the Thai subjects to find out what influenced their WTC. It is possible that individual differences influence Thai subjects’ WTC. When looking at Figure 5, it showed one of the subjects in the mixed group was the most willing to communicate and one Thai subject in the Thai group was slightly more willing to speak English than other subjects in the mixed group. It is perhaps because this person was engaged in and leaded the discussion in the Thai group most of the time, while the other two remained silent. When looking at their data, the Thai subjects in the Thai group explained why they were less willing to communicate, especially in the second session, it was because the topics in the first session were more interesting and more general to their knowledge.

We also looked at internal variation in the Thai group, ‘Poom’ whose WTC in session 1 first slightly decreased after minute 5 and then abruptly went down after minute 10 to 15, from 97 to 20, and his WTC became stabilized. According to the interview after the first experiment, he explained that at the beginning of the experiment he spoke most of the time and later on he became less talkative as other people were talking. Thus, he did not know what to say and let others speak. If we look at the scores on WTC of the other two subjects, we can see that their participation was lower than ‘Poom’ who spoke most of the time. Later
on, ‘Poom’ became silent and the others started speaking up. Similarly, the other 2 subjects, ‘Peeraya’ and ‘Sally’, also commented that their WTC levels were low at the beginning of the experiment as ‘Poom’ was speaking and they were listening and did not want to interrupt until he stopped talking. After that, they had the chance to participate in the discussion. I would say that this is part of the Thai culture where one is speaking and the others should not interrupt the conversation until the person stops speaking, and perhaps also in Dutch culture. As I am also a Thai native, interruption during a conversation can be seen as impolite, although there is no evidence in support of this assumption.

In session 2, one subject in the Thai group explained the reason why his WTC was very low as the experiment occurred after dinner time and he was tired from work. Furthermore, the Thai subjects in the Thai group mentioned that the topics in the second session were unfamiliar and they had little knowledge of the topics such as Dutch Queen’s day, Dutch media, or sports. The topics were more about the Netherlands and they were all Thai, while the mixed groups had one Dutch subject to lead the conversation or explained the detail regarding the topics kept the conversation going. The topic issues confirm the previous findings (Grubbs, Chaengploy, & Worawong, 2009) which report that Thai subjects lack confidence in speaking skills due to insufficient knowledge and preferring to listen rather than to speak and that WTC in a communication depends on the topic, whether it is easy or difficult (MacIntyre, 2004).

Another possible reason was that the Thai subjects in the mixed group were eager to take part of the discussion with new people from different countries and might increase their WTC in the conversation. These were possible causal reasons why they were less willing to communicate than the Thai subjects in the mixed groups, although the subjects in the Thai group are friends which, in fact, they could have shown higher scores on WTC than the Thai subjects in the mixed groups.

One possible reason that the Thai subjects were more reluctant to speak English than the Dutch and the Chinese subjects and showed variation in the Thai group is because of the Thai manners. When someone speaks, you should wait until the speaker finishes their speech, then you can speak up and join the conversation as interrupting a conversation can be seen as impoliteness in the Thai culture.

Another possible reason why the Thai subjects in the Thai group were less willing to participate in the discussion, because the experiment in the second session took place somewhat late and they were tired. Moreover, they also mentioned in the interview that they
were unfamiliar with the topics which were all about the Netherlands and the topics were rather specific as previously mentioned. Likewise, the Thai subjects in the mixed group were eager to get to know and make new friends with the Dutch and the Chinese subjects and there was one Dutch subject in the group who could explain and continued the conversation as they knew all about Dutch. Furthermore, the Dutch subjects also mentioned in the interview that they love to speak English and like to talk with people, therefore, they were eased to speak and discuss any topics.

With respect to the Thai subjects had lower WTC in the mixed groups and in the Thai group than others in average, the previous study by Hinenoya & Gatbonton (2000) is relevant. It points out that introverts are unlikely to benefit from opportunities to interact with people in the target language apart from their own language as Thai personality is defined as introverted in expressing themselves in L2 (Kline et al., 1981; Grubbs, Chaengploy & Worawong, 2009). Therefore, we can assume that this is why the average of WTC of the Thai subjects in the Thai group was very low if compared to the Dutch subjects in the Dutch group. Although the Thai subjects in the mixed group had relatively high WTC, their WTC was still lower than the Chinese and the Dutch subjects.

