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ABSTRACT

Many Korean EFL students are eager to acquire English proficiency. Despite their eagerness and hard work, Korean students seem to have been unsuccessful in achieving their goal. L2 researchers argue that willingness to communicate (WTC) in L2 is one of the best predictors determining success in L2 acquisition, in association with the perspective that the more active L2 students are with L2 use, the greater possibility they have to develop L2 proficiency. It might be important for Korean students to understand what affects WTC in English to enhance the possibility to acquire English proficiency. In explaining the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC in L2, MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized a heuristic model in accordance with the perspective that “authentic communication in a L2 can be seen as the result of a complex of interrelated variables” (p. 547). They claimed that their heuristic model can provide pedagogical use for L2 education.

The current study examined the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model in explaining WTC in English among Korean students before its application to the Korean context. It was assumed that the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model relies on the determination of whether WTC is more trait-like than situational. WTC can be “a trait-like predisposition…relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey et al., 1991, p. 23). WTC can also be situational in that L2 students’ levels of WTC will be different according to
communication situations (McCroskey et al., 1998). The current study employed structural equation modeling that enables the examination of interrelated dependence relationships in a single model (Hair et al., 1998), and collected data from 191 Korean university students by using 10 survey instruments employed from previous studies. Depending on data analysis, the researcher concluded that implying WTC is more likely to be trait-like than situational, MacIntyre et al.’s model was reliable in the Korean context, and that Korean students’ low levels of WTC in English might be responsible for their less successful results in English learning. Based on the findings and the literature review, the current study discusses pedagogical implications for L2 education.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The recent world-wide expansion of international trade and electronic communication has generated a renewed focus of attention on the importance of second/foreign language (L2) education. The Korean government has come to acknowledge the importance of L2 education, and to encourage Korean people to develop their L2 proficiency, especially English proficiency. The Korean government believes that as a medium of world-wide communication, the English proficiency of Korean people can enable Korea to secure greater benefits from diplomacy and trade with other countries by enabling them to communicate more clearly and effectively (Korean Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 2). In an effort to achieve this goal, in 1997 the Korean government modified the national curriculum of English education to motivate Korean students to focus on developing their communicative competence in English rather than their grammatical and reading skills. Along with the Korean government’s effort, many, if not most, Korean people are eager to develop their English communicative competence, or to guide their children to develop English proficiency to become successful in Korean society. In Korea, many social phenomena clearly depict how eager Korean people are to
acquire English proficiency. As a very good example, some Korean parents take their children to the hospital for surgery in the belief that the surgery can enable their children to develop English proficiency with accurate English pronunciation skills (Kim, January 3). Despite their eagerness and hard work, Korean people seem to have been less than successful in acquiring English proficiency. Korea ranked 119th in the world in the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) test in 2002, even though Korea has ranked first among the countries that are members of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in spending money on English education (Shin, 2002, October 2). Reflecting on their sincere eagerness and effort, Korean people must be frustrated with the result and wonder why they have had limited success in acquiring English proficiency and what can lead to their success in the attainment of English proficiency.

It seems that the studies conducted by researchers in Korea have been insufficient to explain what may cause the difficulty of Korean students in developing English proficiency. Probably because of this, many Korean people believe that their difficulty is ascribable to reasons such as unproductive teaching methods (Li, 1998), their difficulty of pronouncing English accurately (Kim, January 3), and the different ways of breathing of Korean people and native speakers of English while speaking English; it is allegedly believed that Korean people will exhale to speak English while American people will inhale to speak English (Heo, 2002, May 9; Jeong, 2001; Kang, 2003, August 8). None of the reasons proposed, however, seem to be supported by theories or English educators in Korea (Kang, 2003, August 8).
L2 researchers have attempted to explore what factors can determine individual differences in the success of SLA (second language acquisition). L2 researchers have hypothesized that affective variables cause individual differences in L2 learning behaviors, which in turn produce individual differences in the success of SLA since some L2 learning behaviors are productive while others are less productive or counterproductive (see Oller & Perkin, 1978; Rubin, 1975). Several important affective factors, such as personality, attitudes, motivation, self-confidence, and language anxiety, have been identified to explain individual differences in SLA (Onwuebuzie, Bailey, & Daley, 2000; Gardner, 1985, 1988; MacIntyre, 1994; Schumann, 1975). However, it appears that none of those identified affective variables can alone explain individual differences, seemingly because those factors may be interrelated with one another in affecting individual differences in the success of SLA. For example, less anxious L2 students appear to have more self-confidence in and positive attitudes toward learning their target L2, which in turn leads to more successful outcomes of SLA. In addition, less anxious L2 students tend to have stronger motivation to learn their target L2 (see Clément et al., 1994; Ely, 1986; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Onwuebuzie et al., 2000; Yashima, 2002). Given the interrelations among these affective variables, it is probably inappropriate to explain individual differences in SLA based on a single affective variable. Thus, a more comprehensive theoretical model that can account for the interrelations among affective variables is needed to explain individual differences in SLA more comprehensively (see MacIntyre et al, 1998).
In an effort to institute a more comprehensive theoretical model to describe the interrelations among affective variables influencing individual differences in the success of language acquisition, language researchers have conceptualized “willingness-to-communicate” (WTC), which is defined as a language student’s intention to initiate communication when he/she is free to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre et al., 1998; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Yashima, 2002). The theoretical concept of WTC has evolved from the perspectives of many language researchers and empirical studies that have tested affective variables in order to identify the constructs of WTC. Burgoon (1976) introduced “unwillingness-to-communicate” (UWTC) as a tendency to avoid oral communication in order to describe individual differences in language behaviors. McCroskey and Baer (1985) conceptualized and introduced WTC to L1 (first language) education for the purpose of explaining individual differences in L1 communication behaviors, by inverting the negative orientation of Burgoon’s UWTC into a positive orientation. Eventually, MacIntyre et al. (1998) adapted the theoretical concept of WTC to explore individual differences in L2 communication behaviors.

Language researchers have included a number of affective variables in explaining an individual’s WTC. They seem to acknowledge that many affective variables influence WTC, thus implying that a single affective variable cannot explain an individual’s WTC. Burgoon tried to explain UWTC, which he regarded as a chronic tendency to avoid or devalue oral communication, with five constructs: anomia, alienation, introversion, self-esteem, and communication apprehension. The five constructs of UWTC will be discussed in the early section of Chapter 2 of this study. On the other hand, MacIntyre (1994) attempted to explain WTC with the five basic constructs identified by Burgoon
(1976) plus the affective variable “perceived competence.” Later, Yashima (2002) explained a L2 student’s WTC with four affective variables: attitude, language motivation, L2 competence, and self-confidence in L2. It is probable that their decisions to include different affective variables in explaining WTC reflect their acknowledgement of the theoretical perspective that there are a number of affective variables with the potential to influence an individual’s WTC. In fact, MacIntyre et al. (1998), who conceptualized a heuristic model of WTC in a L2, claim that there are a number of affective variables that have a potential impact on WTC. In accordance with this, it seems that an individual’s WTC may be one of the significant factors that can explain the interrelations among affective variables influencing individual differences in SLA.

L2 researchers have hypothesized that as affective variables influence individual differences in the success of SLA through their effects on L2 learning behaviors, WTC generates individual differences in L2 communication behaviors, which in turn produces individual differences in the attainment of L2 proficiency (Oller & Perkins, 1978; Rubin, 1975). Generally speaking, L2 researchers agree that L2 students who are more active with L2 use have more potential to develop L2 communication competence (Gardner, 1985, 1988; Long, 1982, cited in Strong, 1983). On the basis of the theoretical perspectives that WTC is one of the important factors explaining interrelations among affective variables and that WTC can lead to success in L2 acquisition, it is likely that understanding what affective variables influence an individual’s WTC can help to explain interrelations among affective variables influencing individual differences in SLA. Along with this, it is probable that if English educators in Korea understand the theoretical concept of WTC, they can help Korean students develop their English
proficiency by explaining to their students what affective variables influence WTC in L2 and how WTC can influence individual differences in the attainment of English proficiency. This can enable Korean students to experience greater success in developing English proficiency.

1.2 Problem statement

MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized a heuristic model of WTC in L2 in order to explain the interrelations among affective variables influencing the WTC in L2. The heuristic model is associated with the perspective that “authentic communication in a L2 can be seen as the result of a complex system of interrelated variables” (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547). The heuristic model is also associated with the perspective that the L2 student’s intention to communicate (WTC) is significantly connected to his/her actual L2 communication (see also Ajzen, 1988). The researcher of the current study will discuss MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of the L2 WTC in detail in Chapter 2.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that their heuristic model is both theoretical and practical in explaining WTC as the result of a complex system of interrelated affective variables influencing individual differences in SLA. According to MacIntyre et al., their heuristic model is theoretical because its conceptualization is based on a number of affective variables that have been identified by empirical studies as influencing SLA and L2 communication, rather than on a single affective variable. MacIntyre et al. further argue that their model is practical in explaining why some L2 students are willing to communicate in L2 even with limited L2 competence, whereas other L2 students are reluctant to interact and communicate with members of their target L2 community even
with sufficient L2 competence, since their model considers “WTC as the final step in preparing the language learner for communication, because it represents the probability that a learner will use the language in authentic interaction with another individual, given the opportunity” (p. 558). Their argument seems to be associated with the perspective that the more active L2 students are with L2 use, the greater possibility they have to develop L2 proficiency (Gardner, 1985, 1988; Long, 1982, cited in Strong, 1983).

In explaining the diversity of WTC among L2 students, MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that their heuristic model can be utilized in practical and pedagogical use. The researcher of the current study assumes that MacIntyre et al.’s model can offer a practical method of explaining the diversity of WTC in L2 among Korean students who are learning English as an L2 in Korea. This researcher’s assumption is grounded in the theoretical perspective that WTC can be “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991, p. 23). Because of the consistency of the personality trait of WTC in L2 learning, the level of an L2 student’s WTC in a communicative context (e.g., talking in a small group) is argued to be predictable on the basis of his/her level of WTC in other contexts (e.g., making a speech in public, talking in a meeting, and talking in a dyad). In other words, the personality trait of WTC seems to enable MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model to explain the diversity of WTC among L2 students across L2 communicative contexts. Thus, it might be reasonable to expect that MacIntyre et al.’s model conceptualized in an ESL context can also explain individual differences in WTC among Korean students learning English as an L2 in Korea as an EFL context.
In spite of the predictability of WTC due to its personality trait construct, the pedagogical application of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model (1998) to the Korean context needs to withstand a thorough examination of the model’s reliability in explaining the WTC of Korean students in L2. Along with the personality trait construct, WTC is also situational in that the level of an L2 student’s WTC will be different according to communication situations (McCroskey & Richmond, 1998). In association with McCroskey and Richmond’s theoretical perspective (1998), language researchers have identified a number of situational affective variables that have potential impact on the level of an individual’s WTC. Affective variables such as the degree of acquaintance between the speaker and the receiver, the number of receivers, the degree of familiarity with the topic being discussed, the degree of formality of the communication context, and the degree of the speaker’s perception of others’ evaluation have been identified as situational variables that can differentiate the level of WTC. For example, it is likely that an L2 student’s level of WTC in a small group will be different from that in a dyad, and his/her level of WTC with a friend will be different from that with a stranger. Because of the situational characteristics of WTC, an L2 student’s level of WTC in a communicative situation is difficult to predict depending on other communicative situations (see MacIntyre et al., 1998; McCroskey, 1991; McCroskey & Richmond, 1998). McCroskey and Richmond (1991, 1998) argue that if WTC is more likely to be situational than trait-like, L2 educators should examine language learning in a variety of communicative contexts before applying a model of WTC to a specific communicative context. In accordance with this perspective, MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model (1998), developed in an ESL (English as a second language) context on the basis of studies performed mainly
in ESL contexts, could potentially explain the WTC in L2 of Korean students in Korea, an EFL (English as a foreign language) context. More importantly, Yashima (2002) argues that “since the ethnolinguistic vitality of a language itself is a variable influencing L2 learning affect, a careful examination of what it means to language learning in a particular context is necessary before applying a model from a different context” (p 62). In regard to these concerns, the present study is intended to examine whether or not MacIntyre et al.’s model is reliable in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean students prior to its pedagogical application of the model in the Korean context as an EFL context different from ESL contexts.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The primary goal of the current study is to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 in explaining the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC in English among Korean students learning English as a foreign language in Korea. The researcher of the current study assumes that WTC is one of the most important factors determining the success of SLA, and that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC is more comprehensive than others currently available in explaining individual differences in WTC in L2. To be specific, this researcher attempts to apply MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean students, in order to help Korean students acquire English proficiency more successfully by explaining what determines success in the attainment of English proficiency by Korean students. However, the researcher of the current study believes that it is necessary to examine whether or not MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model can
explain the diversity of WTC among Korean students learning English in Korea as an EFL context before the pedagogical application of the model to the Korean context for practical use for English education. The researcher’s belief is grounded in the perspective that the applicability of the model to the Korean context is dependent on the determination of whether or not WTC is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts (trait-like) than inconsistent (situational) depending on L2 communicative contexts.

In order to examine the applicability of MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC to Korea as an EFL context, the researcher of the current study has formulated and will test a structural model depicting the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC; the structural model corresponds to MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC that was conceptualized on the basis of empirical studies and theories in SLA. The structural model will be tested by the research method of structural equation modeling (SEM), which enables the examination of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships in a single model (Hair et al., 1998). In establishing the structural model, the researcher follows the theoretical perspective that in a study with SEM, a researcher is able to predict relationships between and correlations among variables. Furthermore, the researcher believes that his ability to predict such relationships is based on theories with which the researcher can justify his decision to include or omit any relationship between or among variables. The theories for justification also support the assumption that all causal relationships are indicated in the structural model (Hair et al., 1998).
1.4 Research questions

The primary goal of the current study is to examine whether MacIntyre et al.’s model can be reliable in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean students learning English in Korea as an EFL context. To examine the applicability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998) to Korea, the researcher of the current study will establish and test a structural model depicting the interrelationships among affective variables influencing WTC on the basis of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC. The basic assumption for this test is that the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model in explaining WTC is dependent on the determination of whether WTC is trait-like or situational. WTC can be identified as “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991, p. 23). The researcher of the current study will determine whether WTC is trait-like or situational by comparing the results of the current study with those of a study by Yashima (2002), which is one of the most recent studies that have tested the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC in Japan as an EFL context. Yashima (2002) performed a study with 297 university students in order to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in explaining the interrelationships among affective variables with the potential to influence WTC in L2 of Japanese university students learning English as a foreign language. Based on the findings, Yashima concluded that MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC would be reliable in explaining an individual’s WTC across L2 communication contexts irrespective of EFL or ESL contexts. The researcher of the present study assumes that the present study will achieve results similar to those from Yashima’s study (2002) if WTC is a personality based, trait-
like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts, irrespective of the distinction between EFL and ESL contexts or the different L2 learning contexts within EFL contexts. The following questions grounded in the theoretical backgrounds will be addressed.

The main question of the current study is “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English and what affect their willingness to communicate in English?” To answer the main question, the researcher of the current study establishes the following two secondary questions.

1. What are the relations among Korean university students' WTC in English, Confidence in English Communication, English Learning Motivation, and Attitudes Toward the International Community?

2. What do the findings of this study imply for the determination of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts?

1.5 Significance of the study

Many, if not most, Korean students are eager to acquire English proficiency in order to enter universities, secure admission to better universities, or achieve higher social standings. In Korea, social phenomena clearly demonstrate how eager Korean students are to achieve English proficiency. Yet, despite their eagerness, Korean students appear to fall short of complete success in achieving their goal. As previously discussed, to enhance the probability of their developing English proficiency, it is important for Korean students to understand what factors determine individual differences in success in
the attainment of English proficiency. WTC, the result of a complex system of interrelated affective variables, is hypothesized to produce individual differences in the attainment of L2 proficiency, by generating individual differences in L2 communication behaviors. L2 researchers are likely to agree that L2 students who are more active with L2 use will have more potential to develop L2 communication competence. Some students who are high in linguistic competence are reluctant to communicate in L2, whereas others with only minimal linguistic knowledge are willing to communicate in L2 whenever opportunities are available. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that WTC is the final step in preparing L2 students for L2 use: That is, more willing-to-communicate students can be more successful in SLA, if they have more opportunities to converse with speakers of their target L2. Due to the importance of WTC, MacIntyre et al. argue that it is essential for L2 educators to design L2 teaching pedagogy and programs that can enhance L2 students’ WTC. In order to achieve this goal, L2 educators should first understand what factors affect L2 students’ diversity in WTC. The students themselves should also understand the importance of WTC and what affective variables determine their degree of WTC, in order to become more successful in learning a L2.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) claim that their conceptualized heuristic model of WTC can provide pedagogical and practical use for L2 education. MacIntyre et al. further claim that as it takes into account both situational and trait-like variables influencing WTC, their heuristic model is more comprehensive than others in explaining the interactive effect of affective variables on WTC and the way to increase L2 students’ WTC. The researcher of this study assumes that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC can enable English educators in Korea to understand what affective variables
determine the diversity of WTC among Korean students learning English as an L2, and to
design L2 teaching pedagogy and programs that can enhance the students’ WTC in
English. The heuristic model can also enable Korean students to become more successful
in achieving English proficiency by helping them understand what factors determine the
diversity of WTC among them and how to increase their WTC to enhance their success in
the attainment of English proficiency. Therefore, it is anticipated that the pedagogical
application of the model to the Korean context will be important for English teachers and
students in Korea as they seek to help their students in developing English proficiency or
for enabling the students themselves to attain success in developing English proficiency.
However, as advised previously, the application of the model developed in ESL contexts
to Korea as an EFL context should follow an examination of the reliability of the model
in explaining WTC in L2 of Korean students in Korea. Therefore, the present study
which is designed to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC
in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean students, will contribute to the
development of English education in Korea.

1.6 Definitions of key terms

Ary et al. (2002) state that the operational definition in a study can be described as
either a measured definition or an experimental definition. A measured definition
explains how the researcher measures a construct in performing a study. For example,
English language proficiency can be operationally referred to as scores on the TOEFL
test. On the other hand, an experimental definition describes in detail certain
experimental conditions that the researcher can produce in a study. For example, “the
operational definition of frustration in a research study may take the form of preventing subjects from reaching a goal” (Ary et al., 2002, p. 31). Ary et al. claim that the operational definition of a concept can be arbitrary, although the researcher is guided by his own experience, and knowledge, and by the work of other researchers. Based on this, definitions of key terms in the current study will be either measured or experimental.

**ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts:** Oxford and Shearin (1994) state that “a second language is the one that is learned in a location where that language is typically used as the main vehicle of everyday communication” (p. 14). For example, English is spoken for daily communication in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. Therefore, ESL contexts can be defined as the English learning contexts where English is spoken for the medium of daily communication.

**EFL (English as a Foreign Language) contexts:** Oxford and Shearin (1994) state that “a foreign language is one that is learned in a place where that language is not typically used as the medium of ordinary of communication (for example, French as it is usually learned in the U.S.)” (p. 14). Thus, EFL contexts can be described as English learning contexts where English is not spoken as a medium of daily communication. Korea, where people speak Korean as the native language, is one of EFL contexts.

**WTC (Willingness to Communicate):** Willingness to communicate in L2 refers to the L2 student’s intention or desire to communicate in L2 when he/she is free to do so. The levels of the participants’ WTC in the current study will be measured by the WTC scale with 12 items developed by McCroskey (1992).

**The diversity in L2 WTC:** The diversity in L2 WTC refers to L2 students individual differences in L2 communication behaviors. Some L2 students high in L2 linguistic
competence are reluctant to communicate in L2 with members of the target L2 community, whereas other L2 students, even with minimal linguistic knowledge, seem to communicate in L2 whenever opportunities are available (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 545).

Reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC: The reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model (1998) will be assessed by the criteria that the model can explain the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC among Korean students, and the explained interrelations should correspond to the previous theories and empirical studies. It is assumed that the reliability of the model is dependent on the determination of whether WTC is more trait-like than situational.

Trait-like WTC: McCroskey and Richmond (1991) claim that WTC can be “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (p. 23). McCroskey and Richmond (1991) further claim that because of the consistency of the personality trait of WTC in L2 learning, the level of an student’s WTC in a communicative context (e.g., talking in a small group) is argued to be predictable on the basis of his/her level of WTC in other contexts (e.g., making a speech in public, talking in a meeting, and talking in a dyad).

Situational WTC: Along with the personality trait construct, WTC is also situational in that the level of an L2 student’s WTC will be different according to communication situations (McCroskey & Richmond, 1998). Affective variables such as the degree of familiarity with the topic being discussed, the degree of the formality of the communication context, and the degree of the speaker’s perception of others’ evaluation have been identified as situational variables that can differentiate the level of WTC. For example, it is likely that an L2 student’s level of WTC in a small group will be different
from that in a dyad, and his/her level of WTC with a friend will be different from that with a stranger. Because of the situational characteristics of WTC, an L2 student’s level of WTC in a communicative situation is difficult to predict depending on other communicative situations (see MacIntyre et al., 1998; McCroskey, 1991; McCroskey & Richmond, 1998).

