

---

**| RESEARCH ARTICLE**

## **A Mixed Method Study on Grade 10 ESL Learners' Willingness to Communicate**

**Sittie Aina T. Pandapatan<sup>1</sup>✉ Ania M. Alipolo<sup>2</sup>, Wardah D. Guimba<sup>3</sup> and Sittie Khaironisa Morohombsar<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Instructor, Philippine Engineering and Agro-Industrial College, Inc. Marawi City, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Faculty, International Academy of Marawi, Marawi City, Philippines

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, College of Education, Mindanao State University, Marawi City, Philippines

<sup>4</sup>Instructor, College of Education, Mindanao State University, Marawi City, Philippines

**Corresponding Author:** Sittie Aina T. Pandapatan, **E-mail:** [sittie.tan@gmail.com](mailto:sittie.tan@gmail.com)

---

**| ABSTRACT**

This study aims to measure the students' level of perceived/self-report WTC and to explore their situational/behavioural WTC in the classroom. It further investigates the most influential factors of their WTC and the significant relationship of their self-report WTC and behavioural WTC. The study incorporates qualitative and quantitative approaches by means of the WTC Scale and Factors influencing WTC questionnaires, classroom observation and semi-structured interviews. A total of one hundred (100) Grade 10 students from MSU-UTC Experimental Campus, Marawi City, were asked to answer the questionnaires and twelve (12) selected students were subjected for the observation and interviews. Findings show that the extent of WTC of the students is sometimes willing to communicate. The most observable behavioural WTC of students is volunteering an answer. However, there is no observed behavioural WTC like giving an answer to an individual student, responding to an opinion, and guessing the meaning of any unknown word. In addition, self-report WTC and behavioural WTC of students has no significant relationship and that their WTC is most influenced by speaking confidence while least influenced by preparedness. The investigation concludes that respondents vary situations before willing to communicate. Teachers are recommended to involve students in interactive activities that allow them to speak. Future researchers are suggested to further investigate students' behavioural WTC by including the teacher as a validator of such actions to enrich the findings.

**| KEYWORDS**

Willingness to communicate, English as a Second Language, behavioural WTC, self-report WTC, speaking confidence

**| ARTICLE DOI:** [10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.1.14](https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.1.14)

---

**1. Introduction**

Second language (L2) speakers have been encouraged to communicate using the target language inside and outside the classroom setting. It is because the goal of language learning is not only to master the structures of language but, more importantly, to use the language for meaningful and effective communication.

Willingness to communicate (WTC) is related to the talking behaviour of L2 speakers. WTC is defined as "the readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons using L2" (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998, p. 547). The behaviours of L2 speakers differ in the degree to which people actually want to start or respond to a discourse.

As observed, few of the utterances which are normally heard inside the classroom when analyzed could be uttered in simple English, and yet students still prefer not to speak (Berowa, 2012). This will make them unable to develop their speaking ability if they do not take the opportunities to speak in English in the classroom (Riasati, 2012). Thus, students' reticence needs to be removed, and learners need to be made more willing to communicate in order to enhance learners' participation in language classrooms and ultimately improve their fluency in the target language (Liu & Jackson, 2009). Obviously, it is essential to investigate the level of WTC of learners and those factors that influence it for a better understanding of learners' communication behavioural

characteristics and for more successful language acquisition (Sener, 2014). More willingness to speak increases students' participation in class which results in better speaking performance and L2 proficiency (Kim, 2004; Riasati, 2012).

This study aimed to measure the level of self-report WTC in English and the factors that influence WTC performance of Grade 10 students of Mindanao State University – University Training Center Experimental Campus located in Marawi City, Lanao del Sur. Specifically, the researchers conducted this study to explore also the situational characteristics of WTC (behavioural WTC) of the respondents since few studies attempted to investigate this dimension of WTC. In addition, the relationship between self-report and behavioural WTC was examined. This study incorporated the quantitative and qualitative approach through questionnaires, actual classroom observations and semi-structured interviews.

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the respondents' extent of self-report willingness to communicate in English?
2. What are the observed behavioural willingness to communicate in English of the selected respondents?
3. What are the most common factors that influence the respondents' willingness to communicate?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the selected respondents' self-report WTC and their behavioural WTC?