**Research question 4**

**What is the relation between the traits and WTC?**

There was a significant positive correlation between the situational trait and the WTC in English speech and there were no relationships between the cultural trait and the WTC and between the personality trait and the WTC in the first session. After session 2, there was no significant correlation between the traits and the WTC. This may be because the sample size was very small. However, when looking at the means of the traits, the means were higher in all traits in session 2 which suggest that the subjects in general were more confident to speak English and that their self-perceived communicative competence was also higher in the second session. It is possible that the subjects were used to other participants in their groups in the second discussion. Therefore, the participants got familiar with each other and were more willing to speak English.

As only the situational trait demonstrated the significant positive relationship with the WTC in English in session 1, the different types of situation and interlocutor that affect the WTC will be observed. The subjects had the highest level of WTC in group discussions,
followed by interpersonal conversation, meetings, and public speaking respectively. It indicated they preferred the types of speech that was less formal than in a meeting or public speaking or they were less willing to speak in a large group of people. Also, the subjects preferred to speak English with friends to acquaintances or strangers. It is obvious that they prefer not to talk to strangers or someone they are not familiar with. This implied that the subjects preferred to speak English with someone they were familiar with in a less formal situation or a familiar or small group of people as most studies suggest that the readiness to engage in a conversation at a particular time depends on the interlocutor one wants to speak with when using an L2 (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovon, 2002).

It is possible that other issues affecting their WTC cause the fluctuation during the conversation; the cause of the ebb and flow is change of topics. With regards to WTC as a state or a trait, a study by Kang (2005) has shown that WTC is a dynamic situational concept that changes from moment to moment and I agree with Kang (2005) as what affects the subjects the most in this study appear to be topics, conversational contexts and tiredness. This indicates that WTC can undergo strong ebbs and flows over time and the WTC can change at different time scales as what changes in one time scale will affect the development of WTC on another time scale. Therefore, I would state that WTC is more as a state rather than a trait.

In general, when compare the Thai with the Chinese subjects, the Thai subjects had higher personality and situational trait than the Chinese subjects which contrasts what I expected. It means that the Chinese subjects had lower degree of self-perceived competence than the Thai subjects as the Chinese subjects underestimated their communicative skills but, in fact, their WTC was higher than the Thai subjects. This conflicts what MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovon (2002) points out that perceptions of competence can influence WTC.

For the Dutch subjects, they were more comfortable to speak English as they mentioned in the interview. I assume that different cultures can embed different attitudes toward speaking a foreign language as the Dutch subjects indicate that they get exposed to the English language most of the time by means of TV programmes and books. The amount of L2 use is, therefore related to WTC and intercultural communication as the amount of interaction individuals get engaged in partly aids individuals’ cultural orientation (Samovar & Porter, 1997; Barraclough, Christophel, & McCroskey, 1988). Moreover, the Dutch subjects also mentioned in the interview that the Dutch language is also similar to the English language as they are from the same language family. Regarding cultural trait, if we look at
the reliability of the cultural trait as mentioned in the Analyses section, the reason why the cultural trait was not reliable at first, it perhaps suggests that the cultural trait is reliable only for particular nationalities.

In this study, the pitfalls of the use of self-report questionnaires were that the measures might be under the influence of irrelevant factors such as self-flattery. Therefore, the author might not receive honest responses, even though the subjects were informed that their data would be referred anonymously.
Chapter 8
Conclusion and Recommendations for Future Research

This present research has brought to light the complex relationship of factors that influence WTC in L2. Regardless of individual differences displayed, no precise variables explained willingness to communicate in L2. MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) pyramid model proposes and has been used and has shed some light on many L2 WTC research. With respect to the pyramid model, the system of time scales shows in the WTC pyramid guides the stages of variables influencing WTC. I assume from the subjects’ behaviours that personality, communication competence, self-confidence, state communicative self-confidence, WTC, and L2 use affected the participants in this study. The idea of time scales used in this study is to reveal what undergoes the ebbs and flows in the WTC over time and that WTC can change at different time scales. The time scales were looked at on the minutes scale during the conversations and on a larger scale for the personality, cultural, and situational traits. Furthermore, cultural traits take place at the life span scale. In the study, it showed that there was substantial variation between and within subjects over time. Many possible issues, which are unpredictable such as topics, self-perceived communication competence, tiredness and time matter, were shown to result WTC.