**Attitudes (International posture):** The definition of attitudes in this study refers to Davidson’s statement (1980) that “an attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in an evaluative (from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable) manner toward some attitude object” (cited in Gudykunst, 2004, p. 130). ESL students may form their attitudes to learning English in accordance with their direct contact with native English speakers, while EFL students may shape their attitudes toward learning English through education and exposure to media (see Dörnyei, 1990; Yashima, 2002). In EFL contexts where students can seldom have direct contact with native speakers of English, “English seems to represent something vaguer and larger than the American community in the minds of young EFL students” (Yashima, 2000, cited in Yashima, 2002, p. 57). It seems probable that EFL students may view “English as something that connects them to foreign countries and foreigners or strangers in Gudykunst’s (1991) sense, with whom they can communicate by using English” (Yashima, 2002, p. 57). On the basis of this perspective, Korean students’ attitudes can be defined by the inclination to assume an “International Posture” (see Yashima, 2002, p. 57). The researcher of the current study will assess Korean students’ attitudes toward learning English by their International Posture, which can be measured by four instruments assessing International Friendship
Orientation in Learning English, Interest in International Vocation/Activities, Interest in Foreign Affairs, and Intergroup Approach and Avoidance Tendency (see Yashima, 2002).

**Motivation:** Gardner (1985) suggests that motivation refers to “the combination of effort and desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 361). In this study, motivation will be assessed by three components: Desire to Learn English, Motivational Intensity, and Attitudes Toward Learning English. Desire to Learn English is relevant to the participants’ desire to achieve a high level of competence in English. Motivational Intensity is related to the amount of effort the participants expend in learning English. Attitudes towards Learning English refer to effects the participants may experience while learning English.

**Self-confidence:** Ganschow and Sparks (1991) suggest that self-confidence can be defined as the language student’s perception of the ease of L2 learning. Clément (1980) claim that self-confidence can be measured according to two dimensions: perceived communication competence and language anxiety. Anxiety can be defined “the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (Spielberger, 1983, cited in Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 125). Anxiety associated with the language learning situation can be defined as specific anxiety reactions to a variety of language learning situations (Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 125). In the current study, anxiety is the L2 student’s specific reaction to communication in English, and his/her anxiety will be measured by a scale with 12 items adapted from MacIntyre and Clément (1996). Perceived self-competence in English is the participant’s self-assessed competence in English communication, which will be assessed by a scale with 12 items adapted from MacIntyre and Charos (1996).
**English proficiency**: Language proficiency can be defined as “communicative competence” (MacIntyre et al., 1998). Canale and Swain (1980) suggest that communicative competence can be identified by four dimensions: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Turrell (1995) suggest that “communicative competence” has five dimensions: linguistic, discourse, actional, sociocultural, and strategic competence. L2 studies have demonstrated that actual communicative competence is significantly related to perceived self-competence (MacIntyre et al., 1997; McCroskey et al., 1991). In the current study, it is hypothesized that the participants’ levels of actual communicative competence in English affect their perceived self-competence in English, which may influence their levels of self-confidence.

1.7 Basic assumptions

The researcher of the current study has chosen to test MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998) for the goal of applying the model to the Korean context, mainly because of this researcher’s assumption that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998) is the most comprehensive model among currently available models in explaining the diversity in WTC as the result of a complex system of interrelated affective variables. MacIntyre et al. (1998) claim that, taking into account both personality trait-like variables and situational variables, their heuristic model is more comprehensive than others in explaining the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC. MacIntyre et al. further claim that their heuristic model can be employed for pedagogical and practical use for L2 education. This researcher further assumes that the applicability of MacIntyre et
al.’s model, including both personality trait-like variables and situational variables, is
dependent on the determination of whether WTC is more trait-like than situational.

In regard to the research method, the researcher of the current study has chosen
the research method of structural equation modeling (SEM). SEM enables the
examination of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships in a single model.
MacIntyre et al. (1998) argued that there are a number of affective variables with the
potential to influence L2 WTC. It is impossible to examine the interrelations among
affective variables including all affective variables at one time. This is an important
concern in testing the model for the purpose of applying it to a certain communicative
context. It is probable that this concern could be reduced by the application of SEM
because of the basic assumptions of SEM. In the method of SEM, the researcher has
control over the decision to include or omit any relations between or among variables on
the basis of theory, with which the researcher should justify his/her decision. The theory
for justification can also support the basic assumption that “all causal relationships are
indicated in the model” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 596; see Kline, 1998, p. 99). Practically, a
theory refers to a researcher’s attempt to depict the entire set of interrelationships
explaining a particular set of outcomes (Hair et al., 1998). Hair et al. (1998) claim that “a
theory may be based on ideas generated from one or more of the three principal sources:
(1) prior empirical research; (2) past experiences and observations of actual behavior,
attitudes, or phenomena; and (3) other theories that provide a perspective for analysis” (p.
583). In light of the concern identified and the basic assumptions of SEM, the researcher
of the current study will establish the structural model for this study on the basis of
theories in SLA.
The primary goal of the current study is to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 in explaining the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC in English among Korean students learning English as a foreign language in Korea, in order to help Korean students develop their English proficiency more successfully. In this section, the researcher of the current study starts by describing the Korean context in which Korean students are struggling to develop English proficiency, in spite of their eagerness and effort to do so. After describing the Korean context, the researcher of the current study reviews the literature on the previous studies and theories that can explain what determines the success of SLA. With the belief that understanding the diversity of WTC in L2 can explain individual differences in SLA, the researcher of the current study explores what factors influence WTC and how WTC can determine the success of SLA. The researcher of the current study believes that explaining individual differences in WTC can help Korean students achieve their goal of success in acquiring English proficiency.
2.1 English-learning environments in Korea as an EFL context

As the amount of international trade that Korea has had with other countries in the world has recently increased, the Korean government has come to realize the importance of communicative competence in English as a medium of world-wide communication. The Korean government believes that English proficiency can enable Korean people to secure greater benefit from diplomacy and trade with other countries by communicating with them more clearly and effectively in English (Korean Ministry of Education, 1997, p. 2). In recognition of the importance of English proficiency, the Korean government has encouraged Korean students to develop their communicative competence in English as an L2. As the initial step to achieve this goal, the Korean government in 1997 modified the national curriculum of English education to focus more on the development of Korean students’ proficiency in communication in English than on their mastery of reading skills and grammar rules in English (Korean Ministry of Education, 1997). Before the modification of the national curriculum, English educators had spent a lot of time and effort on the development of Korean students’ overall English proficiency, stressing reading skills and grammar rules. The government realized that this would hardly enable Korean students, and Korean English teachers as well, to become competent at communication in English (Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; Li, 1998).

In accordance with the modification of the national curriculum, some changes have been made in the practice of English education. First of all, the modified curriculum obliges Korean students to start learning English officially from the third year of elementary school, instead of the first year of junior high school. This obligation might correspond to the theoretical perspective that the sooner L2 students start learning
their target L2, the better their final target L2 proficiency will be (see Ellis, 1994, p. 484).
Furthermore, the modification has led the national entrance exams to universities to assess applicants’ levels of listening competence in English, which are regarded as an indication of English proficiency (Yeo, 2003, November 11). It may not be extreme to state that the primary goal of Korean students is to enter one of prestigious universities, because the differences in prestige among universities affect students’ future employment and marriage prospects in Korea (see Sorensen, 1994, p. 17). Elementary students who are motivated to receive an education of good quality may study harder to enter a prestigious middle school, rated according to the proportion of students from that school able to get into prestigious high schools. Middle school students who are eager to obtain a better quality of education may study harder to enter prestigious high schools, as rated by the proportion of students from those schools able to get into prestigious universities. High school students who want to become successful in the Korean society may study harder to enter one of the prestigious universities (see Sorensen, 1994, p. 19). If the primary goal of Korean students is to enter prestigious universities, the national entrance exams to universities assessing listening competence in English might stimulate Korean students at all three level schools—elementary, middle, and high schools—to develop English proficiency (see Cho, 2004, January 3).

The effect of the Korean government’s policy for English education emphasizing English proficiency is that many of universities in Korea appear to secure more students who are competent at English proficiency. This might be because differences in prestige among universities will be often rated by the proportion of students able to secure jobs. The requirement of English proficiency in job markets will be discussed later in this
section. Along with this, some universities will give admission to a limited number of students who can demonstrate higher levels of English proficiency. Korean students can demonstrate their English proficiency through either the national entrance exams or standardized English tests such as the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) test, the TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) test, and the TEPS (Test of English Proficiency developed by Seoul National University) test. Although the number of students who can receive admission to the universities based on the score from any of the standardized tests is limited, quite a few students tend to prefer choosing the standardized English tests to taking the entrance exams in securing admission to the limited number of universities. It seems that they appear to believe it is easier to prepare for one of the standardized English tests than to study for the national entrance exams that assess students’ knowledge in many different academic subjects. As a result, not a few students seem eager to develop their English proficiency to secure admission to universities (“The Guide”, 2003, December 2; Lee, 2003, August 1).

Like those universities that will give admission to students with higher levels of English proficiency, many companies will recruit those who demonstrate competence in English proficiency. It must be natural for companies to choose new employees with higher levels of English proficiency as English is regarded as a medium of world-wide communication in trading with other countries in the world. A job applicant will be required to submit his/her score from any of the standardized English tests as a proof of English proficiency. Generally speaking, it might be very difficult to secure a job without any proof of communicative competence in English even though a job applicant has a good G.P.A. (Grade Point Average) in his/her academic field (Lee, 2003, August 1;
Park, 2003, June 26). This tendency of companies may force many prospective job-applicants to concentrate their efforts more on studying English than on their academic fields in universities, with the belief that developing their English proficiency will be a greater advantage than improving G.P.A. or their academic knowledge in obtaining a job (Lee, 2003, August 1; “The TOEIC”, 2003, October 29; You, 2003, October 13). Even after securing a job, an employee needs to keep developing his/her English proficiency. Many companies will give their employees promotion opportunities for desired positions on the condition that their employees can demonstrate a certain level of English proficiency. This tendency of companies in recruiting and qualifying promotions appears to make potential job-applicants and employees eager to develop English proficiency (Lee, 2003, August 1).

As important as it is in the academic and the business world, English proficiency is also important for Korean people who wish to become successful in the Korean society. For example, if someone wants to work in the legal profession as a lawyer or an attorney in Korea, he/she must submit a better than minimum score from any of those standardized English tests as a proof of English proficiency before taking the national certificate examination for the legal profession (Jang, 2003, September 8). In addition, officers in the Korean forces must demonstrate their English proficiency if they want to obtain promotions. For these reasons, it is likely that many Korean people are eager to develop English proficiency to become successful in Korea (Jeong, 2003, July 30).
In summary, many, if not most, Korean people are eager to develop English proficiency to enter a university, to secure a job, or to become successful in Korea.

Since English proficiency is essential for Korean people as they survive for advancement, many Korean people are eager to develop their English proficiency, or to encourage their children to develop English proficiency (Jeong, 2003, July 30; Kim, 2004, January 3). In Korea, many social phenomena depict Korean people’s eagerness to acquire English proficiency. It seems that Korean people learning English are be willing to try anything available or alleged to be effective for the development of greater English proficiency. As a good example, an English lecturer has succeeded in attracting a large number of students who are eager to develop English proficiency. The lecturer claimed that Korean people have difficulty developing English proficiency because of the different way they breathe while speaking in English. According to the lecturer, American people will inhale to speak English, whereas Korean people exhale to speak English. In class, the lecturer does not teach how to speak English well, but has his students practice breathing in the way that American people allegedly do while speaking English. It appears that the students in these classes may be willing to change their way of breathing for the sake of a development of English proficiency, since they follow and practice the lecturer’s instructions (Heo, 2002, May 9; Jeong, 2001; Kang, 2003, August 8). As another good example, some Korean parents take their children to the hospital for a surgery because of their belief that the surgery will help improve their children’s English proficiency through greater competence in English pronunciation (Kim, 2004, January 3). Due to the eagerness of Korean people to acquire English proficiency, Korea has been ranked first among the countries, which are members of the Organization for
Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in spending money on education. The fact that Korean people are willing to spend much more money on English tutoring than on tutoring for other academic subjects indicates how eagerly Korean people try to, or direct their children to develop English proficiency (Shin, 2002, October 2).

In spite of their eagerness and hard work to acquire English proficiency, Korean people seem to have been unsuccessful in achieving their goal. As a good example, in 2002, Korea ranked 119th in the TOEFL test in the world (Shin, 2002, October 2). Reflecting on the Korean people’s sincere eagerness and effort, the result must be frustrating to them. Korean people may wonder why they have had limited success in acquiring English proficiency, even with a lot of effort. Korean people may further wonder how they can achieve English proficiency more successfully. To answer these questions, it is worth noting that L2 educators and researchers have claimed that it is important for L2 students to understand what factors affect individual differences in the success of SLA in order to be more successful in their SLA. With this background, the researcher of this study will explore what factors affect individual differences in the success of SLA with the goal of helping Korean students become more successful in acquiring English proficiency.

As previously stated, the main question of the current study is “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English and what affects their willingness to communicate in English?” It is probable that the researcher of the present study is able to predict Korean university students’ willingness to communicate by examining their English-learning contexts and cultures. Gudykunst (2004) argued that it is possible to predict a person’s behavior on the basis of
cultural information relevant to his/her language, beliefs, and prevailing ideology. According to Gudykunst (2004), “people in any culture generally behave in a regular way because of the norms, rules, and values of their cultures. This regularity allows cultural information to be used in making predictions” (p. 16). Grounded in this perspective, the researcher of the present study will explore the English-learning context where the English-learning cultures are shaped in Korea, which may enable the researcher of the present study to predict Korean English-learning students’ WTC in English. Since English-learning activities mostly occur in the classroom context in the Korean EFL context, the following section will explore the classroom cultures.

In attempting to develop the communicative competence of Korean people in English, the Korean government has encouraged English teachers to employ communicative language teaching (CLT) for English education in the classroom in Korea. There is no universal definition of CLT, but a definition by Richard and Rodgers (1986) says that “CLT starts with a theory of language as communication, and its goal is to develop learners’ communicative competence” (cited in Li, 1998, p. 678). Although Korean EFL teachers seem to acknowledge the importance of CLT for the development of their students’ communicative competence in English, it is likely that they are not fully willing to employ CLT, which requires that the teacher has dialogic interactions with students. Instead, they tend to utilize either grammar-translation or the audiolingual method, or combine the two methods in the classroom (see Eun, 2000; Li, 1998). Korean EFL teachers may have some reasons to prefer the grammar translation and the audiolingual method to CLT. For example, neither Korean EFL teachers nor students may be competent enough to perform dialogic interactions in the classroom. Other
reasons such as classroom size and material development can be given to explain their preference. And finally, their performance may be related to expectations about roles in the classroom and the culture (see Eun, 2000; Li, 1998).

Considering the roles of the teacher and the student in the classroom, Korean EFL teachers probably believe that the audiolingual method is more appropriate than CLT for English education in the classroom in regard to the Korean culture. In the Korean culture, in general teachers are supposed to know everything, while students are expected to rely on their teachers to advance students’ knowledge.

If your kids find that you cannot always answer their questions very confidently, you are going to lose their respect and finally lose them. In our culture, teachers are supposed to know everything and be always correct. (Jin-Kyu, July 17, 1995, cited in Li, 1998, p. 687)

The audiolingual method was established on the behaviorist perspective that language acquisition is a process of habit formation through the practices of repetition and memorization (Lado, 1964). According to behaviorism, the teacher should be regarded as a model of good habits, and education of the students take place most effectively if the teacher transmits his/her good habits to the students (Rogoff, Matusov, & White, 1996). It seems that the Korean culture corresponds to behaviorism. Many Korean people keep in mind the old saying “Seu-seung-man-han je-ja-eop-tta: No student can be better than the teacher.” With this belief, the traditional teaching method of “ju-ip-sik-gyo-yuk: inserting knowledge into student” has been dominant in the classroom. Because of the established roles in the classroom, it is likely that the teacher as a transmitter is expected to dominate the classroom, while the student, who is considered an empty vessel, is supposed to keep silent to listen and take knowledge from the teacher.
Furthermore, students may be expected to maintain silence during the class due to the classroom and social culture. Generally speaking, a student’s behavior of asking questions can be considered as disturbing the teacher and the class; thus, it is advisable for the student to wait until the class is over (see Eun, 2000). Moreover, a student’s decision to demonstrate his/her opinion can often be regarded as his/her intention to challenge the teacher’s authority or knowledge; otherwise, the student’s decision can be regarded as his/her action to show off his/her knowledge to the teacher and the class. This can be seen as a violation of the cultural virtue of “modesty.” In regard to the social culture, while growing up, children in Korea will often be discouraged from interrupting the talk of elder people, being told, “eo-reun mal-sseum-e kki-eo-deu-neun-ge a-ni-da” (You should not interrupt the talk of elder people). With this cultural idea in mind, Korean EFL students tend to stay silent rather than try to interact with their teacher.

Concerning the roles and the culture in the classroom, Korean EFL teachers may feel more comfortable with the audiolingual method than CLT. CLT emphasizes creative learning through activities such as information gap, role plays, simulations and unstructured tasks, which necessarily require the teacher and students to use the target language in order to accomplish the tasks (LoCastro, 1996). While performing unstructured tasks in L2, the teacher is subject to making errors. As previously mentioned, a teacher in Korea is expected to know everything; thus, when a teacher making errors, it implies that the teacher is not competent enough to teach students. Consequently, the teacher may lose face and the students’ respect.
In contrast, the audiolingual method, designed as predetermined lessons (Chick, 1996), may seldom cause the teacher to commit errors. The audiolingual method involves both teachers and students in the manner of synchronizing sentences for oral activities. All the teacher must do is to read preformatted sentences to students. Chick (1996) characterized the discourse style as “safe-talk” because the discourse style will cause neither teachers nor students to risk making errors, losing face, or experiencing embarrassment (p. 30). According to Chick, with preformatted sentences, this discourse style can enable teachers to “avoid any risks of losing face associated with displays of incompetence at answering unexpected questions from students” (p. 30). The discourse style can enable students to save face since it rarely requires students to ask questions; all students have to do is to repeat what the teacher has read to them. In the Korean culture, a student’s asking questions can be considered an indication of his/her incompetence (see Eun, 2000). In addition, the discourse style can enable students to save face without causing the teacher to fail to answer their unexpected questions. Students may feel guilty about causing a problem for the teacher (see Cortazzi & Jin, 1996; Eun, 2000).

Korean EFL students live in the Korean culture, which shapes their behavior in the classroom (see LoCastro, 1996, p. 114). As previously discussed, the Korean culture may lead Korean students to expect that it is safest for them to keep silence in the classroom. Based on this, it can be predicted that Korean EFL students may have low levels of WTC in English. The prediction will be examined in this study. Before the examination, the researcher of this current study will review the literature in the following section to explore what affective variables can influence L2 students’ willingness to communicate in L2.
2.2 Affective variables as a predictor of success in SLA

L2 students have varying degrees of success in SLA. The less or unsuccessful L2 students and their teachers may often ask what causes individual differences in the success of SLA, as long as they believe that answering this question can help L2 students increase their probability of succeeding in SLA. A number of researchers in SLA have attempted to explain what factors can affect individual differences in the success of SLA, and identified many affective variables such as personality, attitude, motivation, self-esteem, self-confidence, perceived competence, and language anxiety as influencing individual differences in SLA (Onwuebuzie et al., 2000; Barraclough et al., 1995; Ghaith et al., 2000; Noels et al., 2000; Oller et al., 1978; Robinson, 2001; Schumann, 1975). On the basis of empirical studies regarding the relationship between affective variables and SLA, L2 researchers have found that a single affective variable cannot alone influence individual differences in SLA, but the affective variable interacts with other affective variables to influence individual differences in SLA (see Clément et al., 1994; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995; Gardner, 1985; 1988). In order to answer the question what factors affect individual differences in SLA, it seems that L2 researchers must be able to explain the interrelations among affective variables in influencing individual differences in SLA.