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Willingness to Communicate Construct**

According to McCroskey and Baer (1985), as cited by Wang and Erlam (2011), WTC was derived from first language (L1) communication, and it was assumed as a personality-based, trait-like characteristic that remained stable across situations. However, it has been recently construed as a situational variable, considered as open to any changes so long as it is inclined to the context (MacIntyre et al., 1998). WTC considers the integration of psychological, linguistic and communicative variables to describe, explain, and predict second language communication (Riasati & Noordin, 2011). Bradley (2013) asserted that it is a prerequisite to converse and is not a speaking itself. As cited by Lucarz (2014), MacIntyre et al. (1998) determined the aim of the learning process that should be to pursue communication opportunities and be willing to actually communicate. Moreover, based on the research of MacIntyre et al. (1998), they constructed a layered heuristic model that hypothesized that all social, affective, cognitive, and situational variables influence one's willingness to communicate in L2, which predicts the actual use of language. The first three layers of the pyramid which are supposed to exert situational influences on L2 communication are Communication Behaviour (Layer I), Behaviour Intention (Layer II), and Situated Antecedents (Layer III), while the bottom three layers, namely Layer IV (Motivation Propensities), Layer V (Affective- Cognitive Context), and Layer VI (Social and Individual Context) represent relatively stable, enduring influences on the process of L2 communication. As explained, Communication Behaviour (Layer 1) involves the "L2 Use", or how language is used and considered as the product of a complex system of interrelated variables. The "Willingness to Communicate" variable lies in the second layer, or the behavioural intention, which is the student's intention to communicate if he/she is given the opportunity to do so. Situated Antecedents of Communication are of two variables in this layer which is (1) the desire to communicate with a particular person and (2) the state of communicative self-confidence, which is the momentary feeling of confidence in a particular situation. Motivational Propensities, in this layer, involves important variables such as interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation and L2 confidence. The fifth layer considered the affective and cognitive context, which consists of inter-group attitudes, social situations and communicative competence. Lastly, the last layer, the societal and individual context, comprises intergroup climate and personality.

The study emphasized the WTC within the classroom setting. In this context, as defined by Oxford (1997) cited by Cao and Jiaotong (2012), it is where the interaction of students with others in the target language happened, provided that they have the intention to do so which they are also given a chance to express. Correspondingly, WTC in an L2 classroom concerns the students' intention to use the language. In contrast to Cao and Jiaotong (2012), it is not defined as intention; instead, it is operationalized as occasions when learners engage in communication when they have a choice to engage or not.

### **2.2. Factors Affecting WTC**

Different factors have been identified in the literature as directly and indirectly influencing WTC, including shyness, introversion, emotional stability, self-esteem, communication apprehension, and perceived communication competence (MacIntyre, Babin, & Clement, 1999). Furthermore, in another empirical study which emphasized the context of WTC within classrooms, self-confidence, self-perceived proficiency, and attitude towards L2 or personality (Berowa, 2012; Nagy & Nikolov, 2007; Riasati, 2012; Sener, 2014; Xie, 2011) were dominant factors influencing the WTC of students. As defined by Pattapong (2010), interlocutor refers to the people spoken to during any conversation, either intimates or no-intimates. Interlocutor's L2 proficiency level and its relation to the speaker is an important aspect of communicating the second language (L2) such that communication may be either fostered or hindered by the fact that one of the participants has a higher L2 proficiency or is a native speaker (MacIntyre et al., 1998; Simic, 2014). Furthermore, Nagy and Nikolov (2007) indicated that language anxiety comes from the learners' view to their classmates

that they are more capable and more linguistically skilled than themselves, and they might be laughed with if they make mistakes. In terms of speaking in a group or individually, Riasati (2012) said that learners appeared to be more willing to speak in pairs or groups than individually because they find an opportunity to learn from others and they have more time to discuss a topic. Furthermore, Krashen (1982) explained that a supportive, stress-free and positive atmosphere has already been identified as a prerequisite for successful language learning. Moreover, it has been confirmed that background knowledge of the topic being discussed is decisive when it comes to the level of an individual's willingness to communicate (MacIntyre et al., 1998). It is explained that students can override certain limitations they may have in their overall oral proficiency when they are acquainted with the topic or subject of the conversation during oral classes; however, students can feel less willing to talk in English when they are not familiar with it (Berowa, 2012; Nagy & Nikolov, 2007).