Since most subjects, especially the Dutch subjects who mention that they like to speak English or speak with people, reached the stage of level communicative self-confidence which increase their desire to speak L2. From this stage, they use the target language and through the frequency of L2 use, their WTC increases. This means that the higher the learners are in the pyramid, the time framework will become stricter. The Dutch subjects and the Chinese subjects also exhibited a top-down effect of the pyramid model as they were more willing to use L2 in session 2 and through the familiarity of the language use with the same people, their WTC increased.

The Thai subjects did not twist our expectation as their WTC was lowest among the groups, while it is unsurprising that the Dutch subjects had highest WTC in this study. Generally, the results yielded that the degree of WTC is not related to interrelated factors such as personality trait, situational trait, and cultural trait. It has been found that among the Thai, Chinese, and Dutch groups, WTC in English depends not only on their self-perceived communication competence, but also other small factors such as topics and tiredness. The
situational trait also implies that L2 speakers prefer to speak with people they are familiar with and that they prefer to speak in a small group to a large group and less formal such as meetings and public speaking. However, there is no given pattern of encouraging one to speak up.

For further research, I would suggest larger scale research related to and focused on self-perceived communication competence as it might be possible to indicate whether individual differences can influence WTC in L2. In addition, Thai and Chinese subjects who have not been or studied abroad could be included. Their attitudes towards the target language might change or the frequency of L2 use would increase the subjects’ confidence and WTC. A bigger sample size would also make the study more reliable, especially with Chinese subjects in order to compare them with the Thai samples. A longitudinal study could also shed more light on dynamic systems in order to see a greater variation in the development of WTC.
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Appendix A Questionnaires

Situational means questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Below are 13 situations in which a person might be willing to engage in an interaction. Please presume that you have completely free choice to initiate or avoid communication. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you: strongly disagree =1; strongly agree = 10.

1. Talk in English with an English speaking friend while standing in line.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Talk in English with a small group of English speaking friends.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. Talk in English with a large meeting of English speaking friends.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. Speak in public in English to a group of English speaking friends.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Talk in English with an English speaking acquaintance in an elevator.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. Talk in English with a small group of English speaking acquaintances.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Talk in English with a large meeting of English speaking acquaintances.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Speak in public in English to a group of English speaking acquaintances.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. Talk in English with an English speaking stranger while standing in line.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10. Talk in English to a small group of English speaking strangers.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11. Talk in English to a large meeting of English speaking strangers.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
12. Speak in public in English to a group of English speaking strangers.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13. Talk in English with an English speaking spouse (or girl/boy friend).
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Personality trait questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Below are 15 statements about how you feel about communicating in English during the group discussion. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you: strongly disagree = 1; strongly agree = 10.

1. I dislike participating in group discussions in English.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

2. Generally, I feel comfortable while participating in the group discussion in English.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

3. I am tense and nervous while participating in the group discussion in English.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

4. I like to get involved in the group discussion in English.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

5. I feel tense and nervous when engaging in the group discussion in English with new people.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

6. I feel calm and relaxed while participating in the group discussion in English.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

7. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion in English in the group discussion.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

8. I am afraid to express myself in English in the group discussion.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

9. Communicating in English in the group discussion makes me uncomfortable.
   \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

10. I am very relaxed when answering questions in English in the group discussion.
    \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]

11. I have no fear speaking up in English in the group discussion.
    \[1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7\ 8\ 9\ 10\]
12. I feel very tense and nervous in the group discussion when I have to speak in English.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13. I feel very calm and relaxed in the group discussion when I have to speak in English.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

14. I am afraid to speak up in English in the group discussion.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

15. While speaking up in English, I get so nervous I forgot what I wanted to say.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Cultural trait questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Below are 13 statements about your culture or your attitude towards your culture about communicating in English. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you: strongly disagree = 1; strongly agree = 10.