Onwueguzie et al. (2000) carried out a study to examine the relationship between affective variables and foreign language achievement in a mid-southern university. In this study, 184 students were chosen from four language courses (Spanish, French, German, and Japanese) at three different levels: introductory, intermediate, and advanced. For data collection, the participants were given a questionnaire packet consisting of six instruments: (1) the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS); (2) the Self-
Perception Profile for College Students; (3) the Social Interdependence Scale; (4) the Academic Locus of Control Scale; (5) the Study Habits Inventory; and (6) the Background Demographic Forms. The Self-Perception Profile for College Students is a 54-item scale with 13 subscales. Because many of the subscales (e.g., perceived athletic competence, romantic relationships, close relationships, parent relationships, and morality) were not considered relevant for the study, only three subscales were used: (1) perceived intellectual ability, (b) perceived scholastic competence, and (c) perceived self-worth. According to data analysis, the findings indicated that “low foreign-language achievers tended to have the highest levels of foreign-language anxiety and the lowest levels of perceived intellectual ability and perceived scholastic competence” (p. 9). This result could well demonstrate that individual differences in the success of SLA cannot be explained by a single affective variable.

Ely (1986) conducted a study to explore the interactive effect of several affective variables on SLA. Ely selected participants enrolled in first year Spanish courses at two different levels (Level 1 and Level 2) at a university. On the basis of pilot studies, Ely developed a questionnaire packet including Language Class Risktaking, Language Class Sociability, Language Class Discomfort, and Strength of Motivation. Other instruments measuring the participants’ attitudes (Attitude Toward the Language Class), concern for grades (Concern for Grade), L2 learning backgrounds, and aptitude were also included in this study. The causal analysis of the data indicated that language class risking had a direct and positive effect on the participants’ voluntary classroom participation, while language class discomfort had an indirect and negative effect on classroom participation through its negative effect on language class risktaking. The findings also indicated that
classroom participation was the factor determining the success of oral skills. The results of this study imply that classroom participation as the result of a combination of language class risktaking and language class discomfort could enhance the acquisition of L2 oral proficiency. This result could also demonstrate that individual differences in SLA are the result of the interaction among affective variables.

In an effort to explain the interaction among affective variables in influencing the success of SLA, language researchers have conceptualized WTC (willingness to communicate), which is identified as an individual’s intention to initiate communication when he/she is given an opportunity to do so (MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre et al., 1998; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Yashima, 2002). The theoretical concept of WTC has evolved from many language researchers’ perspectives on communication behaviors and empirical studies that have tested affective variables in order to identify the constructs of WTC. Burgoon (1976) introduced “unwillingness-to-communicate” (UWTC) as a tendency to avoid oral communication in the attempt to describe the diversity in language behaviors. Burgoon tried to explain UWTC, as a chronic tendency to avoid or devalue oral communication, with five constructs: anomia, alienation, introversion, self-esteem and communication apprehension. According to Burgoon, anomie can be characterized by apathy, anxiety, and other negative states, and in the extreme, by alienation and hostility. An individual characterized by anomie may feel insecure, powerless, socially isolated and alienated, considering life as valueless or meaningless; this might cause him/her to fail to adopt or internalize society’s norms and values. Because an individual with anomie tends to regard communicative interactions with others as negative, he/she might distrust other people and avoid communication with others. An individual
characterized by introversion, as the counterpart of extroversion, can be described by quiet, timid, and shy as an indication of anxiety about communication. An introverted individual can be observed to be inner-directed and less sociable, implying that he/she tends to place less value on communication. In regard to self-esteem, an individual with low self-esteem can be regarded as “more persuasible and confirming, with low self-esteem having less faith in their own opinions—attributable to prior negative experiences in communication with others.” An individual with low self-esteem tends to be unwilling to communicate because he/she may perceive that others negatively evaluate his/her efforts to communicate (Burgoon, 1976, pp. 60-62).

By inverting the negative orientation of Burgoon’s UWTC (1976) into a positive orientation, McCroskey and Baer (1985) conceptualized and introduced WTC to L1 language education in order to explain individual differences in L1 communication behaviors. Eventually, MacIntyre et al. (1998) adapted the theoretical concept of WTC to explore the diversity in L2 communication behaviors (see MacIntyre et al., 1998; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Yashima, 2002). Researchers in WTC have hypothesized that WTC generates individual differences in communication behaviors, which in turn produce individual differences in the attainment of language proficiency. In general, researchers seem to agree that language students who are more active with language use have a greater potential to develop language proficiency by having more opportunities to converse with others. Thus, the more willing-to-communicate language students are more likely to succeed in the achievement of language proficiency (Clark, 1989; MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre et al., 1998; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Yashima, 2002).
In attempting to explain an individual’s WTC, language researchers have involved many affective variables. They acknowledge that many affective variables influence WTC, thus implying that a single affective variable cannot define an individual’s WTC. As previously discussed, Burgoon (1976), who conceptualized UWTC (unwillingness-to-communicate), identified five affective variables—anomia, alienation, introversion, self-esteem and communication apprehension—in order to explain an individual’s UWTC. On the other hand, MacIntyre et al. (1999) tried to account for an individual’s WTC with a different set of five affective variables: extraversion, emotional stability, self-esteem, communication apprehension, and perceived communication competence. Later, Yashima (2002) explained an individual’s WTC with four affective variables: attitude, language motivation, language competence, and self-confidence in L2 communication (see also, MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre et al., 2001). It is probable that their decisions to include different affective variables in explaining WTC reflect their acknowledgement of the theoretical perspective that there are a number of affective variables with the potential to influence an individual’s WTC. In fact, MacIntyre et al. (1998), who conceptualized a heuristic model of WTC in L2, claim that there are a number of affective variables that have a potential impact on WTC. In accordance with this, it seems that an individual’s WTC is one of the significant factors that can explain the interrelations among affective variables influencing individual differences in SLA. On the basis of the theoretical perspectives that a number of affective variables influence an individual’s WTC and that WTC can lead to the success of language acquisition, it is likely that understanding an individual’s
WTC can help to explain the interrelations of affective variables in influencing individual differences in the success of SLA.

Language researchers have found that some affective variables are significantly linked to the constructs of WTC, whereas others are not. MacIntyre (1994) analyzed a causal model which included perceived competence plus anomie, alienation, self-esteem, introversion, and communication anxiety, which were identified as the five basic constructs of UWTC by Burgoon (1976). MacIntyre used the data from previous studies performed by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986a) and McCroskey et al. (1987).

According to the data analysis, MacIntyre found that there were no significant links between anomie and WTC, alienation and WTC, or the combination of anomie and alienation and WTC, while there was a significant link between perceived competence and WTC. The results seemed to imply that some affective variables are significant in influencing WTC, whereas others are not.

Based on empirical studies, language researchers have also found that some affective variables appear to influence an individual’s WTC directly while others do so indirectly. MacIntyre et al. (1999) investigated the correlations between WTC and several affective variables (perceived competence, self-esteem, extraversion, emotional stability, and communication anxiety) in order to identify the antecedents of WTC by analyzing data from 206 university students. The data analysis indicated that emotional stability would affect the orientation toward self-esteem. Students with high emotional stability appeared to have high self-esteem; subsequently, students with high self-esteem showed a high level of perceived competence, which led to a high level of WTC. However, there was no significant correlation between self-esteem and WTC. MacIntyre
et al. attributed this finding to the possibility that self-esteem could indirectly influence WTC through its influence on perceived competence. In regard to the relationship between perceived communication competence and WTC, the data analysis indicated that perceived communication competence was the best predictor of an individual’s WTC with a very strong direct path that represented a direct causal relationship. The higher the level of perceived communication competence the students indicated, the higher the level of WTC they reported. The findings from MacIntyre et al.’s study (1999) suggested that some affective variables influence an individual’s WTC directly, whereas others affect WTC indirectly (see also Lalonds and Gardner, 1984; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996).

2.2.1 The roles of affective variables in influencing WTC

On the basis of theoretical perspectives and empirical studies in regard to the relationship between WTC and SLA, MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized a heuristic model of WTC in L2 in order to explain the anticipated interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC. The heuristic model consists of a pyramid-shaped structure with six categories or variables called layers. In general, the heuristic model includes five basic affective variables—motivation, confidence, attitudes, communicative competence, and personality—in order to explain the interrelations of the affective variables in influencing an L2 learner’s WTC in L2. Before explaining MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC further, the researcher of this study will review the literature about the roles of individual affective variables in influencing WTC in L2, for the purpose of exploring whether the inclusion of the affective variables in MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model can be supported by previous theories and empirical studies in the relationship between WTC and SLA.
2.2.2 The roles of personality as a predictor of success in SLA

A number of language teachers and students view personality as one of major factors of determining individual differences in the success of SLA (see Griffiths, 1991b; Naiman et al., 1978). Although personality is considered an important factor in SLA, insufficient studies have been conducted to explore the relationship between personality and SLA. In part, the insufficiency of studies exploring the relationship may be due to the difficulty of identifying personality variables (see Ellis, 1994, p. 517; Griffiths, 1991a, 1991b). Cattell (1943) attempted to explore personality variables by analyzing around 4,500 trait-descriptive terms from the Allport and Odbert compendium (1936). Cattell developed this trait list with 4,500 descriptive terms to produce “a set of 35 highly complex bipolar variables, each pole of which included a composite set of adjectives and phrases” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 26). Other researchers have analyzed Cattell’s variables and found that only five factors, entitled the Big-Five factors, can be considered replicable. If researchers in the study of personality follow the traditional method of numbering and labeling these Big-Five factors, each factor can be identified as follows.

Factor I (Surgency or Extraversion) contrasts such traits as talkativeness, assertiveness, and activity level with traits such as silence, passivity, and reserve; Factor II (Agreeableness or Pleasantness) contrasts traits such as kindness, trust, and warmth with such trait as hostility, selfishness, and distrust; Factor III (Consciousness or Dependability) contrasts such traits as organization, thoroughness, and reliability with traits such as carelessness, negligence, and unreliability; Factor IV (Emotional Stability vs. Neuroticism) includes such traits as nervousness, moodiness, and tempera mentality); Factor V (whether labeled as Intellect or Openness to Experience) contrasts such traits as imagination, curiosity, and creativity with traits such as shallowness and imperceptiveness. (Goldberg, 1993, pp. 26-27)
Motivated by the critics of the Big-Five model, researchers in the study of personality have attempted to identify personality variables as something attractive that can replace the Big-Five factor model. However, it appears that they have failed to achieve this goal. It is likely that most of the critics of the model in the past have turned out to be proponents of the model. Furthermore, some of the contemporary critics of the Big-Five factor model have contributed to the success of the model in explaining the relationship between personality variables and SLA (see Goldberg, 1993).

Goldberg (1993) claimed that the Big-Five factors model identifying personality variables seems to have a consensus among researchers in the study of personality in regard to SLA. However, there are still some critics of the model. Among them, Cattell and Eysenck are the most famous. Cattell argues that the five factors are not sufficient to identify personality variables, whereas Eysenck claims that the five factors need to be reduced (Goldberg, 1993). Eysenck (1970) attempted to identify personality as the somewhat stable and enduring organization of an individual’s character, temperament, intellect, and physique. Character is relevant to an individual’s will, and temperament is associated with his/her emotion. Intellect is related to one’s intelligence, and physique is considered as his/her “somewhat stable and enduring system of bodily configuration and neuroendocrine endowment” (cited in Griffiths, 1991b, p. 108).

Ellis (1994) states that because of the difficulty of defining personality variables, researchers may find it easier to explain and understand personality variables, in regard to the relationship of personality and SLA, with a somewhat general view of personality. Ellis claims that as a somewhat general view of personality, study on the distinction between extroversion and introversion can be promising in exploring the relationship
between personality and individual differences in SLA. As long as the distinction between extroversion and introversion is considered a continuum, it appears impossible to define a clear cut distinction between them. Nevertheless, in general, extroverts and introverts can be described as follows.

Extroverts are sociable, like parties, have many friends and need excitement. They are sensation-seekers and risk-takers, like practical jokes and are lively and active. Introverts are quiet, prefer reading to meeting people, have few but close friends and usually avoid excitement. (Eysenck & Chan, 1982, p. 154, cited in Ellis, 1994, p. 520; see also Eysenck, 1982; Griffiths, 1991b).

Eysenck (1970) advises that when researchers choose to study the distinction between extroversion and introversion concerning SLA, they are exploring only one aspect of students’ personality (cited in Ellis, 1994; see also Ely 1986).

It has been a common belief among L2 students, teachers, and researchers that there is a positive relationship between extroversion and success in the attainment of L2 oral proficiency (Bush, 1982; Ellis, 1994; Griffiths, 1991b). Naiman et al. (1978) conducted a study with 34 adult L2 learners who were identified as good L2 learners. According to research findings from oral interviews with the participants, 31 percent of the participants in the study considered sociability as important, and 22 percent of the participants regarded extroversion as helpful, especially in achieving oral skills. The findings seem to correspond to the perspective in SLA that “the best learners are likely to be extrovert because of their willingness to speak out and interact” (Brown, 1987, cited in Ehrman & Oxford, 1995, p. 70). In regard to L2 teachers’ perception of personality in SLA, Brown (1973) states that L2 teachers, especially in Western society, consider extroversion as a desirable behavior in achieving L2 oral proficiency. Thus, it is
recommended that L2 teachers encourage their students to be extroverted in L2 learning contexts. In accordance with L2 students’ and teachers’ perceptions of the importance of extroversion in SLA, L2 researchers have hypothesized that extroverted L2 learners have a better potential to acquire basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS): “The rationale for this hypothesis is that sociability (an essential feature of extroversion) will result in more opportunities to practice, more input, and more success in communicating in the L2” (Ellis, 1994, p. 520).

In spite of the common belief about the importance of extroversion in achieving L2 proficiency, studies on the distinction between extroversion and introversion have yielded inconsistent results in regard to individual differences in SLA. Strong (1983) reviewed studies on personality previously conducted by other researchers in order to explore the relationship between extroversion and individual differences in SLA. Strong found several studies (Matraux, cited in Valette, 1964; Morrison, 1961; Pritchard, 1952; Rossier, 1976; Strong, 1978; Wong-Fillmore, 1976) reporting that there was a correlation between extroversion and SLA. Matraux reported that extroverted students, who were characterized as talkative, outgoing, and adaptable, turned out to be faster learners in studying English in France (cited in Valette, 1964). Morrison (1961) found that introverted learners, who were described as more awkward, serious, and less sociable students than others among ninth graders underachieved in learning a foreign language. Rossier (1976) conducted a study investigating the relationship between extroversion and acquisition of English among Spanish-speaking adolescents, and found that extroverted students became proficient in English oral fluency more rapidly than introverted students (see Ellis, 1994; Strong, 1983). Strong (1983) reported his own study performed with 13
Spanish-speaking kindergarteners over a year to explore the relationship between personality variables and the acquisition of English. The findings of his study supported the hypothesis that aspects of extroversion, sociability and outgoingness could facilitate the acquisition of natural communicative skills. Based on the findings, Strong concluded that there was a significant correlation between outgoingness and oral production skills (pp. 255-256).

On the other hand, Strong (1983) also found, on the basis of his review of the literature, several studies (Busch, 1982; Genesee et al., 1980; Suter, 1977; Swain et al., 1976) reporting that there was no significant relationship between extroversion and individual differences in SLA. Suter (1977) reported findings from a study with college students that there was no correlation between extroversion and English pronunciation skills. Genesee et al. (1980) conducted a study with 54 first graders in early French immersion programs and found that there was no relationship between oral production and extroversion, characterized in such descriptive terms “has many friends” and “works in groups.” Swain et al. (1976) found that there was no correlation between the traits of extroversion, sociability, and talkativeness and kindergarten students’ French performance in immersion and French as L2 programs in Canada. Busch (1982) performed a study with adolescent and adult Japanese students learning English in Japan. Based on data analysis, Busch concluded that there was no clear relationship between extroversion and the attainment of L2 oral proficiency (cited in Ellis, 1994).

In order to explain the inconsistency of the relationship between extroversion and the acquisition of L2 oral proficiency, L2 researchers have suggested some theoretical perspectives. After reviewing the studies, Ellis (1994) suggested that “the evidence
linking extroversion to the acquisition of BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) is fairly substantial. The effects of extroversion/introversion may be situation-dependent, evident in some learning contexts but not in others” (p. 521) (see also, Busch, 1982; Eysenck, 1982; Griffiths, 1991b). Ellis (1994) further ascribes the inconsistency of the relationship between extroversion and the attainment of L2 oral proficiency to the difficulty of making a clear cut distinction between extroversion and introversion. Finally, Lalonde and Gardner (1984) attribute the inconsistency to the perspective that “broad personality traits have only indirect effect on SLA, an effect channeled through language attitudes and motivation” (cited in MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, p. 9).

2.2.3 The roles of language attitudes in SLA

A number of L2 researchers have claimed that language attitude is one of the important factors in predicting the level of success in SLA (Chihara et al., 1978; Gardner, 1980; Gardner et al., 1978; Gardner et al., 1990; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Spolsky, 1969). In order to describe language attitudes, Gardner (1980) refers to Thurstone’s statement (1928) that “the concept ‘attitude’ will be used to denote the sum total of a man’s instincts and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, fears, threats and convictions about any specified topic” (p. 267). Gudykunst (2004) has also tried to define language attitude by referring to Davidson et al.’s statement (1980) that “an attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in an evaluative (from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable) manner toward some attitude object” (p. 130). MacIntyre et al. (2001) refer to attitudes as “an individual’s positive or negative evaluation of the consequences of performing a particular behavior and desire to experience those consequences” (pp. 372-373). It seems that many statements can possibly be used to
describe language attitude. However, in the research field of SLA, Gardner’s conceptualization of attitudes (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972) with two dimensions, which are integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation, may be most influential. Integrativeness is related to the language student’s desire to learn his/her target L2 in order to meet and communicate with the target language community members, whereas attitudes toward the learning situation are relevant to the evaluation of the teacher and the course (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Yashima, 2002).

In regard to the roles of attitudes in relation to the learning situation in SLA, L2 researchers have hypothesized that positive attitudes toward the learning situation are important for the success of SLA. It is likely that L2 students with positive attitudes tend to consider L2 learning as enjoyable and beneficial, which may motivate the L2 students to be more active in performing classroom activities in the L2. Naiman et al. (1975) found significant correlations between the measure of attitudes and L2 students’ volunteering by raising a hand in class, and between L2 students’ volunteering and the amount of effort they spent on L2 learning; L2 students with positive attitudes toward L2 learning would volunteer more in class, and reported studying hard to learn the L2 (cited in Gardner et al., 1978). It is probable that more active participation and effort in L2 learning can enable L2 students to achieve more significant results in L2 learning. Furthermore, L2 students with positive experiences from L2 learning are more likely to continue learning their target L2. In many cases, L2 students’ decision as to whether they stay in or drop out of a L2 course is dependent on their learning experiences in the past. Associated with positive attitudes, positive L2 learning experiences may motivate L2
students to continue learning their target L2, which may in turn enable L2 students to achieve the success of SLA. Therefore, attitudes can be an important predictor of determining the success of SLA (see Gardner et al., 1978).

Just as much as attitudes toward the learning situation, integrativeness is regarded as important for L2 students’ success in achieving SLA. Gardner (1985), in the socioeducational model of SLA, defines integrativeness as the L2 student’s desire to learn his/her target L2 in order to identify with members of his/her target language community. L2 researchers have hypothesized that integrativeness can be a factor predicting the L2 student’s frequency and quality of contact with members of his/her target L2 community: “Integrativeness may be seen as a factor promoting relations between ethnic groups, to the extent that frequency and quality of contact indicate less social distance between groups” (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 522). Associated with frequency and quality of contact with L2 members, integrativeness has been hypothesized to facilitate L2 students to succeed in SLA. Gardner et al. (1978) argue that integrativeness is important for L2 learners to succeed in acquiring SLA, since successful SLA can be achieved through contact with members of the target L2 community (see also, Clément, 1980, 1984, 1986; Clément & Kruidenier, 1985; Gardner, 1985, 1988; Svanes, 1987).

In contrast with integrativeness, fear of assimilation can be considered a factor that contributes to decreasing the L2 student’s frequency and quality of contacts with his/her target L2 community members. Fear of assimilation refers to the L2 student’s perception of the potential loss of his/her L1 (native/first language) identity and involvement with his/her L1 community as a result of SLA. With fear of assimilation,
the L2 student may resist interaction with L2 members in order to maintain his/her L1 identity and culture (Gudykunst, 1991; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Svanes, 1987; Yashima, 2002). It has been hypothesized that fear of assimilation is associated with ethnocentrism. Summer (1940) stated that ethnocentrism is “the view of things in which one’s own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it” (cited in Gudykunst, 2004, p. 130). Ethnocentrism may be natural and unavoidable because no one can be totally non-ethnocentric. To explain ethnocentrism, Levine and Campbell (1972) suggested two aspects of ethnocentrism: our orientation toward our ingroups and our orientation toward our outgroups. In regard to our orientation toward our ingroups, highly ethnocentric people consider their ingroups as superior to other groups, and regard their ingroups’ values as universal. Considering our orientation toward our outgroups, highly ethnocentric people regard outgroups as inferior to their ingroups, and reject outgroups’ values. In addition, highly ethnocentric people blame outgroups for ingroups’ troubles, so they try to maintain social distance from outgroups. That is, regarding L1 behaviors as natural and right ways, highly ethnocentric L2 students tend to evaluate L2 behaviors that are different from L1 behaviors negatively rather than trying to understand the different L2 behaviors. As a result, highly ethnocentric L2 students tend to avoid or minimize contacts with L2 members (see Gudykunst, 2004; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Yashima, 2002).