### **2.3. Previous Studies about WTC**

There have been few studies that attempted to explore the variables that contribute to WTC through qualitative research inquiry, which includes both self-report WTC and behavioural WTC. The study of Xie (2011) revealed that the self-report WTC of rural Chinese secondary students did not predict the actual WTC behaviour of the selected students, which validates the idea of dual characteristics of WTC. It revealed factors that influence their WTC identified as self-confidence, self-perceived proficiency, international posture, identity interlocutors, and parental influence. In the similar study of Cao and Philp (2006), having the same instruments such as the WTC Scale questionnaire, classroom observations, and interview, their study had the same result as Xie's (2011). It further explains that students were most willing to speak when participating in group or pair work. It revealed the factors perceived by learners that influence WTC in class which were the group size, familiarity with the interlocutor(s), interlocutor(s)' participation, familiarity with topics under discussion, self-confidence, medium of communication and cultural background. Nagy and Nikolov (2007) probed a further qualitative study of WTC, which showed that a great majority of participants felt most willing to use English outside of the classroom although they have been attending English classes daily. Dominantly, participants were least willing to communicate in a formal language learning context and informal context. Factors revealed that inhibited them from communicating in English were: the perception that others were more proficient and linguistically experienced in English; cannot relate to the topic they were required to talk about; afraid of not being perfect; and communication apprehension. Moreover, Simic's (2014) study revealed that the topic of the speaking activity was identified as a strong influence on 254 Australian and Serbian speakers' WTC. It also showed that there is a general preference for speaking in groups rather than doing individual presentations, which was consistent in both schools. Furthermore, the predicted factors in the study were: preparedness, interest in the topic; speaking confidence; personality; relationship with interlocutor; perceived speaking skills of the interlocutor, task type, correction and grading, classroom atmosphere, and embarrassment factor.

In a recent study of Sener (2014), by quantitative and qualitative method, he ascertained that students' overall WTC in English was in between moderate and high, and their motivational intensity was very high both inside and outside. Correspondingly, the study of Berowa (2012) found that respondents sometimes used and were sometimes willing to communicate in English in different speech situations and that linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude, and personality were significant to the respondents' WTC in English. By employing semi-structured interviews and peer debriefing technique with interrater, Riasati's (2012) study showed that a number of factors affect speakers' WTC, which include task type, topic familiarity, topic interest, topic preparation, sex of interlocutor, age of interlocutor, familiarity with interlocutor, degree of interlocutor preparation, personality (shyness), teacher's role, class atmosphere, self-confidence, perceived speaking ability, grading of speech, and correctness of speech.

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1 Research Design**

This study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative approach was used in analyzing the numerical statistics of the gathered data from the questionnaires. On the other hand, a qualitative approach was administered in analyzing the classroom observation and for the semi-structured interview.

### **3.2 Participants**

The Grade 10 students during the school year 2015–2016 of Mindanao State University-University Training Center Experimental Campus were the subject of this study. All students from the three sections completed the questionnaires. Then, the result of the WTC Scale Questionnaire was converted to a percentage which was also converted to the descriptive equivalent of the collected data in order to distribute the data according to three levels of Willingness to Communicate (WTC), namely: low level, average level, and high-level WTC. From each level, two (2) students in every section were chosen by the fishbowl method. Based on the result, there were no students categorized in the low-level WTC. Therefore, in a section, there were a total of four (4) students who underwent observation and interview for the qualitative data instead of six. Overall, there were (12) students from three (3) sections.

### **3.3 Instrumentation**

The study employed instruments that included questionnaires, classroom observations, and semi-structured interviews. The WTC Scale questionnaire used in this study was taken from the study of Xie (2011). It was answered by a three (3) point Likert's Scale,

namely, never willing to communicate, sometimes willing to communicate, and always willing to communicate in each of the provided situations. This questionnaire was considered a self-report WTC. The second questionnaire was derived from the study of Simic (2014), which revealed the factors influencing students' willingness to communicate. To provide a contextualized account of students' WTC, classroom observations were employed. It examined respondents' WTC behaviour related to their participation in classroom discourse by a modified classroom observation scheme. The classroom observation scheme is categorized into two: (1) the interaction of the student and teacher, which involves answering/commenting and answering and asking questions; (2) the interaction of the student and the class or the other student like talking to seatmate or other group and presenting or responding opinion to the class. Moreover, a semi-structured form of interview was also conducted with the selected students to gather greater insight from them.