1. People will judge me on the level of my English proficiency when I speak English.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. It is common for people to speak English of the same nationality.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. I believe speaking English among people of the same nationality is an inappropriate manner.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. In my culture, it is common to give an opinion in a discussion.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. My culture encourages me to speak a foreign language.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. In a discussion, I do not like to stand out by giving my opinions or asking questions.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. I like to take part in group work or a discussion with foreign students in a multicultural class/group.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. I like to take part in group work only with people of the same nationality.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. My educational background makes me confident in speaking English.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. I am not confident in my grammar ability when it comes to speaking English.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. I am shy when people correct my English.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
12. The teaching methods in school and university directly relate with my confidence in speaking English.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

13. I believe if I have a high proficiency of English, I will be accepted in my community.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Appendix B WTC-meter

WTC-meter

Please draw a horizontal line across the thermometer to measure your willingness to communicate in the L2 conversation at a particular moment. Willingness to communicate is defined as how much you are willing to engage in the discussion right now.
Appendix C Topic list

Session 1

1. Your attitude towards Dutch people
2. Learning Dutch language for foreign students, e.g. is it necessary for international students to know Dutch language? Should there be a free language course?
3. Dutch food
4. Dutch culture e.g. greetings, manners.
5. The transport facilities in the Netherlands
6. The role of men and women in the Netherlands
7. Your opinion towards Dutch education system
8. Tourism in Holland e.g. tourism situation, tourist attractions.
9. Tourist information services and facilities in the Netherlands
10. Advantages and disadvantages of living in Groningen, if compared to other cities.

Session 2

1. Sports
2. Dutch Queen’s day
3. Supermarkets or local markets in the Netherlands, e.g. opening times, services, fresh food.
4. Weather in the Netherlands
5. Dutch personality
6. Foreign cuisines or the openness to foreign cuisines in the Netherlands.
7. Dutch media
8. Groningen
9. Music e.g. Dutch folk music
10. Summer holidays in the Netherlands
Appendix D Cronbach Alpha reliability for measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait without item 5 and 7</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait without item 5 and 7</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC-meter</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E Group statistics for the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.2188</td>
<td>12.96726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94.9688</td>
<td>4.91212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1346</td>
<td>1.15192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3077</td>
<td>1.19169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>.70808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2727</td>
<td>.70808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6667</td>
<td>1.61658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.4167</td>
<td>.88506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thai subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61.7500</td>
<td>15.13997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61.2250</td>
<td>15.13997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8000</td>
<td>2.32468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9077</td>
<td>1.98768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4000</td>
<td>1.89889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6364</td>
<td>2.20161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0533</td>
<td>2.29415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8267</td>
<td>2.53973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese subjects</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.1750</td>
<td>29.45100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.1875</td>
<td>15.29118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9231</td>
<td>.97907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational trait session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>3.15478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2727</td>
<td>1.02852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural trait session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3636</td>
<td>.89995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>2.26274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait session 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6333</td>
<td>3.25269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## T-test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dutch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>-1,745</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>-2,409</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chinese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thai</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 1</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC session 2</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix F** Correlation analysis for overall WTC, situational trait, cultural trait, and personality trait of 2 sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WTC</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.608*</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.608*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.842**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CT</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.591*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.842**</td>
<td>-.591</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Appendix G Correlation analysis for WTC, situational trait, cultural trait, and personality trait of session 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.609 *</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.609 *</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.781 **</td>
<td>-0.583 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Appendix H Correlation analysis for WTC and situational trait, cultural trait, and personality trait of session 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WTC</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.855*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CT</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT</strong> Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.855*</td>
<td>-.514</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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