Returning to the general concept of attitudes consisting of attitudes toward the L2 learning situation and integrativeness in SLA, studies on the relationship between attitudes and the success of SLA have turned out to be inconsistent, even though L2 researchers have regarded attitudes as important for the success of SLA. In Gardner’s
review of the literature (1980), some researchers reported a negative relationship between attitudes and the success of SLA. Oller, Hudson, and Liu (1977) found that there was a negative relationship between attitudes toward residency in the U.S. and English proficiency among Chinese immigrants, and that the negative relationship was neutralized by the length of residency in the U.S.; those who lived longer in the U.S. might be more competent at English while their attitude toward the U.S. would be less favorable. In addition, Oller, Baca, and Vigil (1977) reported that there was a negative relationship between attitudes of Mexican-American women workers and English proficiency. Oller et al. ascribed the negative relationship to the perspective that negative attitudes resulting from oppressive conditions caused by the lack of English proficiency could enhance the motivation to develop English proficiency (see Gardner, 1980).

The inconsistent relationship between attitudes and SLA can be explained by the theoretical perspective that attitudes may not affect SLA alone, but interact with other factors to influence SLA (Gardner, 1985, 1988). Among the factors, the social context where L2 learning occurs must be considered an important factor that interacts with attitudes in influencing SLA. In regard to the relationship between attitudes and SLA, ethnolinguistic vitality can possibly explain the importance of the social context in shaping the L2 student’s attitudes. Giles et al. (1977) state that “ethnolinguistic vitality” can be described by “three structural variables: the status of a language in a community, the absolute and relative number of its locators (demographic characteristics) and the institutional support (e.g., governmental services, schools, mass media) for the language” (cited in Clément, 1980, p. 148). Among the variables, language is the factor showing the strongest ethnolinguistic vitality. In the case that the status and prestige given to the
L2 in a community are favorable to the L1, the L2 student is more likely to adapt to the L2 and its culture, showing positive attitudes toward L2 (assimilation). Relevant to the absolute and relative number of the locators, if the L2 learner is a member of a non-dominant group in the community and his/her target L2 language and culture are dominant in the community, he/she might be expected to value the L2 and its culture more favorably than the L1. In a typical L2 learning context, others’ attitudes (e.g., teachers, peers, parents, and the government) toward L2 can be significant in affecting the L2 student’s attitudes toward the L2 (see Clément, 1980; Spolsky, 1969). According to these perspectives, the social context is an important factor affecting the L2 student’s attitudes toward L2 learning, which in turn affects the success of SLA.

In addition to the relationship between attitudes and the social context, the inconsistent relationship between SLA and attitudes can be explained by the theoretical perspective that if other things are equal, some affective variables such as intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety have direct effects on SLA, while others such as attitudes and personality have indirect effects on SLA (see Chihara et al., 1978; Gardner, 1985, 1988). Gardner (1985, 1988) claims in the socioeducational model that attitudes have indirect effects on SLA through motivation. According to Gardner, the L2 student’s attitudes including both integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation influence his/her motivation to learn his/her target L2, and differences in motivation affect how successfully the L2 learner learns his/her target L2. In other words, the L2 student’s positive attitudes toward L2 learning may increase his/her level of motivation to learn his/her target L2, which in turn increases the possibility of success of SLA. Gardner (1985) analyzed a causal model with 17 indicator variables in order to
explore the relationships among attitudes, motivation, and SLA. Gardner collected data from 200 grade 7 children studying French as an L2. The data analysis indicated that there were strong causal paths linking attitudes to motivation, and there were clear paths linking both motivation and aptitude to L2 achievement (see also Gardner & Lysynchuk, 1990; Gardner et al., 1978; MacIntyre et al., 1978; Yashima, 2002). In regard to the relationships among attitudes, motivation, and SLA, Gardner (1979) found that the correlation of motivation with L2 achievement was higher than the correlation of attitudes with SLA. Gardner further found that significant correlations of attitudes became non-significant when motivation was partialed out, but “when either integrativeness or attitudes toward the learning situation were partialed out of the correlations of motivation with achievement, the correlations remained significant” (cited in Masgoret & Gardner, 2003, p. 131).

2.2.4 The roles of motivation in SLA

In agreement with many other L2 researchers, Gardner (1985, 1988) argues that motivation is one of the important factors in predicting the success of SLA. Gardner claims that motivated L2 students extend their active and personal involvement in L2 learning, which can enable them to achieve successful L2 acquisition (see also Oxford, 1994). Because of the importance of motivation in SLA, L2 researchers argue that it is important for L2 educators and researchers to understand why L2 students learn their target L2 (Crooks & Schmidt, 1991). To explore factors of influencing the L2 student’s motivation, Gardner and Lambert (1959) first made a distinction between instrumental and integrative motivation. According to Gardner and Lambert, instrumental motivation refers to the L2 student’s desire to learn his/her target L2 in order to achieve his/her
practical purposes such as acquiring good grades in school, securing a job, or obtaining a promotion. On the other hand, integrative motivation is related to the L2 student’s willingness to identify with members of his/her target L2 community.

At the early stage of conceptualizing motivation, Gardner and Lambert (1959) considered integrative motivation as superior to instrumental motivation in determining success of SLA (cited in Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). Gardner and Lambert hypothesized that integratively motivated L2 students might be more active in participating in the L2 classroom, and maximize the opportunities to interact with members of their target L2 community out of the L2 classroom. Active interactions with L2 members could enable L2 students to achieve L2 proficiency, especially in the oral-aural features of proficiency (see Gardner, 1988; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Oxford & Shearing, 1994; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992). Gardner et al. (1979) conducted a study with 89 Canadian students and 65 American students in an intensive French program to explore the relationship between attitudinal/motivational attributes and SLA. The participants were given a packet of 24 questionnaires that assessed the participants’ attitudinal/motivational attributes. According to the data analysis with factor analysis, the findings indicated that the Canadian students who entered the intensive program with positive attitudes toward learning French as an integrative motive appeared to be much more successful in developing oral skills and perceived the program as more rewarding than those who were not similarly motivated (pp. 317-318).

The theoretical concept of integrative motivation and its effect on the success of SLA seem to correspond to the claim of Schumann’s Acculturation model that the L2 learner can successfully acquire L2 proficiency if he/she is willing to acculturate to the
target L2 community. According to Schumann (1986), acculturation leads the L2 student into contact with members of his/her target L2 community, which may result in verbal interactions that can be the immediate cause of SLA (see Crooks and Schmidt, 1991, p. 477). The closeness between L1 and L2 in culture determines the degree to which the L2 student acculturates to the target L2 community; the closer the cultures of L1 and L2, the more likely he/she will acculturate to the L2 community.

Svanes (1987) performed a study with 167 foreign students learning Norwegian in Norway. The study was intended to explore the relationship between cultural distance and motivation, and between motivation and proficiency. According to the criteria of cultural distance, the participants from 27 different countries were categorized into 4 groups: the European students (Group one), the African students (Group two), the Middle East Asian students (Group three), and the other Asian students. Svanes assumed that Group one is closer to the Norwegian culture than Group two, and Group two is closer to the Norwegian culture than Group three since the participants in Group two were from countries that were once colonized by European countries. Svanes also assumed that Group three was closer to the Norwegian culture than Group four because the geographical approximation of Group three allowed members in Group three to interact with and understand the European culture more than Group four. A questionnaire with 20 items was administered to the participants to assess their levels of motivation, and the Level two examination, including reading comprehension, listening comprehension, a cloze test, and oral proficiency, was also administered to the participants in order to assess their proficiency. According to the data analysis, Svanes found that there was a highly significant correlation between cultural distance and grades and between cultural
distance and motivation; European and American students achieved the best grades, and the participants from Middle East/Africa were the third best while the Asian students’ achievement was the poorest. The European and American students were more integratively motivated than the other students, who were more instrumentally motivated. Based on the findings, Svanes concluded that there is a relationship between cultural distance and SLA.

In spite of the importance of integrative motivation in SLA, L2 studies have shown that instrumental motivation is as important as integrative motivation for L2 students seeking to achieve L2 proficiency. More importantly, it appears that in general instrumental motivation is more prominent in SLA than integrative, especially in EFL contexts. Dörnyei (1990) attempted to explain the prominence of instrumental motivation in EFL contexts, with the perspective that integrative motivation is far less relevant than instrumental in EFL contexts where EFL students have few opportunities to interact with English speakers. In other words, EFL students may rarely have chance to identify with English speakers. As a result, instrumental goals may shape EFL students’ motivation to learn English more significantly (see also Dörnyei, 1990; Ghaith & Shaaban, 2000; Kruidenier & Clément, 1986; Warden et al., 2000).

Warden and Lin (2000) performed a survey study with a sample of 500 university students learning English in Taiwan as an EFL context. The study was designed to explore the relationship between motivational orientation and social contexts. For data collection, Warden and Lin distributed a survey questionnaire to the target sample of 500 university students, and received 442 completed questionnaires from the sample. On the basis of data analysis using exploratory factor analysis, the findings indicated that
integrative motivation was not as important as instrumental motivation to the participants. Warden and Lin reasoned that the limitation of opportunities for the participants to interact with English speakers might have caused the absence of integrative motivation among the participants learning English in an EFL context.

Although the categorization of motivation into two dimensions (instrumental vs. integrative) has been influential in explaining motivation in SLA, a number of L2 researchers argue that categorization with two dimensions is not sufficient to explain all possible reasons to learn L2. Dörynei (1994) argued that “the categorization of motivation in terms of integrative versus instrumental is too static and restricted” (p. 274). Oxford and Shearin (1994) referred to an example study performed with 218 American high school students learning Japanese as a L2. In the study, the participants were asked to write an essay that would indicate their reasons for learning Japanese. According to the data analysis, many of the participants reported reasons relevant to either instrumental or integrative motivation. However, more than two-thirds of the participants indicated their reasons to learn Japanese that could not be grouped into either instrumental or integrative motivation. Oxford and Shearin (1994) concluded that motivation is much more complicated than can be explained by the dimensions of integrative and instrumental motivation (see also Clément et al., 1983; Dörynei, 1994; Oxford, 1994).

At a later stage of conceptualizing motivation, Gardner no longer argued the superiority of integrative motivation in SLA, attempting instead to explore the complexity of motivation in SLA. Gardner (1985) established the socioeducational model on the basis of previous empirical studies in order to explain the complexity of motivation. According to Gardner, motivation refers to the L2 student’s effort and desire
to achieve the goal of learning the language and favorable attitudes toward learning the language. In the socioeducational model, attitudes include two dimensions: integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation. Integrativeness can be assessed by three components: Integrative Orientation, Interest in Foreign Languages, and Attitudes Toward the L2 Community, whereas Attitudes Toward the Learning Situation can be assessed by two components: Evaluation of the Teacher and Evaluation of the L2 course. Gardner hypothesizes that motivation includes three components: Desire to learn the L2, Motivational Intensity, and Attitudes Toward Learning the L2. Desire to learn the L2 is relevant to the L2 student’s desire to achieve a high level of competence in L2, while Motivation Intensity is related to the amount of effort the L2 student expends in learning L2. Attitudes Toward Learning the L2 refer to affect the L2 student may experience while learning L2.

In the socioeducational model, Gardner explains the relationship among attitudes, motivation, and SLA. Two dimensions of attitudes are correlated with each other, and both dimensions of attitudes are supposed to influence the level of the L2 student’s motivation to learn his/her target L2. Corresponding to research findings in SLA, Gardner (1985, 1988) hypothesizes in the socioeducational model that attitudes indirectly affect the success of SLA through their effect on motivation, while motivation can directly affect the level of SLA. Crooks and Schmidt (1991) have pointed out that the socioeducational model is so dominant in explaining the interrelationship among attitudes, motivation, and SLA that an alternative has not been seriously considered in SLA (see also Dörynei, 1990, p. 501). Masgoret and Gardner (2003) supported the validity of the
socioeducational model in both ESL and EFL contexts in explaining the relationship among attitudes, motivation, and SLA.

Masgoret and Gardner (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of studies exploring the relationship among attitudes, motivation, and SLA. The meta-analysis was intended to investigate the validity of the socioeducational model in both EFL and ESL contexts. Masgoret and Gardner explained that “meta-analysis uses the data set (i.e., the study) as the unit of analysis and permits tests of hypotheses in terms of relationships obtained in the data sets” (p. 125). The data set included 75 independent samples conducted in either ESL or EFL contexts, and obtained from elementary, secondary, or university students. Thus, in addition to attitudes, motivation, and SLA, two additional variables social contexts (ESL vs. EFL) and age (elementary, secondary, or university programs) were included in the meta-analysis. Three hypotheses were tested to achieve the research goal of examining the validity of the socioeducational model in regard to social contexts and age. The meta-analysis reported that attitudes and motivation were related to L2 achievement, and that motivation was more highly correlated with L2 achievement than with attitudes. In addition, the meta-analysis found that in explaining the relationship among attitudes, motivation, and SLA, social contexts appeared to have little effect on the relationship, and that the age and experience of the student could have an effect on the nature of the relationships among attitudes, motivation, and SLA. Based on their findings, Masgoret and Gardner concluded that neither language learning environment (ESL vs. EFL) nor age had clear moderating effects on the relationships among attitudes, motivation, and SLA (p. 156).
### 2.2.5 The roles of self-confidence in SLA

In addition to the other affective variables discussed above, self-confidence is one of the important factors determining the success of SLA. Ganschow and Sparks (1991) suggested that the L2 student’s self-confidence, defined as his/her perception of the ease of L2 learning, is an important factor in predicting his/her willingness to experience L2 learning difficulties (cited in Onwueguzie et al., 2000). Devito (1986) pointed out that “self-confidence supposedly enhances one’s ability to achieve goals through communication as well as the capacity to provide mutual satisfaction for interpersonal interaction” (cited in Clark, 1989, p. 237). Clark (1989) claimed that “confidence allows a student to develop a desire to communicate” (p. 237). In accordance with these perspectives, Onwueguzie et al. (2000) argued that L2 students with higher levels of self-confidence tend to be more active in interacting with their target L2 community members, which can enable them to achieve success in SLA (see also MacIntyre, 1994).

Clément (1980) hypothesized that self-confidence involves two cognitive variables: perceived self-competence and language anxiety. Clément’s hypothesis is supported by MacIntyre and Carre’s study (2000). MacIntyre and Carre had the participants count from one through 10 in the L2 in front of the class. Unexpectedly, several speakers refused to count even though they appeared to be competent to perform the task. On the basis of the findings, it is probable that L2 students’ confidence in communicating in L2 is “not isomorphic with perceived competence or anxiety about communicating, though the three variables should be significantly correlated” (cited in MacIntyre et al., 2001, pp. 371-372).
L2 studies have demonstrated that perceived competence is significantly related to actual competence. Because of the relationship between perceived and actual competence, L2 researchers often suggest that “evaluating self-perceptions of competence is an efficient mechanism for placing students at appropriate levels, saving both the time and the expense of formal testing” (MacIntyre et al., 1997, p. 266). L2 proficiency can be defined as “communicative competence” (see MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 554). Canale and Swain (1980) suggested that communicative competence can be identified by four dimensions: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence.

Grammatical competence: use of appropriate grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Sociolinguistic competence: use of elements such as style, register, and intonation in appropriate contexts and setting. Discourse competence: ability to combine language elements to show cohesion in form and coherence of thought. Strategic competence: use of verbal and nonverbal communication strategies, such as gestures and circumlocution, to compensate for unknown language. (cited in Shrum & Glisan, 1994, p. 141)

Instead of using four dimensions to define communicative competence, Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Turrell (1995) attempted to define communicative competence with five dimensions: linguistic, discourse, actional, sociocultural, and strategic competence.

Linguistic competence includes knowledge of the basic elements of communication, including syntactic and morphological rules, lexical resources, and the phonological and orthographical systems needed to realize spoken and written communication. Discourse competence refers to competence in selecting, sequencing, and arranging words, structures, sentences, and utterances to achieve a unified spoken or written text. The main subareas include cohesion, deixis, coherence, generic structure, and the conversational structure inherent to the turn-taking system in conversation. Actional competence refers to matching communicative intent with linguistic form, based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force. Sociocultural competence involves knowledge of how to express messages appropriately within the
overall social and cultural context, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variation in language use. Strategic competence refers to knowledge of communication strategies, which are considered to be verbal and nonverbal devices that allow a speaker to compensate for deficiencies in any of the other underlying competences of communicative competence. Strategic competence can be used to cope with language-related problems of which the speaker is aware during the course of communication. (cited in MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 554-555)

In regard to the relationships among perceived competence, actual competence, and self-confidence in SLA, McCroskey and Richmond (1991) pointed out that in general the L2 student is cognitively aware of his/her perceived L2 competence, while not cognitively aware of his/her actual competence. According to McCroskey and Richmond, the L2 student’s decision of whether or not to interact and communicate in the L2 is a cognitive one, so his/her decision may be affected more by his/her perceived competence than by his/her actual L2 competence. Yashima (2002) performed a study with 389 Japanese university students studying information science at a university in Japan. The study was intended to explore the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC among the participants. The participants’ levels of affective variables such as attitudes, motivation, confidence, and WTC were measured by a packet of questionnaires. On the basis of data analysis using the research method of SEM, there was no significant relationship between actual L2 proficiency, which was measured by a standardized English test, and L2 communication confidence \((r = .14)\), while L2 communication confidence was significantly related to perceived competence \((r = .72)\) and to WTC in L2 \((r = .68)\).

MacIntyre et al. (1997) argued that the L2 student’s perception of L2 competence can be biased by his/her level of language anxiety. L2 students who are more anxious about communicating in L2 tend to perceive their actual L2 competence more negatively,
lower than rated by neutral observers. Clément et al. (1994) conducted a study with 301 students enrolled in the third year of secondary school instruction. The study was designed to explore social psychological factors that can influence motivational aspects in L2 learning contexts. For data collection, a packet of questionnaires was given to the participants. The data analysis using correlational and factor analysis found that less anxious students tended to report their own proficiency more positively. The data analysis also found that there was a positive and significant relationship between language achievement and self-confidence, and language achievement and the evaluation of learning contexts (see also, MacIntyre et al., 1997; Onwueguzie et al., 2000).

In regard to the relationship between language anxiety and SLA, a number of researchers claim that language anxiety is negatively related to L2 learning performance and achievement (Bailey et al., 1999; Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1994; Clément, MacIntyre, & Noels, 1997; Horwitz et al., 1986; Gardner et al., 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1993; Samimy et al., 1994; Richardson, 1990; Saito & Samimy, 1996). It has been hypothesized that language anxiety is related to any efforts to acquire L2 competence (Horwitz et al., 1986; Gardner et al., 1991; Samimy, 1992, 1994). An L2 student’s behaviors associated with language anxiety can be identified by such symptoms as “distortion of sounds, inability to reproduce the intonation and rhythm of the language, ‘freezing up’ when called on to perform, and forgetting words or phrases just learned or simply refusing to speak and remaining silent” (Young, 1991, cited in Samimy, 1994, p. 30). Additional symptoms of language anxiety may include the L2 learner’s tendency to drop out of class, to avoid eye contact, to attend classes unprepared, or to become excessively competitive (Bailey, 1983; Horwitz et al., 1986; Young, 1992).
Relevant to L2 performance, language anxiety negatively affects three stages of the language learning process: input, processing, and output. At the stage of input, language anxiety may interfere with an L2 student’s concentration on incoming input. This might cause a decrease in the amount of information that can be registered in the memory. It is hypothesized that if the learning task is relatively simple relative to a given student’s competence, language anxiety may have little impact on processing although the effect of language anxiety on processing may grow as the task becomes more difficult. At the stage of output, language anxiety may hinder a student from retrieving previously learned information. In other words, more anxious students may be destined to underachieve in L2 language performance (Gardner et al., 1989; see also Ellis, 1994).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b) investigated the effect of the anxiety dimensions on L1 and L2 performance with instruments including Digit Span and Vocabulary tests. A Digit Span test measures short-term memory and concentration, requiring test-takers to “repeat strings of single digit numbers of varying lengths, either forward, backward, or both directions” from the tape recorder (p. 517). Scores were calculated on the basis of the number of digits placed in the right position (maximum = 78). The Thing Category Test, as a vocabulary production measure, asked the participants to name things; a sample item from this test is “name all things that would be put in a refrigerator” (p. 522). Twenty-three scales, as measures of language anxiety, were administered to the participants (n = 95) to assess their levels of language anxiety. Research findings reported that language anxiety was significantly and negatively correlated with L2 performance on the Digit Span and the French Categories test. In contrast, “none of the correlations involving L1 performance variables was significant” (p. 526). MacIntyre et
al. pointed out that language anxiety seemed to have a negative effect on both the input and output stages in L2 performance, while no effects of language anxiety were found in any of the L1 production measures. This might have been because L1 performance measures were not difficult for the participants to perform. MacIntyre et al. further concluded that language anxiety might not interfere with performance on simple cognitive tasks.