### **3.4 Data Gathering Procedures**

There were three (3) stages in the data gathering of the study. The first stage was the completion and collection of the WTC questionnaire and then to be succeeded by classroom observations of the twelve (12) students in the whole class setting that was conducted during their five (5) class sessions. The observed behaviours of the twelve (12) students were recorded to their corresponding categories through the observation scheme. They were observed during normal classroom activities, and there was no interaction between the respondents and the researchers/observers. Finally, the researchers had an interview with the selected students. Each interview was recorded by using an audio recorder in order to guarantee accurate data.

### **3.5 Data Analysis Procedures**

The collected data from the questionnaires was measured using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) that investigated the descriptive statistics of the self-report WTC. Thus, quantitative analysis was used. For the classroom observation, descriptive statistics were used in which the number of times each student participated was calculated for each observation respectively and then added to a total number at the end of all observations. Its results were converted to a percentage. The numerical results obtained from the questionnaire were converted to the descriptive equivalent of the collected data. The result was considered as Low level of WTC if it reaches 35 below; Average level of WTC if 36-70, and High level of WTC if it reaches 71 and above. In addition, the recordings of each student interview were transcribed by the researcher.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1 Self-report Willingness to Communicate in English**

The data revealed that the respondents are always willing to communicate in English when they say "thank you" and "sorry"; answer and help others to answer a question; participate in pair discussion, and introduce themselves without looking at notes. Moreover, most of the presented situations were answered by the respondents as sometimes willing to communicate in English. These situations are when they read out a textbook in class; greet their classmates; talk to their teacher before, during, and after their class; sing a song; present their opinion; volunteer an answer, and give a speech. Out of 15 statements, it depicts that they are not willing to communicate in English when they ask a question to their teacher privately. In addition, the overall mean of the extent of their willingness to communicate in English is 2.28 or sometimes willing to communicate.

The results imply that polite expressions like "thank you" and "sorry" seem to be automatic response and expressions. When the topic is related to oneself, respondents may willingly introduce themselves in English because it does not require factual information. However, as compared to the result, the respondents were sometimes willing to communicate in giving a speech, even looking at notes and reading out conversations in English from the textbook. This result indicates that knowing the topic is significant in communicating, which supports the claim of Nagy and Nikolov (2007) that when students are not familiar with the subject of the conversation, they feel less willing to talk in English. During the interview, the respondents confirmed: *"If I don't know what to say, then I will just look at my notes."* (R9) and *"If it is necessary, I look at my notes."* (R10). As analyzed, they use notes as a guide or help for them to speak English. It indicates that they find ways to have a successful language practice. Furthermore, the results show that the respondents are always willing to communicate in answering a question in English when asked by their teacher but sometimes willing to communicate when volunteering an answer in English. During the interview, they said that they were "nervous" when answering a question given by the teacher. It indicates that even though the students are "nervous", they are still always willing to communicate. This implies that the students are obligated to answer when called upon by the teacher, even if they do not know the answer. The idea of being obligated makes them speak. In other words, the presence of their teacher pressures them to communicate. They may not be willing to communicate at first, but it helps them to develop their WTC.

On the other hand, when they were asked during the interview about when they are willing to volunteer an answer if their teacher asks them a question, they answered the following: *"If I know the answer."*(R9) and *"When my classmates are all participating."* (R12). Their responses imply that what makes them communicate is when they have the knowledge of the topic being discussed. When they find themselves not participating while their classmates are, they tend to be active in the conversation or discussion. It suggests that they do not want to be left behind by their classmates. It proves that classmates contribute to their willingness to communicate. The Planned Behavior Theory (PBT) of Ajzen (1991) supports the response of the respondents to answering only

when their classmates are all participating. The PBT accentuates the normative beliefs which reflect the external influence on an individual's view about a particular behaviour. This means that a person can be inflicted with social pressure and can influence his decision in performing such behaviour by the judgment and opinions of significant others (Zhong, 2011).

When asking the teacher, a question in English privately, the respondents are not willing to communicate. However, during the interview, the respondents had a different response when asking the teacher, a question in English privately which was *"I ask my teacher in private because I am afraid to speak in English in front of them (my classmates) and also the words that come out from my mouth might be corrected (when asking in the class)."* (R8). Based on this response, it can be deciphered that respondents do not want their classmates to witness their poor speaking skills and proficiency. Even though they intend to clarify something to the teacher, they are conscious of the presence of their classmates. Because of it, it may hinder their interest to learn. With this scenario, it should be noted that asking a question to the teacher is one way of learning. As cited by Asaoka (2013), Vygotsky (1978) suggested in his Sociocultural Theory that active social interaction with others can lead to cognitive development. For Lightbrown and Spada (1999), if these activities will not allow interaction, learners cannot be expected to develop the oral skills required for successful communication.

Generally, the level of willingness to communicate in English of the respondents is "sometimes willing to communicate", which implies that they communicate depending on the situation they encounter. They have the tendency to communicate to others or not to communicate at all. It does not mean that they are undecided, but they vary the situation first before speaking, which makes them sometimes willing to communicate. From this result, it can be drawn that there are factors and circumstances that hinder them from successful language practice. These factors may include anxiety, perceived interlocutors' skills, interest in the topic, and the likes.

#### **4.2. Behavioral Willingness to Communicate in English**

Most of the selected respondents are willing to engage in volunteering, an answer which includes raising their hand. Many of them also present their own opinion in class, give an answer to their teachers' questions and talk to their seatmates. However, they rarely volunteer a comment and ask their teacher a question and clarification. Furthermore, as reflected on their result, they were not willing to give an answer to the individual student and respond to an opinion. They also never guess the meaning of any unknown word mentioned in the class.

The findings suggest that respondents are likely to engage in answering the questions and presenting their opinion willingly. The number of times answering questions occurred was nearly the same as the rate when they presented their opinion. They took part in volunteering a comment in regards to what the teacher said. Based on their answers in the interview, they volunteer in answering the question when they have the knowledge of the question being asked and accurate information on hand.

Furthermore, during the observation, they also provided answers in response to the teacher's questions; some had done it individually while others did it in chorus with their classmates. Such a case implies that students participate and manifest willingness to communicate if they perform in a group to hide from their fear to work and presenting individually. In other words, respondents do know the answer in regards to the teacher's question, but prior to their way of answering, those respondents who answered individually have seemingly higher speaking confidence than those respondents who had answered in chorus.

Surprisingly, four of the situations received no observed WTC. These circumstances occur when they give an answer to the individual student and to their teacher through private response; guess the meaning of an unknown word, and respond to an opinion. These suggest that respondents do not have much interest in such situations mentioned above. Rather, they are likely to engage in situations of their interest and when they are in the frame of their mind. It is observed that there is no such unknown word mentioned during the class because the students and the teacher do not prefer to use unfamiliar terms when having a discussion or conversation. Moreover, giving an answer to a teacher through private response is not an observable act and cannot be examined. It is impossible for the students to give their responses privately during the class. As observed, the respondents had no opportunity to give their answers to their classmates. Instead, they wait for their teacher to ask them questions regarding their discussion. They did not react to the opinion of their classmates. It suggests that there was no interaction between each student. Thus, interaction only happens between the teacher and students, which is linked to willingness to communicate in English. Williams and Burden (1997) underlined the significance of the interaction between teachers and learners and their peers, for they contribute to the process of learning. This proves that interaction provides learners opportunities to use the second language (L2); however, it did not occur in the classes.

#### **4.3. Factors Influence Willingness to Communicate**

The result revealed that the respondents generally agreed on 12 statements which comprise six factors that influence their willingness to communicate like the speaking confidence when speaking; perceived speaking skills of their classmate; personality

towards English practice; relationship with interlocutor either classmates or native speakers; task type in individual or group; and the classroom atmosphere. They completely agreed on the rest of the factors such as being embarrassed inside the classroom; committing mistakes, familiarity and interest with the topic; and being prepared in speaking English. It should be noted that the greater the mean of the factor, the more it affects or influences their willingness to communicate. Thus, the lesser the mean, the least it affects or influences WTC. With this, statistically, it ascertained that speaking confidence has a great influence (2.32) on the respondents' WTC while preparedness has the least influence (1.33) on their WTC.