In addition to the negative relationship between language anxiety and L2 performance, the negative relationship between language anxiety and L2 achievement has been reported by a number of L2 researchers (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000; Clément et al., 1994; Clément et al., 1997; Horwitz et al., 1986; Gardner et al., 1991a; Richardson, 1994). Language anxiety may discourage students from taking risks in communicating in L2, which may cause them to underachieve in L2 learning, because risk-taking is important for success in language achievement. Clément et al. (1997) claimed that it is important for L2 students to communicate in their target L2 so that they can reassess their L2 competence. Anxious students who are reluctant to communicate do nothing but maintain a vicious cycle, wherein their anxiety level remains high because they do not receive evidence of increasing proficiency that might reduce anxiety. The negative effect of language anxiety may also cause a student to lose motivation to participate in L2 interactions, which may lead to his/her underachievement in L2 (Gardner et al., 1993).

Samimy and Tabuse (1992) performed a study to explore the potential influence of affective and motivational variables on L2 achievement at the university level. Seventy-six students were chosen from Japanese language courses at three different levels—101, 102, and 103 in a midwestern university in the U.S. For this study, eight
instruments were adapted from Ely’s study (1984, 1986) as a questionnaire packet: (1) Language Class Risktaking; (2) Language Class Sociability; (3) Language Class Discomfort; (4) Motivational Types; (5) Strength of Motivation; (6) Attitudes Toward the Language Class; (7) Concern for Grade; and (8) Students’ personal background and previous experience with the L2. Each participant’s level of achievement was measured by a combination of his/her cumulative scores on daily performance, mid-term and final exams, and homework assignments (p. 386). In the fifth week of the autumn quarter of 1989 and the spring quarter of 1990, the questionnaire packets were given to the participants. According to data analysis by a stepwise regression, the study results indicated that there was high negative correlation between the two variables Language Discomfort (a measure of the degree of anxiety) and Risk-taking. Feeling uncomfortable or anxious in class, participants seemed not to take risks in communicating in the L2. In the autumn quarter, the three variables Sex, Language Class Risk-taking, and Student Class Status were the best predictors of the students’ grades. Female graduate students who were willing to take risks in the L2 received high grades. On the other hand, the two variables Strength of Motivation and L2 Spoken at Home were the best predictors of the students’ final grades. Students who were motivated to dedicate effort and energy to learning the L2, and had opportunities to speak the L2 at home, received higher grades in the L2 at the end of the three consecutive quarters.

Returning to the relationship among self-confidence, self-perceived competence, and actual competence, L2 studies have found that self-confidence is negatively correlated with language anxiety, while positively related to perceived competence. MacIntyre, Noels, and Clément (1997) conducted a study with 37 university students
learning French as an L2 in order to explore the relationship among perceived competence, actual competence, and language anxiety by testing two hypotheses. MacIntyre et al. hypothesized that perceived competence and actual L2 competence were moderately correlated, but the correlation between them was not isomorphic. MacIntyre et al. further hypothesized that both perceived competence and actual L2 competence were negatively correlated with language anxiety. For data collection, MacIntyre et al. employed a questionnaire consisting of two scales: a language anxiety measure and a scale of self-rated L2 proficiency. The language anxiety measure included 19 items from Gardner’s French use anxiety and French class anxiety. The measure had a 7-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” (α = .92). The scale of self-rated L2 proficiency (Can-do) had 32 items. Subscales examined the participants’ levels of proficiency in L2 speaking (α = .93, 10 items), L2 reading (α = .86, five items), L2 writing (α = .93, eight items), and L2 comprehension (α = .94, nine items). To assess the participants’ actual levels of L2 proficiency, MacIntyre et al. assigned the participants 25 tasks corresponding to each of the areas of the Can-do scale (eight tasks for L2 speaking, seven tasks for L2 comprehension, five tasks for L2 reading, and five tasks for L2 writing). The participants were given the questionnaire and then L2 production tasks in class. According to the data analysis, actual L2 competence, perceived competence, and language anxiety were all interrelated. The findings indicated that perceived competence was significantly correlated with actual L2 competence; more proficient L2 students tended to perceive themselves as more proficient. In regard to the relationship with language anxiety, both perceived competence and actual competence were
negatively correlated with language anxiety. In conclusion, the results supported the two hypotheses (see also MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre et al., 2001; Yashima, 2002).

The literature review discussed above seems to imply that in determining individual differences in success of SLA, the decision of whether or not an affective variable is important is dependent on the significance of its effect on the L2 student’s learning behavior. It is likely that an important affective variable for the success of SLA can significantly lead the L2 student to employ productive L2 learning behavior, which must include the frequent and active involvement in L2 communication. This corresponds to the theoretical perspective that affective variables may cause individual differences in L2 learning behaviors, which in turn may cause individual differences in the success of SLA, as long as some L2 learning behaviors are productive whereas others are less or counterproductive (Oller & Perkin, 1978, p. 90). Long (1982) argues that L2 students who can maintain communicative interactions in L2 with L2 members have optimal conditions for developing their L2 proficiency (cited in Strong, 1983). As discussed above, extroversion as a construct of personality is significant for the success of SLA because extroversion can make it easier for the L2 student to interact and communicate with members of the target L2. Attitudes and motivation are also important for the success of SLA because attitudes and motivation are likely to be related to the L2 student’s active and personal involvement in L2 communication with the target L2 members. In addition, self-confidence is important for the success of SLA since L2 students with high self-confidence are more likely to interact and communicate with the target L2 members. It is probable that those affective variables are important for the
success of SLA since those affective variables are related to the frequency and quality of the L2 student’s communication with members of the target L2 community.

It is worth noticing that, as described above, none of those affective variables can alone influence the L2 student’s communication behaviors in L2. Instead, those affective variables will interact with one another in influencing the L2 student’s communication behaviors. Therefore, it is important for L2 researchers and educators to understand the interrelations of those affective variables in influencing the L2 student’s communication behaviors in L2, in order to explain individual differences in SLA more comprehensively.

2.3 MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998)

In an attempt to explain the interrelations of affective variables influencing L2 communication behaviors, MacIntyre et al. (1998) instituted a heuristic model of WTC. MacIntyre et al. argued that the heuristic model may provide “an account of the linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables that might affect one’s willingness to communicate” (p. 545).

As demonstrated in the text below, an examination of WTC offers the opportunity to integrate psychological, linguistic, and communicative approaches to L2 research that typically have been independent of each other. We view the WTC model as having the potential to provide a useful interface between these disparate lines of inquiry. Our second goal is to suggest potential relations among these variables by outlining a comprehensive conceptual model that may be useful in describing, explaining, and predicting L2 communication. (p. 545)

The heuristic model of WTC consists of a pyramid-shaped structure with six categories or variables called layers. Among the variables in the structure, some variables are hypothesized to produce relatively “situational influences” on WTC, whereas others are
hypothesized to cause relatively “enduring influences” on WTC. “Enduring influences” can be defined as long-term properties of the environment or person that can possibly apply to any situation, while “situational influences” can be described as more transient and dependent on the specific context in which a person functions at a given time (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 546). Hypothesized to have situational influences on and to be the most proximal causes of L2 communication, the three layers closest to the top of the pyramid are Communication Behavior (L2 use = Layer I), Behavior Intention (WTC = Layer II), and Situated Antecedents ( Desire to Communicate with a Specific Person = Layer III). The bottom three layers—Layer IV (Motivation Propensities), V (Affective-Cognitive Context), and VI (Social and Individual Context = the bottom of the pyramid) represent relatively stable, enduring, and distal influences on the process of L2 communication. Similar to affective variables influencing WTC indirectly, the bottom layers function as the foundation of the pyramid on which the first three layers interact with each other as well as the latter layers in influencing L2 communication (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547; Yashima, 2002, p. 57).
As shown in Figure 2.1, each of the six Layers has one or more than one variable. The following section will discuss each of the variables in the Layers, focusing on its role in a Layer as well as its relationships with other variables on the basis of MacIntyre et al.’s theoretical perspectives. Some variables will be discussed in brief if discussed in the previous section, while others will be discussed in depth if necessary.
Layer I (Communication Behavior) involves the variable “L2 use,” which can be regarded as “the result of a complex system of interrelated variables” (p. 547). According to MacIntyre et al., in a broad sense communication behavior includes activities relevant to L2 learning (e.g., speaking up in class, reading an L2 newspaper, watching L2 television, or utilizing the L2 on the job). MacIntyre et al. argue that a productive L2 learning program must create L2 communication opportunities for L2 students who seek out L2 communication opportunities for the development of L2 competence.

Layer II (Behavioral Intention) includes the variable “willingness to communicate (WTC).” MacIntyre et al. define WTC as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using an L2” (p. 547). The readiness might be clearly explained by the following example. In a classroom, a teacher asks his/her students a question, and students raise their hands to show their intention to answer the question. Even if only one student has the opportunity to answer the question in L2, all other students who have raised their hands can be considered as demonstrating non-verbal communication activity. Thus, WTC can be regarded as the L2 student’s intention to communicate if he/she is given an opportunity to do so.

MacIntyre et al. point out that the theoretical definition of WTC corresponds to the Theory of Planned Behavior conceptualized by Ajzen (1988). According to the theory, “the most immediate cause of behavior is the intention to engage in a behavior and the person’s actual control over his/her actions” (p. 548). In accordance with the Theory of Planned Behavior, that behavior is strongly predicted by intention or
willingness to act, MacIntyre et al. hypothesize that the WTC of an L2 student can predict his/her involvement in actual L2 communication (see p. 548).

In regard to affective variables influencing WTC, MacIntyre et al. point out that the L2 student is likely to engage in L2 communication if he/she has enough self-confidence, a combination of a lack of language anxiety and sufficient communication competence. In addition, MacIntyre et al. claim that the L2 student may participate in L2 communication if he/she feels motivated in an interpersonal situation by a combination of affiliation (integrative) and control (instrumental) motives. The distinction between affiliation and control will be discussed in the later section. Social context can explain why a certain L2 is taught, and why L2 students want to learn the L2 (see pp. 547-548).

Layer III (Situated Antecedents) includes two variables: the desire to communicate with a specific person and state self-confidence. These two variables can be regarded as immediate precursors of WTC. It is hypothesized that both affiliation and control motives influence the L2 student’s desire to communicate in L2. Affiliation is relevant to an individual’s tendency to identify with others. Regarded as the most important factor in informal communication situations, the degree of an individual’s affiliation may vary depending on his/her counterpart’s physical and social proximity, attractiveness, and so on. Control is related to an individual’s intention to influence the other’s behavior. As a motivation for interpersonal communication, control may result in L2 use only if the L2 student feels comfortable enough in using the target L2 to achieve his/her goals efficiently (pp. 548-549).
In regard to state self-confidence, perceived competence and a lack of anxiety can determine the L2 student’s level of self-confidence. Perceived competence, state perceived competence in this case, is relevant to an individual’s feeling that he/she is able to communicate in L2 in a particular situation. State anxiety might be “the transient emotional reaction defined by feelings of tension and apprehension, accompanied by autonomic nervous system arousal” (Spielberger, 1983, cited in MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 549). Both perceived competence and state language anxiety are hypothesized to vary depending on social and individual factors. It has been hypothesized that an increase of state language anxiety results in the reduction of self-confidence, while a decrease in perceived competence results in a reduction of self-confidence (p. 549).

Layer IV (Motivational Propensities) involves three important variables: interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation, and L2 confidence. Intergroup motivation, in general, involves two purposes: control and affiliation: “As a motivational orientation, control instigates communication behavior that aims at limiting the cognitive, affective, and behavioral freedom of the communicators” (p. 550). Control often emerges from the more powerful party. For example, doctors employ communication as a medium of controlling their patients’ behaviors. However, communication for control is not always from the more powerful party. For example, patients initiate communication with their doctors to explain their malady. Affiliation often originates in an interest in formulating a relationship with the interlocutor. As previously discussed, the degree of affiliation is dependent on personal characteristics of the interlocutor such as attractiveness, similarity, physical proximity, and frequency of contact. Personality
(extroversion versus introversion) can also be a factor in predicting the degree of affiliation (p. 550).

Contrary to interpersonal motivation, intergroup motivation is directly derived from an L2 student’s belonging to a particular group. It is hypothesized that the intergroup motivation is influenced by intergroup climate and intergroup attitudes. L2 learning for either integrative or instrumental motivation can encourage L2 students to initiate L2 speech. It seems that in regard to interpersonal motivation control and affiliation can be the basic components of the two types of motivation. Motivation for either control or affiliation would result in the same types of communicative behaviors as the interpersonal situation. Both control and affiliation are regarded as important in determining the L2 student’s choice of an interlocutor (pp. 550-551).

Self-confidence in L2 in Layer IV is somewhat different from the situation-specific, state-perceived competence in Layer III in that self-confidence in Layer III corresponds to “the overall belief in being able to communicate in L2 in an adaptive and efficient manner” (p. 551). Self-confidence can be affected by two components: “the self-evaluation of L2 skills, a judgment made by the speaker about the degree of mastery achieved in L2” and language anxiety when using an L2 (p. 551).

Layer V (the Affective and Cognitive Context) involves variables that have a more remote and indirect effect on WTC through the affective variables discussed above. The variables in Layer V are intergroup attitudes, social situation, and communicative competence (pp. 551-552).
Intergroup attitudes are related to integrativeness, fear of assimilation, and motivation to learn the L2. Integrativeness is related to the L2 student’s desire to identify with members of the L2 community. L2 researchers have hypothesized that integrativeness can increase frequency and quality of contact with members of the L2 community. In contrast to integrativeness, fear of assimilation is expected to decrease the L2 student’s frequency and quality of contact with L2 community members. Fear of assimilation is caused by the L2 student’s perception of the potential loss of his/her identification and involvement with the L1 community by acquiring his/her target L2. Motivation to learn the L2 is influenced by attitudes toward the L2. Positive attitudes can motivate L2 student to dedicate a more intense and thorough effort to learning the L2 (pp. 552-553).

Social situation can influence the L2 student’s confidence that may be a function of his/her experience with members of the L2 community. For example, a university professor has sufficient confidence in L2 while giving a lecture to a class, but less confidence in L2 while talking to an L2 native speaker in L2 by telephone. Positive experiences in an L2 will encourage the L2 student to have a positive attitude toward the L2 communication. In association with social situation, social variation can be influenced by many factors, of which five factors are regarded by many researchers as important: the participants, the setting, the purpose, the topic, and the channel of communication. Relevant to the participants, “the most important participant variables are the speaker’s age, gender, and social class, as well as various aspects of the relationship between the participants: the power relationship between them, their level of
intimacy, the extent of their shared knowledge, and the social distance between them” (p. 553).

The setting is related to the place and time of communication. Biber (1994) suggests six primary domains – business/workplace, education/academic, government/legal, religious, art/entertainment, and domestic/personal, in order to explain the setting. Within each domain, two sub-domains, private and public exist. For example, in the workplace, the speaker may have a communication with the interlocutor for a meeting (public) or a chat (private). McCroskey and Richmond (1991) suggest three general domains: school environments, organizational environments, and social environments (p. 553)

The purpose is related to the goals or intentions of discourse that direct communication activities. While some communication situations can be characterized by only one featured purpose, most situations include more than one purpose. Biber (1999) suggests “four main categories of purpose: persuade (or sell), transfer information, entertain (or edify), and reveal self” (p. 553). The topic of communication is expected to significantly influence the degree of the L2 student’s self-confidence in the L2, which will in turn influence his/her use of the L2. In other words, the L2 student’s self-confidence in L2 communication is significantly dependent on the speaker’s topical expertise and familiarity with a certain register. Finally, the communication channel involves the medium chosen for the communication. Two main channels are speaking and writing (pp. 553-554).
As one of the variables in Layer V, it is hypothesized that communicative competence influences the L2 student’s willingness to communicate. Canale and Swain (1980) define communicative competence as four dimensions: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) describe communicative competence with five dimensions: linguistic, discourse, actional, sociocultural, and strategic competence.

Layer VI (the Societal and Individual Context) includes intergroup climate and personality. According to Gardner and Clément (1990), “intergroup climate can be defined along two complementary dimensions concerned with the structural characteristics of the community and their perceptual and affective correlates” (p. 555). Structural characteristics of the L1 and L2 communities can explain the intergroup climate. Among the characteristics, ethnolinguistic vitality is regarded as important. Giles et al. (1977) link ethnolinguistic vitality to the relative demographic representation of the L1 and the L2 communities in terms of their relative socioeconomic power and representation in social institutions such as the government, legislation, and the church (p. 555) (see 2.2.3 The roles of language attitudes in SLA for more information).

Perceptual and affective correlates are relevant to “the role of attitudes and values regarding the L2 community and the motivation to adapt and reduce social distance between ethnic groups” (p. 556). It is hypothesized that a positive attitude toward the L2 community leads to positive interactions with members of the L2 community. Moreover, it is hypothesized that the L2 student’s positive attitudes toward the L2 community can enhance his/her motivation and achievement in L2.
It is likely that since members of the minority community perceive that acculturation to the majority community can secure benefits such as social acceptance, economic advancement, and psychological adjustment, members of the minority might readily adapt to the majority community. During the process of adaptation/acculturation to the majority, the minority needs to acquire the L2, the language of the majority, with which members of the minority can secure the various human needs necessary for acculturation. Kim (1988) argues that harmonious adaptation/acculturation is possible if members of the minority can communicate with members of the majority community.

In regard to negative intergroup issues, prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior can explain the negative relationship between the L1 and L2 communities. Allport (1965) suggests that “prejudice refers to a negative attitude toward members of another group, grounded in information about the group that is either illogical or unjustifiable” (p. 556). The L2 student may learn prejudice from other members of his/her L1 community, historical thinking patterns, or direct experience with the target group. Regarding members of the L1 community, parents may be the greatest influence on children’s ethnic attitude development (Aboud, 1988; Phinney, 1990), even though “the influence of parents on attitude formation and maintenance eventually may be superseded by the influence of peers and the media” (p. 557).

In Layer VI, personality is thought to have an indirect impact on WTC through other affective variables such as attitudes, motivation, and confidence. For example, a certain personality can predict how an individual will react to members of the L2 community in regard to L2 communication. The L2 student with an authoritarian personality type may avoid having communication with the L2 community members.
Similar to ethnocentrism, “the authoritarian personality type is an individual who is highly conventional, submissive to authority, and aggressive toward those whom he or she believes are inferior or different” (p. 557). A number of definitions of personality trait have been suggested, but the Big Five is regarded as the most basic and independent personality trait (p. 557).

In summary, MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model explains WTC with cognitive affective variables interacting with social factors. In general, the cognitive affective variables included in the model are personality, attitudes, motivation, L2 competence, and self-confidence. According to the model, affective variables such as personality, L2 competence and attitude have indirect influence on WTC, while motivation and self-confidence have direct effects on WTC. Responding to the socioeducational model by Gardner (1985), MacIntyre et al.’s model describes how attitudes have indirect effects on WTC through motivation, and motivation influences WTC so as to achieve the success of SLA. Self-confidence has two dimensions—perceived competence and a lack of anxiety, which corresponds to MacIntyre’s Model of WTC (1994).

MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that their heuristic model of WTC can be of practical and pedagogical use in explaining individual differences in WTC, which is important for the success of SLA. The researcher of the current study assumes that MacIntyre et al.’s model (1998) can be useful in explaining the diversity of WTC in L2 among Korean university students who are learning English as a foreign language in Korea. This assumption is grounded in the theoretical perspective that WTC can be “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991, p. 23). Because of the
consistency of the personality trait of WTC in L2 learning, the level of an L2 student’s WTC in a communication context (e.g., talking in a small group) is argued to be predictable on the basis of his/her level of WTC in other contexts (e.g., making a speech in public, talking in a meeting, and talking in a dyad). That is, the personality trait of WTC seems to enable MacIntyre et al.’s model to explain the diversity of WTC among L2 students across L2 communication contexts. Thus, it might be reasonable that MacIntyre et al.’s model can also explain the diversity of WTC among Korean students learning English as an L2 in Korea.