***Factor 1: Speaking Confidence***

During the classroom observation, the researchers did not perceive the apparent speaking confidence of the respondents, which contradicts their statement describing that they agreed of being confident when speaking English and were satisfied with their speaking skills. This implies that respondents knew within themselves they were confident enough. In the interview, respondent 8 said, "I can't find the right words to use and say." The response of R8 can be explained that lack of grammatical competence may lead to difficulty in expressing and articulating one's thoughts in an actual speech. Because of this, anxiety exists. The affective filter hypothesis of Krashen (1982) claimed that learners with high motivation, self-confidence, a good self-image, and a low level of anxiety could lead to successful language use. On the other hand, low motivation, low self-esteem, and deliberating anxiety can increase the affective filters and can mentally block the learners from acquiring the language.

***Factor 2: Interlocutor***

The respondents only agreed that they are confident when speaking with peers because they knew that peers can cause anxiety and that they may make fun of them. However, they completely agreed on like to speak with the foreigners, which confirmed that even though they do not have the opportunity to communicate with them, they still like to speak. Regardless of the result above, during the interview, they clarified that they still prefer to communicate in English to their peers. In the study of Nagy and Nikolov (2007), they indicated that language anxiety comes from the learners' view to their classmates that they were more capable and more linguistically skilled than. However, Pattapong (2010) argued that speakers of L2 felt more relaxed to communicate with their peers because they are concerned about how familiar they felt with their peers; how they perceived the attitudes and characteristics of their peers; and how they evaluated their peers' English proficiency compared to them.

***Factor 3: Personality***

The respondents showed signs of contradictions with their answers in the given statements. They completely agreed that they like speaking in English, but they had only agreed to be at ease when speaking during English class. During the interview, the response of R12 implies that he/she has no interest in speaking English, while the responses of R1 and R3 suggest that they give importance and interest in speaking English and the language itself. Moreover, the R7 who said that "...I am shy" signifies that he/she is an introvert, while the respondent who considered speaking English as fun and enjoyable insinuates that he/she is an extrovert. Some of their responses also denote a complete desire to speak in English, but when put in a situation, their desire has lessened because "it turns out an epic fail", or they feel "shy". In contrast to this case, according to Riasati & Noordin (2011), learners who perceive that they are competent in communicating are more confident in interacting with others. Thus, one's perception of his/her capacity and competence can greatly influence his/her degree of WTC.

***Factor 4: Task Type***

As reflected in the results, it can be drawn that the respondents prefer to work with a group than with their own. Working with the group may be their way to express their feelings and thoughts comprehensively because they could not possibly be hindered by factors that affect their willingness to speak. They find it advantageous because they have the choice not to communicate to their group mates, unlike presenting individually wherein they cannot find room to escape from the crowd. This result has the same findings as Cao and Philp (2006) and Riasati (2012) that students were most willing to communicate in a group or pair work because they find an opportunity to learn from others and they have more time to discuss a topic. However, Berowa (2012) uttered that students who work in pairs or groups might resort to using their first language (L1) when talking to each other.

***Factor 5: Class Atmosphere***

Respondents "agree" that they need to feel relaxed when speaking to the class. In the classroom, the researchers cannot completely identify whether the classroom is in a positive atmosphere because only the respondents themselves feel it because of their perceived distractions. The researchers interpret the kind of class atmosphere based on their actions. The researchers observed that they stutter and use code-switching while speaking in English during their English class. These observed performances confirm that they are not feeling relaxed, which prevents them from learning and practising the language. These findings are corroborated by Berowa's (2012), who said that using the target language in a formal setting like the classroom is a daunting and tension-filled experience. Furthermore, Krashen (1982) explained that a supportive, stress-free and positive atmosphere has already been identified as a prerequisite for successful language learning.

*Factor 6 and 7: Embarrassment factor, Correction and Grading*

Furthermore, as reflected in their result, the respondents' level of liking to speak is so high that they even find mistakes as a sign of learning and that they were not depressed. But during observation, their level of liking to speak was not perceived by the researchers due to some factors. Such factors may include anxiety and nervousness, and lack of confidence. Respondents confirmed that they are still motivated to speak even if they are corrected in order to improve their language skills. Moreover, during the interview, they verified that the classroom is a place to practice their speaking skills and their grammatical competence. They are able to compare themselves in the classroom by observing the performance of their classmates. They find it advantageous for they are able to correct and improve themselves on their own. This idea is supported by Asaoka (2013), who considered the classroom as a "safe" place for language practice and can be a means to develop WTC.