In spite of the predictability of WTC due to its personality trait construct, the pedagogical application of MacIntyre et al.’s model (1998) to the Korean context needs to withstand an examination of the model’s reliability in explaining the WTC of Korean university students in L2. Along with the personality trait construct, WTC is also situational in that the level of an L2 student’s WTC will be different according to communication situations. The situational differences of WTC make it difficult to predict or explain WTC across communication contexts. McCroskey and Richmond (1991, 1998) argue that if WTC is more likely to be situational than trait-like, L2 educators should examine language learning in a variety of communicative contexts before applying a model of WTC to a specific communicative context. In accordance with this perspective, MacIntyre et al.’s model, developed in an ESL context on the basis of studies performed mainly in ESL contexts, could potentially explain WTC in L2 of Korean students in Korea, an EFL. More importantly, Yashima (2002) argues that “since the ethnolinguistic vitality of a language itself is a variable that influences L2 learning affect and communication, a careful examination of what it means to learn a language in
a particular context is necessary before applying a model developed in a different context” (p. 62) (see also, Dörnyei, 1990; Warden et al., 2000). In regard to these concerns, the present study is intended to examine whether or not MacIntyre et al.’s model is reliable in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean students before the pedagogical application of the model to the Korean EFL context.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methods employed in the present study. This chapter consists of five sections—research design, participant selection, instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research design

The primary goal of the current study was to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 in explaining the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC in English among Korean students learning English as a foreign language in Korea. The researcher of the current study was motivated to conduct the current study by the theoretical perspective that understanding what determines individual differences in WTC can help to promote the more successful attainment of L2 proficiency. In association with the theoretical perspective, the researcher of the current study attempted to introduce to the Korean students MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998), which is regarded as more comprehensive than other models in explaining the diversity of WTC in L2. The researcher of the current study believed that MacIntyre
et al.’s model of WTC could help Korean students understand what factors determine the success of L2 proficiency, which could enable them to achieve their goal of achieving English proficiency. Before introduction of the model to the Korean context for pedagogical and theoretical use in Korea, the researcher of the current study felt it necessary to explore whether MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC would be reliable in the Korean context, which was different from the context where MacIntyre et al.’s model was conceptualized. With this background, this study was designed to examine the reliability of the heuristic model of L2 WTC in explaining the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC among Korean university students learning English in Korea. In other words, the present study was intended to explore whether MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC was generalizable to the Korean context in explaining the diversity of WTC in English among Korean students.

In order to examine the generalizability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (see Figure 2.1 in Chapter 2) to the Korean context, the researcher of the current study formulated and tested a structural model that was established on the basis of MacIntyre et al.’s model. MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 suggests that attitudes are directly related to WTC and indirectly related to WTC through motivation. MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 also suggests that L2 learning motivation is directly related to WTC and indirectly related to WTC through confidence in L2 communication. Furthermore, MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC suggests that confidence in L2 communication is directly related to WTC. In accordance with MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model, the researcher of the current study formulated a structural model as follows.
For the purpose of testing the structural model, the researcher of the current study established the following research hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1**: Attitudes are directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.

**Hypothesis 2**: English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication.

**Hypothesis 3**: Confidence in English Communication is directly related to WTC in English.
The researcher of the current study believed that the examination of the research hypotheses could enable the researcher to respond to the main research question “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English and what affects their willingness to communicate in English,” and to its secondary questions as follows.

1. What are the relations among Korean university students' WTC in English, Confidence in English Communication, English Learning Motivation, and Attitudes Toward the International Community?

2. What can the findings of this study imply for the decision of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts?

3.1.1 Research method

The present study primarily employs a quantitative research method with a packet of questionnaires, which will assess the participants’ levels of affective variables. The quantitative research method is associated with positivism, a philosophic view that was formulated in the 19th century. According to positivism, general principles or laws govern both the social world and the physical world. Thus, it was posited that researchers can find governing principles or laws and apply them to explain and predict human behavior. Positivists believe that establishing objective techniques for data collection and measurement is the best way to explain and predict human behavior. In research, the primary interest of positivists is to generalize research findings to a larger population. Along with this, positivists argue that research must be systematic and open to replication by other researchers (Ary et al., 2002, p. 22). Since the purpose of this
study is to explore the generalizability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 to the Korean context, it is appropriate for this study to employ quantitative research methodology.

The researcher of the current study employed the research method of SEM (Structural Equation Modeling) as a quantitative research approach. SEM enables the examination of multiple and interrelated dependence relationships in a single model. In SEM, dependence relationships can be multiple and interrelated because a dependent variable in a relationship can be an independent variable in other relationships. This makes it possible for the researcher to examine and explain complex relationships among variables (Byrne, 1994; Hair et al., 1998; Kline, 1998). In SEM, researchers can create a pictorial portrayal of the predicted relationships among variables, which is referred to as a structural model. In formulating a structural model, researchers have complete power over the structural model in accordance with the predicted relationships among variables. Researchers also decide what variables (indicator variables) measure what constructs (latent variables) in the measurement model. Indicator variables are observed values that can be used to measure a latent variable, which cannot be measured directly. A latent variable can be represented or measured by one or more indicator variables (Hair et al., 1998). Along with the characteristics of SEM, the researcher of the current study believes that the research method of SEM is appropriate for the research purpose of the current study, which is to examine the interrelations among affective variables predicted in MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998).
In regard to the structural model of the current study drawn in Figure 3.1, the researcher of the current study described how to measure the latent variables in the structural model in the following section. In other words, the researcher of the current study described what indicator variable measured which latent variables.

Concerning attitudes, Gardner (1985) claimed in the socioeducational model that attitudes have two dimensions: integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation. Dörynei (1990) argued that integrativeness seems to be irrelevant to EFL contexts where EFL students can hardly have opportunities to identify with native speakers of English. Yashima (2002) also argued that “English may represent something vaguer and larger than the American community in EFL students’ minds. For many EFL learners, English symbolizes the world, something that connects them to foreign countries and foreigners or strangers in Gudykunst’s (1991) sense” (p. 57). Along with Dörynei’s and Yashima’s perspectives, this study substitutes Gardner’s conceptualization of attitudes with “international posture”. Yashima (2002) measured “International Posture” with four indicator variables: Intercultural Friendship Orientation, Interest in International Vocation/Activities, Interest in Foreign Affairs, and Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency. According to Yashima, when capturing the general individual attitudes toward intercultural communication, international vocation or activities and foreign affairs, the attitudes defined by several variables turned out to be fairly strongly related to motivation as defined by Gardner and Lambert (1972) (p. 62). In their heuristic model of WTC, MacIntyre et al. (1998) describes intergroup attitudes with two dimensions: integrativeness and fear of assimilation. The two dimensions are related to the L2 student’s tendency to approach to or avoid L2 communication (p. 552). Based on the
theoretical perspectives, International Posture will be measured with four indicator variables: Intercultural Friendship Orientation, Interest in International Vocation/Activities, Interest in Foreign Affairs, and Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency (see Figure 3.2).

![Figure 3.2 The measurement model of International Posture](image)

Note. IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency

In terms of motivation, Gardner (1985) hypothesized in his socioeducational model that motivation includes three components: Desire to Learn the L2, Motivational Intensity, and Attitudes Toward Learning the L2. Following Gardner’s socioeducational model, the researcher of the current study measures the latent variable L2 Motivation with three indicator variables: Desire to Learn English, Motivational Intensity, and Attitudes Toward Learning English (see Figure 3.3).
Figure 3.3  The measurement model of Motivation

Note. MI: Motivational Intensity; DLE: Desire to Learn English; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English

Regarding Confidence in English Communication, the researcher of the current study measured Confidence in English Communication in the structural model with two indicator variables: Perceived Competence in English and Communication Anxiety in English. The researcher’s decision corresponded to the theoretical perspective in MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC as well as other L2 researchers such as Clément (1980), MacIntyre (1994), and MacIntyre et al. (2000) (see Figure, 3.4).
Finally, the researcher of this study will measure WTC in English with a single indicator variable: WTC in English (see Figure, 3.5).
Figure 3.6 below illustrates the structural model comprising latent variables and the measurement model of the latent variables in the structural model of this study.

Note. IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; DLE: Desire to Learn English; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English.
3.2 Participation selection

In regard to the selection of participants for the current study, the researcher of the current study chose Korean undergraduate university students learning English as an L2 in Korea. The researcher of the current study anticipated that selected university students could at least provide the researcher with a good range of affective variables such as English learning motivation, age, and academic fields compared to other Korean students learning English. For example, compared to middle or high school students, undergraduate university students may have diverse motivations to learn English; some of university students may want to lean English in order to secure jobs, while others will want to learn English to enter graduate schools, to pass the national certificate examination for the legal profession, or to achieve other purposes. In regard to age, some students enter the university right after high school, while others have spent at least one year before entering universities after (a) failure(s) to obtain admission to colleges. Because affective variables tend to interact with one another, the researcher expects that the range of affective variables may maximize the diversity of WTC among Korean undergraduate university students learning English in Korea.

3.2.1 Sample size

The sample size is important in estimating and interpreting SEM models, even though the main focus of SEM is not on individual observations: The main focus of SEM is on the pattern or relationships across respondents (Hair et al., 1998, p. 601). In SEM, the sample size can be affected by four different concerns—model misspecification, model size, departures from normality, and estimation procedure (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 604-605).
Model misspecification is associated with specification error, which can be caused by the omission of relevant variables from the specified structural model. To some extent, because a researcher cannot include all potential construct and indicator variables, all structural models may suffer from specification error. The researcher should increase the sample size if he/she is concerned about the impact of specification error. However, the impact of specification error should be negligible if the researcher includes all variables relevant to the theory in the specified structural model (Hair et al., 1998, p. 604).

The concern of model size is related to the complexity of the specified structural model. As the complexity of a structural model increases, the researcher increases the sample size. The absolute minimum sample size must outnumber the number of covariances or correlations in the input data matrix. However, it is more typical to have a minimum ratio of at least five respondents for each estimated parameter, while a ratio of 10 respondents per parameter is considered most appropriate. When increasing the sample size, the researcher should consider the parsimony of his/her specified structural model in attempting to achieve a larger degree of freedom. The parsimony refers to the achievement of a better/greater model fit with fewer coefficients. The parsimony assures that the test results of the model are not a result of overfitting the data (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 640-605; Kline, 1998, pp. 111-112).

The concern of departures from normality is connected to the assumptions of multivariate normality. If the input data offend the assumptions, the researcher needs to increase the ratio of respondents so that parameters to be in the ratio of 15 respondents for each parameter, which is a generally accepted ratio (Hair et al., 1998, p. 605).
Finally, regarding the concern of estimation procedure, the most common estimation procedure is maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). In general, the appropriate use of MLE requires a sample size of 100 to 150. As the sample size increases above 100 to 150, the sensitivity of the MLE method in detecting differences among the data increases. If the sample size becomes large (i.e., over 400 to 500), the MLE becomes too sensitive in detecting any difference, and makes all goodness-of-fit measures poor. A sample size ranging from 100 to 200 is recommended. Hair et al. (1998) specifically recommend a sample size of 200: “One approach is always to test a model with a sample size of 200, no matter what the original sample size was, because 200 is proposed as being the critical sample size” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 605).

Hair et al. (1998) further recommend that the researcher increase the sample size beyond 200 if any of the four concerns arises. Following Hair et al.’s recommendations, the researcher of the current study uses a sample size of around 200, with the possibility of increasing the sample size when any of the four concerns is suspected or detected.

### 3.2.2 Participants in this study

Participants in the current study were Korean undergraduates learning English as required course work in Korea; most of them were freshmen. The researcher contacted several informants and asked them to help recruit enough participants for the current study. The informants were this researcher’s colleagues who were lecturing at five different universities in Korea. The informants agreed to help the researcher recruit enough participants. The number of participants was expected to be around 200. To ensure an adequate response, the researcher of the current study collected data from around 200 participants. Participants who had spent more than three months in English-
speaking countries will be excluded. In addition, any participants under the age of 18 were excluded from the current study. The researcher of the current study expected that all participants had studied English for 10 years at elementary, middle, and high schools in Korea. More importantly, the researcher expected potential recruits to be willing to volunteer because a number of Korean students are eager to develop their English proficiency (see Chapter one and two of this study).

3.3 Research instruments

The primary goal of the present study was intended to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998) in explaining the interrelations of affective variables influencing WTC in English among Korean students learning English in Korea. As previously stated, the researcher of the current study hypothesized that the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model in explaining WTC across communication contexts is dependent on the determination of whether WTC is trait-like or situational. WTC can be “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991, p. 23).

The researcher of the current study determined whether WTC is trait-like or situational by comparing the results of the current study, which was conducted in Korea, with those of Yashima’s study (2002), which was performed in Japan. Yashima’s study (2002) was one of the most recent studies that have tested the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC in EFL contexts. Because of the research goal, the researcher of the current study followed Yashima’s research procedure (2002). This means that the researcher of the current study employed the same research instruments as those that Yashima used for
her study, except for the instrument of Attitude Toward Learning English. In other words, among the 10 research instruments in the current study, nine instruments were adapted from Yashima’s study, and the other one was from Gardner (1988). The reason that the researcher of the current study included the instrument of Attitude Toward Learning English from Gardner (1988) was because he wanted to base his structural model on the theory of L2 learning motivation (see 2.2.4 The roles of motivation in SLA) as well. In the following section, the researcher of the current study described the instruments that assessed the participants’ affective variables, an assessment that could enable the researcher to test the structural model established in this study to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2.

3.3.1 A packet of questionnaires measuring indicator variables

In the structural model for the current study, four latent (construct) variables were included: Attitude (International Posture), English Learning Motivation, Confidence in English Communication, and WTC in English. The three latent variables, Attitudes (International Posture), English Learning Motivation, and English Communication Confidence, were measured by nine indicator variables, and the latent variable, WTC in English was measured by one indicator variable, WTC in English. The following section describes which indicator variables defined which latent variables, and how the indicator variables were measured.

Attitudes (International Posture): Four indicator variables defined this latent variable. Each of the four indicator variables was measured by a questionnaire scale.

- Intercultural Friendship Orientation (IFO) was measured by four items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85$) developed by Yashima’s factor analysis of Japanese
learner’s orientations toward learning English. The four items requested participants to rate on a 7-point scale the degree of importance of each item asking their reasons to learn English (e.g., It will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people) (Yashima, 2002, p. 60, 66).

- Interest in International Vocation/Activities (IVA) was measured by six items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .73$) developed by Yashima (2002) on the basis of her own studies (1999, 2000) and Tanaka et al.’s study (1991). Each of the six items asked participants to indicate the degree of their interest in an international career and living overseas on a 7-point scale (e.g., “I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently”) (Yashima, 2002, p. 60).

- Interest in Foreign Affairs (IFA) was defined by two items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .67$). The two items were originally formulated by Kitagawa and Minoura for their study (1991), and Yashima modified the items to use for her study (2002). The two items requested participants to rate their degree of interest in international issues on 7-point scales (e.g., “I often read and watch news about foreign countries”) (Yashima, 2002, p. 60).

- Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency (AAT) was described by seven items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .79$). These seven items were developed by Gudykunst (1991) and Kim (1991) for the measurement of intercultural communication competence in Japanese on the basis of work by Gudykunst (1991) and Gouran and Nishida (1996). Yashima (2002) modified the items described in abstract terms to describe more concrete situations, attitudes, and behaviors in an attempt to make the items easy for participants to respond to. Each of the seven items asked
participants to evaluate on a 7-point scale their tendency to approach or avoid L2 communication with foreigners. (e.g., “I would share an apartment with international students”) (Yahima, 2002, p. 60).

**English Learning Motivation:** This latent variable was defined by three indicator variables: Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn English, and Attitudes Toward Learning English.

- **Motivational Intensity (MI)** was measured by six items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$) formed by Gardner and Lambert (1972). Each of the six items requested participants to rate on a 7-point scale the degree of their agreement with its statement (e.g., “Compared to my classmates, I think I study English relatively hard”).

- **Desire to Learn English (DLE)** was described by six items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .78$). These six items, taken from Gardner & Lambert (1972), asked participants to evaluate their degree of desire to learn English on 7-point scales (e.g., “I believe absolutely that English should be taught at school.”) (Yashima, 2002, p. 60).

- **Attitudes Toward Learning English (ALE)** was defined with 10 items that assessed participants’ feelings toward learning L2 (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .95$). Five were positively worded and five were negatively worded. A high score indicated a favorable attitude. (e.g., “I love learning English.” “I hate English.”) (Gardner, 1988; Gardner & Lysynchuk, 1990).

**Confidence in English Communication:** This latent variable was measured by two indicator variables—Communication Anxiety in L2 and Perceived Competence in English.
• Communication Anxiety in English (CA) was defined by 12 items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .92$) adapted from MacIntyre and Clément’s study (1996). Each of the 12 items asked participants to indicate the percentage of time they would feel nervous in each of four communication contexts (i.e., public speaking, talking in meetings, talking in small groups, and talking in dyads) and the three types of receivers (strangers, acquaintances, and friends) (e.g., I would never feel nervous = 0 % vs. I would always feel nervous = 100 %). (e.g., Having a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances.) (Yashima, 2002, p.60)

• Perceived Communication Competence in English (PC) was described by 12 items (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .92$) by MacIntyre and Charos (1996). The items requested participants to indicate their self-assessed competency in each of four communication situations and three types of receiver between the numbers 0 (completely incompetent) and 100 (completely competent). (e.g., Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers.) (Yashima, 2002, p. 60-61).

WTC in English was measured by the 12-item scale (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 91$) formulated by McCroskey (1992). The scale asked participants to indicate the percentage of time they would be willing to communicate in English when free to do so in each type of communication situation between the numbers 0 (totally not willing to) and 100 (totally willing to). (e.g., Present a talk in English to a group of strangers.).

For the current study, the researcher’s main concern about using the instrument of WTC in English discussed above is that this instrument for measuring the WTC above is more likely to be oriented to assessing WTC in social contexts, while the current study is somewhat likely to assess the participants’ WTC in academic contexts. In spite of this
important concern, the researcher of the current study have chosen to use the instrument of WTC above because of the generalizability of the instrument to both social and academic contexts as claimed by McCroskey (1992). McCroskey (1992) claimed that the WTC instrument is assumed to be representative across academic and social contexts because of its correlation with other instruments that measure WTC in academic contexts. Chan (1988) reported the correlation of the total score of WTC on the instrument developed by McCroskey with the scores of WTC on an instrument she developed to measure college student respondents’ willingness to communicate in a classroom (r = .70, .80 corrected for attenuation). Combs (1990) reported in the results of her study involving college professors as respondents that there was a high association between the total score of WTC on the instrument by McCroskey and the scores on an instrument she developed to measure WTC with a special type of audience, authority figures (department chairs and higher university administrators) (pp. 17-18).

To make the questions in the nine instruments easier for the Korean participants to understand and respond to, the researcher of the current study has translated the language of the instruments from English to Korean. The researcher of the current study with 10 Korean graduate students studying at The Ohio state University evaluated the translation in order to verify that the translation of the instruments is reliable and valid. Among the 10 Korean graduate students, three of them had experience in teaching Korean at high schools or universities, and the other seven graduate students had experience to teach English at middle schools, high schools, universities, or private language institutes. The researcher of the current study had the 10 graduate students read both the original sentences written in English and the sentences translated in Korean, and
asked them to write down their suggestions for the improvement of each sentence if the translation of the sentence were not appropriate. On the basis of their suggestions, if necessary, the researcher of the current study modified the wording as appropriate for the participants in the current study to be able to understand more clearly and respond to the questions in the instruments. The researcher of the current study believed that because the 10 Korean graduate students were expert at both Korean and English, the evaluation with the 10 Korean graduate students could increase the validity and the reliability of the translation of the instruments (see Appendix C).

3.4 Data collection procedures

The researcher of the current study asked the informants to distribute flyers to potential participants at five different universities in Seoul and its vicinity in Korea. The flyers advertised the need for participants for the present study. The flyer indicated the goals of this research, potential benefits for participants, requirements for participation in the current study, and procedures followed. The informants distributed flyers to potential participants studying English as required course work in person or will post flyers around classrooms where English classes would be held. After the informants distributed enough flyers to potential participants, the researcher of the current study waited to recruit participants for three weeks. If not enough recruits were obtained, the researcher of the current study would ask the informants to distribute flyers again. The researcher continued distributing flyers in three-week intervals until recruiting enough participants—around 200 participants.
The flyer asked potential participants to contact the researcher of the current study through e-mail, who would send them a packet of questionnaires by e-mail attachment. The researcher’s e-mail to the participants explained the significance of the current study, the research procedure, what the participants need to do to participate, the approximate amount of time required for the completion of the questionnaires, the confidentiality of participation, and potential benefits of participation. The researcher’s e-mail also explained that he offered the participants a chance to win a free T-shirt: one out of every five. This offer was intended to increase their motivation to participate in the present study (see the e-mail letter attached). Through the e-mail, the researcher of the current study further explained to the participants that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions on the questionnaires, and that they should choose the most appropriate responses to the questions reflecting their English communication behaviors or tendencies. In regard to the confidentiality of the participants, the researcher of the current study assured them that no information would be divulged to outside parties without their permission.

When the researcher of the current study completed collecting data from the participants, he conducted a raffle for the free T-shirts. The researcher sent 40 winners (approximately one out of every five) free T-shirts with a letter in order expressing his gratitude to them. The researcher of the current study sent a thank-you letter to the other participants and the informants.
3.5 Data analysis

For data analysis of the current study, the researcher used AMOS 4.0, which became popular recently because of its simple interface for the user (Hair et al., 1998). The data from the packet of questionnaires were input into the computer program of AMOS 4.0. The following section describes how to analyze the data using the research method of SEM in order to help readers understand the data analysis of the current study more clearly. Mainly, the researcher of the current study followed the stages of analyzing data that Hair et al. (1998) suggested.

3.5.1 Data analysis stages in SEM

Hair et al. (1998) postulated that the process of SEM can be explained with seven stages. While the first four stages are relevant to the process of establishing the structural and measurement model, the last three stages are related to the process of analyzing the structural and measurement model. This section describes the last three stages—Stage 5, Stage 6, and Stage 7—as the process of analyzing the structural and measurement model. Each stage will be described in detail in regard to data analysis.

**Stage 5: Assessing the identification of the structural model**

In Stage 5, the main concern is model identification. This section explains what model identification is, what problem the failure of model identification causes, and how a researcher diagnoses and remedies the problem.

Prior to the examination of the results, researchers should assure that the structural model is identified. A problem in the identification of the structural model is likely to cause the computer program to produce meaningless or illogical results.
In establishing the identification of the structural model, the two most basic rules are the rank and order conditions. The order condition is related to the model’s degree of freedom, which must be greater than or equal to zero. A model with exactly zero degrees of freedom is defined as a “just-identified model.” The just-identified model is a perfect fit of the model, but this solution is not interesting because of its lack of generalizability. If the model has a negative number of degrees of freedom, the model is referred to as an “underidentified model,” which fails to satisfy the order condition. A negative number of degrees of freedom indicates that the model has tried to estimate more parameters than information is available for in the data matrix. To estimate the underidentified model, a researcher fixes or constrains some parameters. Researchers attempt to achieve an “overidentified model” with a positive number of degrees of freedom, suggesting that the model has more information in the data matrix than the number of parameters to be estimated, which ensures that the model is as generalizable as possible. In addition to the order condition, the model must satisfy the rank condition. The rank condition requires that researchers should algebraically determine whether each parameter is uniquely estimated (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 608-609).

Like the computer software, researchers can diagnose identification problems by detecting possible symptoms such as “very large standard errors for one or more coefficients, the inability of the program to invert the information matrix, wildly unreasonable estimates or impossible estimates such as negative error variances, or high correlations (± .90 or greater) among the estimated coefficients” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 609). Three common sources of an identification problem are “a large number of estimated coefficients relative to the number of covariances or correlations, indicated by
a small number of degrees of freedom—similar to the problem of overfitting the data, the use of reciprocal effects (two-way causal arrows between two constructs), and failure to fix the scale of a construct” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 609). Researchers can solve an identification problem relevant to one of the three sources by defining more constraints on the model. That is, researchers can solve the problem by gradually deleting paths from the path diagram until the problem is solved (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 608-610, 631-633).

Stage 6: Evaluating Goodness-of-fit criteria

In Stage 6, three steps are taken for evaluating the results. The first step is to examine offending estimates. Researchers should understand what offending estimates are, how to detect them, and how to deal with them. In the second step, researchers need to assess the overall model fit to ensure that the model is appropriate. Finally, researchers should compare the proposed model with other competing models in order to evaluate whether the proposed model is acceptable because no other models can achieve a higher level of fit. The following section describes what researchers should perform for examining the results in Stage 6.

The first step in evaluating the results is to examine offending estimates related to theoretically inconsistent estimates. The following three examples of offending estimates are most common in SEM: “negative error variances, standardized coefficients exceeding or very close to 1.0, or very large standard errors” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 610, 633). If the case of negative error variances is detected, researchers may solve this problem by fixing the offending error variances to a very small positive value (.005). Researchers should acknowledge that this solving method can only conceal the underlying problem, and
consider this when interpreting the results. As Hair et al. (1998) notes, “if correlations in
the standardized solution exceed 1.0, or two estimates are correlated highly, then the
researcher should consider elimination of one of the constructs or should ensure that true
discriminant validity has been established among the constructs” (p. 610).

Along with the condition that there are no offending estimates, researchers can
take a second step, which is to assess the overall model fit with one or more goodness-of-fit
measures for the purpose of ensuring that the model is an appropriate representation of
the entire set of relationships: “Goodness-of-fit measures the correspondence of the
actual or observed input (covariance or correlation) matrix with that predicted from the
proposed model” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 611). Three types of goodness-of-fit measures are
absolute fit measures, incremental fit measures, and parsimonious fit measures. Absolute
fit measures assess only the overall model fit including both structural and measurement
models collectively without the concern of adjustment for the degree of “overfitting” that
possibly arises. Researchers can employ incremental fit measures when comparing the
proposed model to their other specified model. Finally, parsimonious fit measures can
facilitate the comparison between models with different complexities and objectives.
Even an acceptable level of overall goodness-of-fit does not assure that all constructs will
satisfy the requirements for measurement model fit, or that the structural model is certain
to be fully supported (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 611, 633-636). After the process of assessing
overall model fit, researchers examine the estimated loadings and the statistical
significance of each loading. In regard to variance extracted, the threshold value is of .50
(Hair et al., 1998, p. 636).
Researchers examine the structural model in terms of the significance of estimated coefficients. In the case when a one-tailed test of significance (a negative or a positive relationship) is employed, the critical value for the .05 significance level is 1.645, while the critical value for the .05 significance increases to 1.96 when a two-tailed test is employed. In addition to the examination of the significance and the corresponding critical value, researchers can examine the structural model relevant to multicollinearity accounting for the correlations among construct estimates. If large values are detected (over .90), corrective actions, including the deletion of one construct or the reformulation of causal relationships, should be taken. In many cases, correlations over .80 can be indicative of problems (Hair et al., 1998, p. 613).

The final approach to model assessment is comparing the proposed model with other competing models. This can help researchers to judge whether their proposed model is acceptable because no other models with formulations similar to the proposed model can achieve a higher level of fit. Since there may always be a better-fitting model, this approach is significant. The three types of goodness-of-fit measures can be used as a means of comparing the proposed model with other competing models (Hair et al., 1998, pp. 613-614, 638-639).

Stage 7: Interpreting and modifying the model

In Stage 7, researchers interpret the results to examine whether the results correspond to the proposed theory, once the model is considered acceptable. Related to the interpretation of the results, two issues should be considered: the use of the standardized versus unstandardized solutions and model respecification.
Researchers acknowledge a significant difference between the standardized and unstandardized solutions in regard to their interpretation and use. According to Hair et al. (1998), “in structural equation models, the standardized coefficients all have equal variances and a maximum value of 1.0, thus closely approximating effects sizes, as was shown by beta weights in regression” (p. 614). The bigger the value of coefficients, the more important the coefficients in the relationships. Thus, the standardized coefficients can be used to indicate relative importance, but those are not comparable across samples. On the other hand, “the unstandardized coefficients are expressed in terms of the construct’s scale, which makes these coefficients comparable across samples and retains their scale effect” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 614).

After model interpretation, researchers decide whether there are better methods to improve model fit that correspond to the underlying theory, which involves them in model respecification. Researchers can make their decision for model improvement based on an examination of the residuals of the predicted covariance or correlation matrix. The standardized residuals, also called normalized residuals, indicate the difference between the observed and the estimated correlation or covariance matrix. At the .05 level, residual values greater than ± 2.58 are considered significant, and significant residuals represent a substantial prediction error for a pair of indicators (i.e., one of the correlations or covariances in the original input data). When researchers detect significant residuals, they must identify a remedy by adding or modifying the relationships in the structural model.
Moreover, researchers can base their decisions for model improvement on modification indices, which are calculated for each nonestimated relationship. The modification index is associated with the reduction in chi-square that would occur corresponding to the estimation of the coefficient. A value of the modification index greater than or equal to 3.84 indicates that corresponding to the estimation of the coefficient, a statistically significant reduction in the chi-square is obtained. Modification indices can provide the researcher with a useful method of assessing the impact of theoretically based model medications, but he/she should base his/her model modifications on a theoretical justification rather than solely on modification indices.

In summary, researchers can make decisions for model improvements on the basis of an examination of the residuals of the predicted covariance or correlation matrix and modification indices. By adding or deleting the relationships from the model, researchers can modify/respecify the model for improvements, which is termed “model respecification”. However, researchers should remember that model respecification should be based on a theoretical justification (Hair et al., pp. 614-615, 641-643).
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter reports findings from the data analysis of the present study utilizing both SPSS 12.0 for Windows and AMOS version 4.0. The data analyzed in the present study were collected from 191 participants who voluntarily responded to the questions of the survey questionnaires consisting of 10 instruments, whose total items were 53.

4.1 Demographic information of the participants

Before reporting the findings, this section briefly introduces the 191 participants in the current study in regard to their ages, genders, academic majors, and experiences of visiting any English-speaking countries.

4.1.1 Participants

A total number of 191 university students participated voluntarily in the current study by responding to packets of questionnaires through e-mail. The researcher of the current study purposefully recruited as participants Korean students who were taking English classes as required course work at universities in Korea as an EFL context. The recruited participants were majoring in 37 different academic fields at five different
universities in Seoul, the capital city of Korea, and its vicinity. Among the participants, 107 were male (56%) and 84 were female (44%). The difference in ages among the participants ranged from 19 to 33 (see Table 4.1). In regard to the experience of visiting English-speaking countries previously, 152 of the participants had never visited any English-speaking country, four had visited for less than one week, seven had visited for between one and two weeks, 12 had visited for between two and four weeks, 12 had visited between five and eight weeks, and four had visited for between nine and 12 weeks before. For reason stated previously, any recruited university students who had visited any English-speaking countries for more than three months were excluded from this study (see Table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 – 21</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 – 33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: The difference in ages of the participants
Table 4.2: The experience of visiting English-speaking countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>79.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 weeks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 4 weeks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 8 weeks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – 12 weeks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following section, the researcher of the current study will report the findings in response to the research questions and the research hypotheses.

4.2 Secondary Research Question A:

“What are the relations among Korean university students’ WTC in English, confidence in English communication, English learning motivation, and attitude toward the international community?”

The main question of the current study is “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English and what affects their willingness to communicate in English?” In order to investigate the main question, the researcher of the current study formulated two secondary-questions, and Secondary Research Question A stated above; Secondary Research Question B will be
discussed in the next section. The researcher further formulated three research hypotheses as follows in order to examine the secondary questions, especially focusing on Secondary Research Question A.

**Hypothesis 1:** Attitudes are directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.

**Hypothesis 2:** English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication.

**Hypothesis 3:** Confidence in English Communication is directly related to WTC.

The three research hypotheses in regard to the relations among the affective variables are depicted in the structural model of this study in Figure 4.1 below.

![Figure 4.1](image_url)

**Figure 4.1** The structural model depicting relations among affective variables
Before discussing Secondary Research Question A along with the three hypotheses, the researcher of the current study reports descriptive statistics of 10 indicator variables, which measured four construct variables, on the basis of the participants’ (n = 191) responses to the questionnaires measuring 10 indicator variables. Figure 4.2 displays what indicator variables measured which construct variables.

Figure 4.2  The structural model and the measurement model

Note.  IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; DLE: Desire to Learn English; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English; WTC: Willingness to Communicate in English.
4.2.1 Descriptive statistics

In order to measure 10 indicator variables, the researcher of the current study employed 10 instruments, and reliability of each instrument was acquired as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>n of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLE</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFO</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC in L2</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Reliability statistics of the 10 instruments (n of valid cases = 191)

Note. IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; DLE: Desire to Learn English; IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English; WTC in L2: Willingness to Communicate in English.
In Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), “a commonly used threshold value for acceptable reliability is .70, although this is not an absolute standard, and values below .70 have been deemed acceptable if the research is exploratory in nature” (Hair et al., 1998, p. 612). Based on this criterion, the reliabilities of the instruments are valid since all of them were over .70.

Each indicator variable was represented by the mean scores, which were achieved as the result of dividing the total scores, on the basis of the participants’ responses to the instrument, by the number of items of the instrument. For example, the total score of the indicator variable IFA (Interest in Foreign Affairs) ranges from 2 to 14 according to a participant’s responses to the IFA instrument with 2 items and a 7-Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree; see the Instrument attached in Appendix B). The mean score of the IFA ranges from 1 to 7 as the result of dividing the total score by the number of items of the IFA instrument. As another example, the total score of the indicator variable CA (Communication Anxiety in English) ranges from 0 to 1200 depending on a participant’s responses to the CA instrument with 12 items and a 100-scale (0 = never, 100 = always; see the Instrument attached in Appendix). The mean score of the CA ranges from 0 to 100 as the result of dividing the total score by the number of items of the CA instrument. In scoring, some items of the instruments were reversed to summate scores. For example, the second item (“I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can”) of the AAT (Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency) was reversed for summation. Thus, if a participant’s response to the item was ‘Strongly Agree,’ the participant’s response was scored as 1 rather than 7. In reverse, the
participant’s response (Strongly Disagree) was scored as 7 rather 1. Table 4-4 lists what items among the 10 instruments were reversed for summation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would rather stay in my hometown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t think what’s happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I hate English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Learning English is a waste of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I think that learning English is dull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>When I leave school, I shall give up learning English entirely because I’m not interested in it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: The list of items reversed for summation

Note. AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English
In accordance with the criteria for scoring, the input data yielded the correlation matrix of the indicator variables as follows (see Table 4.5: Correlation matrix).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants ( (n = 191) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. IFA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ATT</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MI</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. IVA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DLE</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. IFO</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ALE</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CA</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WTC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Correlation matrix

**Note.** IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; DLE: Desire to Learn English; IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English; WTC: Willingness to Communicate in English.

\*p < .05. **p < .01.
After scoring for the 10 indicator variables, the researcher of the current study transformed the mean scores of the three instruments measuring the three indicator variables—Communication Anxiety in English (CA), Perceived Competence in English (PC), and Willingness to Communicate in English (WTC)—with the scale from 0 to 100 (0 = never, 100 = always for CA and WTC; 0 = no competence at all, 100 = quite competence for PC) to correspond to the mean scores of the 7-Likert scales of the other 7 instruments. This was completed by the method of multiplying the mean scores of the instruments by 7 and dividing them by 100 (the mean score × 7 ÷ 100). For example, if a participant’s mean score of CA is 50, the participant’s mean score of CA can be transformed to be 3.5 (50 × 7 ÷ 100). The researcher decided to transform the mean scores of the three instruments in order to unify the scales of the 10 instruments to correspond closely to one another as a 7-Likert scale. Yashima (2002) also transformed the scales of the two instruments Motivation Intensity (MI) and Desire to Learn English (DLE) adapted from other researchers to correspond to the other 7-Likert scale instruments in an attempt to unify the scales of all the instruments. The researcher of this study expected that the data transformation would ease the data analysis.
Along with the data transformation, the input data from the 191 participants produced the following statistical descriptions of the 10 indicator variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC in L2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics

On the basis of the descriptive statistics (Table 4.6: Descriptive statistics), the error variance of each indicator variable was calculated by the formation of \((1 - \text{reliability}) \times \text{total variance}\). For example, the measured reliability of the variable IFA is .80 (see Table 4.3: Reliability statistics of 10 instruments), so its error variance is 0.37 as the result of \((1-.80) \times 1.87\). Table 4.7 shows the error variance of each indicator variable,
which would be input as starting values in the measurement model in this study (see Figure 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha$)</th>
<th>Error Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLE</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFO</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALE</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC in L2</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: The error variances of the indicator variables

4.2.2 The structural and measurement model for analysis

Figure 4.3 below displays the relations among the construct variables (the structural model) and what indicator variables defined which construct variables (the measurement models). Shown in Figure 4.3, error variables were classified into 3 categories: delta ($\delta$), epsilon ($\varepsilon$), and zeta ($\zeta$). Delta ($\delta$) represented not only errors of measurement of the indicator variables (IFO, IVA, IFA, AAT), defining the exogenous variable, Attitudes (International Posture), but also other variables that may influence
scores on the four indicator variables besides Attitudes (International Posture). Epsilon (ε) represented not only measurement errors of the six indicator variables (MI, DLE, ALE, CA, PC, and WTC), defining the three endogenous variables (ELM, CIEC, and WTC in English), but also other variables that might influence the six indicator variables besides the three endogenous variables (Arbuckle, 1997). Zeta (ζ) represented residual of the endogenous variables: ELM, CIEC, and WTC in English. “Residual terms are indicative of less than perfect prediction of the endogenous variables” (Byrne, 1994, p. 8) (see Figure 4.3).

On the other hand, as shown in Figure 4.3, it was assumed that zeta (ζ) 1 and zeta (ζ) 2 were correlated on the basis of theoretical perspectives. According to theoretical perspectives, L2 learning motivation is related to L2 competence: L2 students who are motivated to study harder can achieve a higher level of L2 competence than less motivated L2 students (see Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Yashima, 2002). In addition, theoretical perspectives state that L2 competence is related to L2 confidence: The more competence L2 students have, the more confidence they have in L2 communication (see MacIntyre, 1994; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Yashima, 2002). Although L2 competence is related to both L2 learning motivation and L2 confidence, the researcher of the current study decided to exclude L2 competence from the structural and the measurement model in the current study. His decision was due to the difficulty requiring volunteering participants to take English proficiency tests such as the TOEFL test. In addition, his decision was affected by Yashima’s finding (2002) that there was no statistically significant relation between the achievement on the TOEFL test and L2 confidence, which directed the researcher of the current study to decide not to utilize the TOEFL test.
Rather than the TOEFL test, it was very difficult to measure participants’ levels of L2 competence in the Korean EFL context. Based on this, it was theoretically reasonable to assume that the residuals, zeta (ζ) 1 and zeta (ζ) 2, were correlated.

In an attempt to improve the model fit, the researcher of the present study employed the strategy of relaxing the assumption that all variables were not correlated with each other, by connecting variables together; consequently, as shown in Figure 4.3, delta 2 and delta 4 as well as epsilon 2 and epsilon 3 were collected with a double-headed arrow (see Arbukle, 1997, pp. 371-372 for more information). Indeed, it seems that the questions of IVA measuring the interest in an international career and living overseas were closely related to the questions of AAT assessing intercultural communication competence. Moreover, it is likely that the questions of DLE measuring the participants’ desire to learn English were closely related to the questions of ALE assessing the participants’ feelings toward learning an L2 (see Appendix B).
Figure 4.3: The structural and the measurement model for analysis

Note. A (I.P.): Attitudes (International Posture); ELM: English Learning Motivation; CIEC: Confidence in English Communication; IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; DLE: Desire to Learn English; IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English; WTC: Willingness to Communicate in English.
4.2.3 The analysis of the structural and the measurement models

The structural and the measurement models were analyzed by AMOS version 4.0. The analyzed models (see Figure 4.4) achieved a good fit to the data according to the chi-square goodness of fit index (40.06) at 29 degrees of freedom, which was not significant (p = .83). This non-significant finding was indicative of goodness of fit. The AMOS program also reported that other goodness of fit measures such as GFI (0.96), AGFI (0.92), and RMSEA (0.045) indicated a very good fit. “GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) is always between zero (0) and unity (1), where unity indicates a perfect fit” (Arbuckle, 1997, p. 568). The GFI value, greater than 0.9, indicates that the model fits the data well (McDonald & Ho, 2002). Like the GFI, the AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) is between zero and 1, where unity (1) indicates a perfect fit (Arbuckle, 1997, 568). A RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) value which is smaller than 0.05 indicates a close fit of the model in relation to the degree of freedom (Arbuckle, 1997; McDonald & Ho, 2002). When RMSEA is greater than 0.1, a model is not acceptable.
Figure 4.4: The analysis of the structural and measurement model (Standardized regression coefficients)

**Note.** A (I.P.): Attitudes (International Posture); ELM: English Learning Motivation; CIEC: Confidence in English Communication; IFA: Interest in Foreign Affairs; AAT: Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency; MI: Motivational Intensity; IVA: Interest in International Vocation/Activities; DLE: Desire to Learn English; IFO: Intercultural Friendship Orientation; ALE: Attitude Toward Learning English; CA: Communication Anxiety in English; PC: Perceived Competence in English; WTC: Willingness to Communicate in English

** p < .01
4.2.4 Hypothesis tests

The following section reports the tests of the three hypotheses formulated to examine Secondary Question A, on the basis of the data analysis of the structural model.