*Factor 8: Topic*

The findings also propose that when respondents find such a topic to be interesting, this will drive them to like it and that they would engage themselves to talk. Therefore, the more they get interested, the more they like it, and the more they give importance to speaking English. R8 responded, "I am willing to communicate if I know the topic in order for me to express more my ideas." From this response, familiarity with the topic is significant for them. As this idea thoroughly expounded in the previous interpretations, it also implies that when they are asked spontaneously to speak something that they have no knowledge of, they will not be able to express their thoughts. Thus, it will make them not willing to communicate.

*Factor 9: Speaking Confidence*

It can be drawn from the result that they need to prepare before speaking in English inside the classroom. As observed during a classroom observation, the researchers perceived that respondents were not prepared because some of them remained silent and restless in their seats. As analyzed from their responses during the interview, they prepare because they are anticipating mistakes and errors when communicating. Thus, effective interaction needs preparation. From a psychological perspective, WTC represents the psychological preparedness in language use. For Xie (2011), it has distinctive importance in disclosing learner's communication psychology and encouraging communication engagement, particularly in the classroom. This perspective is often considered as the main cause of the frequency of using L2 (Yu, Li, & Gou, 2011). It has been confirmed that background knowledge of the topic being discussed is decisive when it comes to the level of an individual's willingness to communicate (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Following this discovery, it could be concluded that students' WTC would automatically increase if they were provided with a chance to prepare themselves before speaking (Simic, 2014).

In general, the factors that influence WTC may also be affected by other predicted factors as reflected in the collected data. Some factors overlap, and some are associated with another factor. It only means that a factor could be the cause of the emergence of another factor. In other words, some factors are interrelated to each other – it could be a causal factor or the effect of another factor.

**4.4. Relationship between Self-report WTC and Behavioral WTC**

It is indicated that the significance value is 0.513, which is greater than 0.05. This means that there is no notable association between the variables. The respondents' self-report WTC is not affected by their behavioural WTC. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. This result was supported by the study of Xie (2011), which also revealed that self-report WTC did not predict the actual WTC behaviour of the students. Similarly, Cao and Philp (2006) have the same findings as to the current study. These findings further validate the idea of dual characteristics of WTC. Thus, if students reported a high level of willingness to communicate, they do not necessarily tend to participate more inside the classroom. Bradley (2013) elucidated that learners with a low level of WTC may possess linguistic knowledge and communicative competence; however, it is only they who lack practice and speaking skills upon engaging any discourse even they are given the opportunity to speak.

**5. Conclusion**

After a thorough discussion and careful analysis of data, evidence shows that the respondents were sometimes willing to communicate in English. It suggests that respondents' willingness to communicate varies depending on the situations they are engaged in. Moreover, the most observable act of the respondents was "volunteering an answer". Situations such as "Give answer to individual student"; "Guess the meaning of an unknown word"; and "Response to an opinion" were unobservable acts of the respondents. Evidence also shows that their willingness to communicate was mostly influenced by the speaking confidence factor. It implies that respondents perceive themselves as confident, but this perception was opposed as observed by the researchers during a classroom observation. On the contrary, the factor which had the least influence on their willingness to communicate was preparedness. This denotes the idea that being prepared is the key to successful speaking and learning. The investigation concludes that respondents vary situations before willing to communicate. On the other hand, the results of self-report WTC and behavioural WTC were not correlated. Hence, self-report WTC and behavioural WTC had no significant relationship.

Finally, due to some aspects that are not discussed in this paper, future researchers are suggested to study further this kind of topic, especially the variable, behavioural WTC, to find out more about it in their locality which may include the teacher as a validator on students' behavioural WTC; try to make a study on the willingness to communicate outside the classroom, and try to conduct a study on the willingness to communicate in English of the non-English subject teachers. It may give a new perspective and new findings of WTC.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**ORCID iD :** Sittie Aina T. Pandapatan <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6240-9587>

## References

- [1] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50, 179-211.
- [2] Allahyar, N. & Nazari, A. (2012). Potentiality of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory in Exploring the Role of Teacher Perceptions, Expectations and Interaction Strategies. *WoPaLP, Vol.6*. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [3] Asaoka, N. (2013). Willingness to Communicate – Group Dynamics and Seating Allocation at Beginning Level Japanese. *Polyglossia*, Vol. 25. Retrieved: 14.06.15
- [4] Berowa, A.M. (2012). Factors Affecting the Willingness to Communicate in English among Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP) Programs Students. Unpublished Masteral Thesis, MSU Marawi City.
- [5] Bradley, N. (2013). Promoting a Willingness to Communicate in Japanese Students. Retrieved: July 14, 2015.
- [6] Cao, Y. & Jiaotong, X. (2012). Willingness to Communicate and Communication Quality in ESL Classrooms. *TESL Reporter* 45, (1&2), 18-36. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [7] Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A Comparison of behaviour in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *The system*, 34(4), 480-493.
- [8] Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53, 3-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467>
- [9] Kang, S.-J. (2005). Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *The system*, 33, 277-292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.10.004> Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [10] Kim, S.J. (2004). Exploring willingness to communicate (WTC) in English among Korean EFL (English as a foreign language) students in Korea: WTC as a predictor of success in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Ohio.
- [11] Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon. [http://www.sdkrashen.com/Principles\\_and\\_Practice/Principles\\_and\\_Practice.pdf](http://www.sdkrashen.com/Principles_and_Practice/Principles_and_Practice.pdf). Retrieved: August 04, 2015
- [12] Lightbrown, P. & Spada, N. (1999). How languages are learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2009). Reticence in Chinese EFL students at varying proficiency levels. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2): 65-61
- [14] Lucarz, M.B (2014). Pronunciation Anxiety and Willingness to Communicate in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [15] MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in an L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545-62.
- [16] MacIntyre, P., Babin, P., & Clement, R. (1999). Willingness to Communicate: Antecedents and Consequences. *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 2, 215-229. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [17] McCroskey, J. E., & Baer, J. E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention Denver, CO.
- [18] Nagy, B. & Nikolov, M. (2007). A qualitative inquiry into Hungarian English majors' willingness to communicate in English: Classroom perspectives. *UPRT 2007: Empirical studies in English applied linguistics* (149-168). Pecs: Lingua Franca Csoport. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [19] Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 443-456.
- [20] Pattapong, K. (2010). Willingness to communicate in a second language: A qualitative study of issues affecting Thai EFL learners from students' and teachers' point of view. The University of Sydney. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [21] Riasati, M.J. & Noordin, N. (2011). Antecedents of Willingness to Communicate: A Review of Literature. *Studies in Literature and Language* 3 (2). 74-80. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [22] Riasati, M.J. (2012). EFL Learners' Perception of Factors Influencing Willingness to Speak English in Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Study. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 17 (10), 1287-1297. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [23] Sener, S. (2014). Turkish ELT students' willingness to communicate in English. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics, ELT Research Journal*, 3(2). 91-109. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [24] Simic, I. (2014). Willingness to Communicate: A comparison between Austrian and Serbian students. Karl-Franzens University, Graz, Austria. Retrieved: July 13, 2015
- [25] Simic, M. & Tanaka, T. (2008). Language Context in the Willingness to Communicate research Works: A Review. Retrieved: 14.06.15
- [26] Suksawas, W. (2011). A Sociocultural study of EFL learners' willingness to communicate. The University of Wollongong. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3427>. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [27] Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 285-304.



- 
- [28] Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [29] Wang, Y. & Erlam, R. (2011). Willingness to Communicate in the Japanese language classroom: An Inquiry Learning Project in a Year 7 Classroom. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, Vol. 37. Retrieved: June 14, 2015
- [30] Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Xie, Q. (2011). Willingness to communicate in English among secondary students in the rural Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. Auckland University of Technology. Retrieved: August 06, 2015
- [32] Yu, H., Li, H., & Gou, X. (2011). The personality-based variables and their correlations underlying willingness to communicate. *Asian Social Science*, 7(3), 253-257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n3p253>
- [33] Zhong, Q. (2013). Understanding Chinese learners' willingness to communicate in a New Zealand ESL classroom: A multiple case study drawing on the theory of planned behaviour. *System* 41. 740-751. Retrieved: July 13, 2015