4.2.4.1 Hypothesis 1: “Attitudes are directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.”

The decision of whether or not the relations between or among the variables are significant is based on the critical ratio (C.R.) achieved by dividing the regression weight estimate by its standard error (S.E.). When the C.R. is greater than 1.96 (in absolute value) at the .05 level or 2.576 (in absolute value) at the .01 level, the relations among or between variables are statistically significant. The C.R. is used to test the null hypothesis that in the population from which the sample came the relation between two variables is zero: If an estimate has a critical ratio greater than the assigned value 1.96 at the .05 level or 2.576 at the .01 level, the relation between the two variables is significant at .05 or .01, rejecting the null hypothesis. That is, the relation between the two variables is significantly different from zero at the .05 level or the .01 level (Arbuckle, 1997, pp. 289, 317-318).
Figure 4.5: The test of Hypothesis 1

Note. Standardized regression coefficients
** p < .01

Figure 4.5 shows the relations of Attitudes (International Posture) with WTC in English and English Learning Motivation. The estimate of regression weight (unstandardized) from Attitudes to WTC in English was -0.30, and its standard error (S.E.) was 0.29, and its C.R. was -1.05. Since the C.R. value was smaller than 1.96 (in absolute value) at the .05 level, the relation between Attitudes (International Posture) and WTC in English was not significant, thus rejecting the hypothesis that “Attitudes are directly related to WTC in English.” In other words, the finding indicated that controlling the other variables in the model, Attitudes (International Posture) might not be a direct predictor of determining the participants’ WTC in English.
In regard to the relation between Attitudes (International Posture) and English Learning Motivation, the estimate of regression weight from International Posture to English Learning Motivation was 0.73 (unstandardized), and the its standard error (S.E.) was 0.09, and its C.R. was 8.00. With the C.R. value greater than 2.576, the relation between International Posture and English Learning Motivation was significant at the .01 level. In other words, Attitudes (International Posture) could be an important and positive predictor in determining the participants’ English Learning Motivation.

Concerning the relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English, the relation was not significant: The estimate of regression weight from English Learning Motivation to WTC in English was -0.11 (unstandardized), its S.E. value was 0.29, and its C.R. value was -0.40 (in absolute value) smaller than 1.96 at the .05 level. According to this finding, English Learning Motivation might not be a direct predictor defining WTC in English.

In summary of the response to Hypothesis 1, Attitudes (International Posture) did not appear to be related to WTC in English directly or indirectly through English Learning Motivation. The response to the hypothesis that “Attitudes are indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication” will be discussed in the following section.
4.2.4.2 Hypothesis 2: “English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication.”

Figure 4.6 shows the relations of English Learning Motivation with WTC in English and Confidence in English Communication in regard to Hypothesis 2 that “English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication”.

As previously reported, the relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English turned out to be insignificant at the .05 level (C.R. = -0.40 < 1.96). The hypothesis that English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English was rejected at the .05 level. However, there was a significant relation between English
Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. The estimate of the regression weights from English Learning Motivation to Confidence in English Communication was 0.83 (unstandardized), its S.E. was 0.09, and the C.R. was 7.97. Since the C.R. value was greater than 2.576, the relation between the two variables was significant at the .01 level. In terms of the relation between Confidence in English Communication and WTC in English, the data analysis reported that the relation between the two variables was significant at the .01 level: The estimate of the regression weights from Confidence in English Communication to WTC in English was 1.25 (unstandardized), and its S.E. was 0.29, and its C.R. value was 4.31, greater than 2.576 at the .01 level. Therefore, Confidence in English Communication was significantly and directly related to WTC in English.

To be brief, the findings rejected the hypothesis that English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English. On the other hand, the findings supported the hypothesis that English Learning Motivation is indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication. Returning to Hypothesis 1 that “Attitudes are indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication,” the findings supported the hypothesis. Attitudes were significantly and directly related to English Learning Motivation, which was in turn significantly and directly related to Confidence in English Communication. Since Confidence in English Communication was significantly related to WTC in English, the hypothesis that “Attitudes are related to WTC in English indirectly through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication” was supported.
4.2.4.3 Hypothesis 3: “Confidence in English Communication (L2 Confidence) is directly related to WTC in English.”

Figure 4.7 displays the relation between Confidence in English Communication and WTC in English. According to the data analysis, there is a significant relation (r = .83: standardized) between Confidence in English Communication and WTC in English at the .01 level.

Figure 4.7: The test of Hypothesis 3 (Standardized regression coefficients)

The estimate of the regression weights from L2 Confidence to WTC in English was 1.25 (unstandardized), and its standard error (S.E.) was 0.29, and its critical rate (C.R.) was 4.31 greater than 2.576 at the .01 level. This indicated that the relation between L2 Confidence and WTC in English was significant, supporting the hypothesis.
that “Confidence in English Communication is directly related to WTC in English” at the .01 level.

In summary, the relations (All are standardized) among the affective variables in regard to the three research hypotheses have been achieved as follows.

1. Attitudes were not related to WTC in English directly, nor indirectly through English Learning Motivation. Attitudes were related to WTC in English indirectly through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. The indirect effect of Attitudes on WTC in English was .52 (.79 x .80 x .83). Since Attitudes had no direct effect on WTC in English, the total effect on WTC in English was .52.

2. English Learning Motivation was not related to WTC in English directly, but was related to WTC in English indirectly through Confidence in English Communication. The indirect effect of English Learning Motivation on WTC in English was .66 (.80 x .83). Since English Learning Motivation has no direct effect on WTC in English, the total effect on WTC in English was .66.

3. Confidence in English Communication was directly related to WTC in English. The direct effect of Confidence in English Communication on WTC in English was .83. The total effect of Confidence in English Communication was .83.
4.3 Secondary Research Question B:

“What can the findings of this study imply for the determination of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts?”

The researcher of this study examined Secondary Research Question B stated above by comparing the findings of this study with the findings of Yashima’s study (2002). Secondary Question B was grounded in the theoretical perspective that WTC can be “a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991, p. 23). If WTC is a trait-like predisposition, this study would acquire findings similar to those of Yashima’s study (2002). In contrast, if WTC is situational, this study would achieve results different from those of Yashima. Along with this perspective, the following section reports the comparison of the findings of this study with those of Yashima’s study (2002).

Yashima (2002) reported that there was a slight (standardized regression coefficients = .22), but significant (p < .01) relation between International Posture (Attitudes) and WTC in L2. Yashima pointed out that “it was not surprising that the more internationally oriented an individual was, the more willing he or she was to communicate in English” (p. 62). In contrast to Yashima’s study (2002), the current study yielded the finding that there was no significant relation between International Posture (Attitudes) and WTC in English.
Concerning the relations among Attitudes, L2 Motivation, and WTC in L2, Yashima (2002) found that Attitudes were strongly (standardized regression coefficients $= .79$) and significantly ($p < .01$) related to L2 motivation. This study replicated Yashima’s finding: The direct path from Attitudes to L2 Motivation was strong (standardized regression coefficients $= .78$) and significant ($p < .01$) (see Figure 4.5 in this study).

In terms of the relation between L2 Motivation and WTC in L2, Yashima reported that there was no direct path from L2 Motivation to WTC in L2, which was different from previous research conducted in an ESL context. Yashima pointed out that this result might be unique to her research context, Japan as an EFL context (see Yashima, 2002, p. 62). This study replicated Yashima’s result that there was no direct relation between L2 Motivation and WTC in L2 (see Figure 4.6). The result found in Yashima’s and this study that there was no relation between the two variables also means that Attitudes were not related to WTC in L2 indirectly through L2 Motivation.

In regard to the relation between L2 Motivation and L2 Confidence, Yashima found that L2 Motivation was significantly ($p < .01$) related to L2 Confidence (standardized regression coefficients $= .41$). The present study replicated Yashima’s study: The direct path from L2 Motivation to L2 Confidence was strong (standardized regression coefficients $= .77$) and significant ($p < .01$) (see Figure 4.6).

Relevant to the relation between L2 Confidence and WTC in L2, Yashima reported that L2 Confidence was significantly ($p < .01$) related to WTC in L2 (standardized regression coefficients $= .68$). In Yashima’s study, L2 Confidence was defined by the two indicator variables—L2 communication anxiety (CA) and perceived
L2 communication competence (PC). Yashima stated that the relations among the two indicator variables and L2 Confidence replicated the WTC model established by MacIntyre (1994). According to the findings of Yashima’s study, CA was negatively related to L2 Confidence (standardized regression coefficients = -.49) while PC was positively related to L2 confidence (standardized regression coefficients = .72). The present study replicated Yashima’s findings in that the data showed that CA was negatively related (standardized regression coefficients = -.35) to L2 Confidence while PC was positively related to L2 Confidence (standardized regression coefficients = .65). The present study also replicated the relation between L2 Confidence and WTC in L2 found in Yashima’s study: The data analysis of the present study indicated that L2 Confidence was strongly (standardized regression coefficients = .83) and significantly (p < .01) related to WTC in L2. The significant path from L2 Confidence to WTC in L2 found in both Yashima’s and the current study could mean that L2 Motivation, although not directly related to WTC in L2, was indirectly related to WTC in L2 through L2 Confidence. The significant path from L2 Confidence to WTC in L2 demonstrated in both studies could also mean that Attitudes were indirectly related to WTC in L2 through L2 Motivation and L2 Confidence (see Yashima, 2002, p. 61; Figure 4.4 in this study).

In summary, Yashima’s study reported that Attitudes were directly related to WTC in L2, and were indirectly related to WTC in L2 through L2 Motivation and L2 Confidence. In addition, L2 Motivation was indirectly related to WTC in L2 through L2 Confidence, although not related to WTC in L2 directly. Finally, L2 Confidence as defined by both L2 communication anxiety (CA) and perceived L2 communication competence (PC) was directly related to WTC in L2 (see Figure 4.8). Yashima
concluded that the results of her study supported MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 in accordance with other models such as the socioeducational model by Gardner (1985) and the WTC model by MacIntyre (1994).

Figure 4.8: L2 communication model in the Japanese EFL context from Yashima’s study (2002)

Note. Standardized regression coefficients
** p < .01

The current study replicated Yashima’s findings except that there was no direct relation between Attitudes and WTC in L2. Although not corresponding to that of Yashima’s study (2002), this finding supported the theoretical perspective, built on the basis of previous studies on the relation between Attitudes and WTC in L2, that there is no direct relation between Attitudes and WTC in L2 (see 2.2.3 The roles of language attitudes in SLA).
In response to the research question whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts, the findings of this study, replicating the findings of Yashima’s study, could imply that in general WTC is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts than situational, with the caution that the relations among affective variables influencing WTC in one L2 communicative context are not exactly same as those in the other L2 communicative contexts (compare the relations in Figure 4.9 with those in Figure 4.8).

Figure 4.9: L2 communication model in the Korean EFL context from the current study

Note.  Standardized regression coefficients

** p < .01
Returning to the main question, “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English?” the data analysis suggested that the selected Korean university students had low levels of WTC in English. According to the data analysis, the dispersion (variance) of values of the variable, WTC in English, was positively skewed (1.017), indicating that the dispersion had relatively few large values. Twenty-two percent of the participants chose not to communicate in English at all: That is, more than one out of five among the participants would not choose to communicate in English at all. Figure 4.11 shows the dispersion of values of WTC in English among the participants depicting that their levels of WTC in English were low.

![Figure 4.10: The dispersion of values of WTC in English](image)

Figure 4.10: The dispersion of values of WTC in English
In summary, the selected Korean university students appeared to have low levels of WTC in English. To enhance WTC in L2, the selected university students and their EFL teachers should understand what influences WTC in L2. MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998) is considered more comprehensive than other currently available models in explaining the diversity in WTC in L2. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that their heuristic model of WTC can provide pedagogical and practical applications for L2 education. In an attempt to apply MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC to the Korean EFL context, the present study examined the reliability of the heuristic model, and found that the heuristic model is reliable in the Korean EFL context in explaining the diversity in WTC in English among Korean university students (see 4.3 Secondary Research Question B in this study).

Concerning the relations among the affective variables influencing WTC in English, the current study found that Attitudes, as defined by four indicator variables—Intercultural Friendship Orientation, Interest in International Vocation/Activities; Interest in Foreign Affairs, and Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency, were not directly related to WTC in English, but were indirectly related to WTC in English through L2 motivation and L2 Confidence. In addition, the current study found that L2 Motivation, as defined by three indicator variables—Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn English, and Attitude Toward Learning English, was not directly related to WTC in English, but was indirectly related to WTC in English through L2 Confidence. Furthermore, the present study indicated that L2 Confidence, defined by two indicator variables—Communication Anxiety in English and Perceived Competence in English, was significantly related to WTC in English. The results of the current study corresponded to
the perspectives presented in MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 as well as the previous theoretical perspectives.

The findings of the present study suggest that Attitudes, English Learning Motivation, and Confidence in English Communication are important for WTC in English since those affective variables influence WTC in English either directly or indirectly. As previously discussed, WTC in L2 is an important factor determining success in the attainment of L2 proficiency. Korean university students should understand how to promote the affective variables so as to enhance their WTC in English. Understanding this is significant because it can help them increase the possibility of achieving success in the attainment of English proficiency. The following chapter will discuss the results of this study, implications of the results, and suggestions for English education.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the summary of findings, a discussion of the results, and pedagogical implications/suggestions for second and foreign language education relevant to willingness to communicate in L2. The researcher of the current study organizes the summary in regard to the three hypotheses intended to examine the research questions. In the section of discussion of the results, the researcher will base his discussion of the results on previous theoretical perspectives and studies. The pedagogical implications for L2 education will also be based on previous theoretical perspectives and studies.

5.1 The summary of findings

5.1.1 Research questions and hypotheses

This study was intended to investigate the main question “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English and what affects their willingness to communicate in English.” To examine the main question, the researcher of the current study formulated two secondary questions and three hypotheses as follows.
Secondary Question A: “What are the relations among Korean university students’ WTC in English, Confidence in English Communication, English Learning Motivation, and Attitudes Toward International Community?”

Secondary Question B: “What can the findings of this study imply for the decision of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts?”

Hypothesis 1: “Attitudes (International Posture) are directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.”

Hypothesis 2: “English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication.”

Hypothesis 3: “Confidence in English Communication is directly related to WTC in English.”

The three hypotheses were mainly intended to examine Secondary Question A. Secondary Question B was formulated to solve the concern of whether or not MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 is reliable in explaining the diversity of WTC in L2 among Korean university students learning English as an L2 in Korea as an EFL context. If WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, the diversity of WTC in L2 is predictable. That is, the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model is dependent on the determination of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts (see 1.2 Problem statement in this study). The secondary questions and the three
hypotheses were examined on the basis of the data from 191 Korean university students, who voluntarily participated in the current study by responding to questionnaires.

The following section presents a summary of findings of this study in accordance with the three hypotheses stated above. The rejection or acceptance of each hypothesis will not be presented in this section (see 4.2.4 Hypothesis tests for details).

5.1.2 Hypothesis 1: “Attitudes (International Posture) are directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.”

The data analysis indicated that the direct path from Attitudes, defined as International Posture in this study, to WTC in English was not significant at the .05 level. That is, Attitudes was not directly related to WTC in L2. On the other hand, Attitudes were strongly (r = .78) and significantly (p < .01) related to English Learning Motivation. In regard to the relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English, the data analysis found that the direct path from English Learning Motivation and WTC in English was not significant, thus indicating that there was no direct relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English. This also indicated that Attitudes, which were directly related to English Learning Motivation, were not related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation. To be brief, Attitudes were not related to WTC in English directly or indirectly through English Learning Motivation. In response to the part of Hypothesis 1 that “Attitudes are indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication,” the data analysis indicated that Attitudes were indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. This finding
will be further discussed in the section of the summary of findings concerning Hypotheses 2 and 3.

5.1.3 Hypothesis 2: “English Learning Motivation is directly related to WTC in English, and indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication.”

As previously reported, English Learning Motivation was not directly related to WTC in English. On the other hand, the data analysis indicated that English Learning Motivation was directly related to Confidence in English Communication by the finding that the path from English Learning Motivation to Confidence in English Communication was strong (r = .80) and significant (p < .01). Concerning the relation between Confidence in English Communication and WTC in English, the data analysis found that the direct path from Confidence in English Communication to WTC in English was strong (r = .83) and significant (p < .01), thus indicating that Confidence in English Communication was directly related to WTC in English. This finding could also indicate that English Learning Motivation was indirectly related to WTC in English, and that Attitudes were related to WTC in English indirectly through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. In brief, the data analysis indicated that English Learning Motivation was not directly related to WTC in English, but was related to WTC in English indirectly through Confidence in English Communication.
5.1.4 Hypothesis 3: “Confidence in English Communication is directly related to WTC in English.”

In the model of this study, Confidence in English Communication was defined by the two indicator variables: Communication Anxiety in English (CA) and Perceived Competence in English (PC). According to the data analysis, Confidence in English Communication was negatively related to CA (r = -0.35), while positively related to PC (r = 0.62). In regard to the relation between Confidence in English Communication and WTC in English, the data analysis indicated that the direct path from Confidence in English Communication to WTC in English was strong (r = 0.83) and significant (p < 0.01), thus indicating that Confidence in English Communication was directly related to WTC in English.

The following section will present the summary of findings concerning Secondary Question B. As previously stated, the response to Secondary Question B will be based on a comparison of the findings of the current study with the findings of Yashima’s study (2002).

5.1.5 Secondary Question B: “What can the findings of this study imply for the determination of whether WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts, or to be situational depending on L2 contexts?”

Yashima (2002) reported that Attitudes were directly related to WTC in English, and that Attitudes were also directly related to English Learning Motivation. In regard to the relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English, Yashima found that English Learning Motivation was not directly related to WTC in English. This meant that Attitudes were not indirectly related to WTC in English through English
Learning Motivation. On the other hand, she reported that English Learning Motivation was directly related to Confidence in English Communication, and Confidence in English Communication was directly related to WTC in English. That is, English Learning Motivation was indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication. This indirect relation between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication also meant that Attitudes were indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication.

In general, the present study replicated the findings of Yashima’s study except for the relation between Attitudes and WTC in English. While Yashima’s study reported the direct and significant relation between Attitudes and WTC in English, the present study indicated that there was no direct relation between the two variables. Although the present study did not replicate Yashima’s study, the present study supported the previous perspective, established on the basis of research studies, that there is no direct relation between Attitudes and WTC in L2, but Attitudes tend to influence WTC in L2 indirectly through other affective variables. Except for the relation between Attitudes and WTC in English, the present study replicated the results of Yashima’s study. According to the data analysis, the current study found that Attitudes were directly related to L2 Motivation, and related to WTC in L2 indirectly through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. Furthermore, it found that English Learning Motivation was indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication even though English Learning Motivation was not directly related to
WTC in English. Finally, Confidence in English Communication was found to be directly related to WTC in English.

On the basis of the comparison of this study’s findings with Yashima’s findings (2002), it seems possible that WTC in L2 is more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts rather than situational depending on L2 contexts. However, the reader should be cautious not to ignore the fact that there was a discrepancy between the current study and Yashima’s study in regard to the relation between Attitudes and WTC in L2. The researcher of this study tentatively concludes that WTC in L2 is in general more likely to be consistent across L2 communicative contexts with a situational characteristic at the same time.

In regard to the main question “how willing are Korean university students learning English as a foreign language to communicate in English?” the data analysis indicated that the selected Korean university students showed low levels of WTC in English on the basis of the dispersion (variance) of values of the variable, WTC in English, which was positively skewed (1.017).

5.2 Discussion and implications

The findings of the current study indicated that Korean university students learning English as a foreign language had low levels of WTC in English. Grounded in the theoretical perspective that WTC in L2 is one of the important factors determining success in the attainment of L2 proficiency, Korean university students’ low WTC in English can be considered in part responsible for their less than optimal or unsuccessful
results in English learning (see 2.1 English-learning environments in Korea as an EFL context in this study). To be successful in L2 learning, Korean university students need to become more willing to communicate in English. MacIntyre et al. (1998) claim that involving many affective variables such as personality, attitudes, motivation, and self-confidence, “authentic communication in L2 can be seen as the result of a complex system of interrelated variables” (p. 547). Korean EFL students need to understand the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC in an attempt to enhance their WTC in English, in that more WTC can lead to more successful results in achieving the attainment of English proficiency. EFL teachers in Korea should also understand the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC in English in order to establish an English education program that can encourage students to be more willing to use English. MacIntyre et al. (1998) instituted a heuristic model of WTC (see Figure 2.1) to explain the interrelations among affective variables influencing WTC in L2 with a pyramid-shaped structure with six layers. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argued that their heuristic model of WTC can be put to practical and pedagogical use in explaining the diversity in WTC.

The researcher of the current study believed that MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC in L2 is the most comprehensive model among currently available models in explaining the diversity in WTC in L2. With this belief, he expected that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 could explain the diversity in WTC in L2 among Korean students who were learning English as an L2 in the Korean EFL context. In other words, he expected that the introduction of the heuristic model of WTC in L2 to the Korean EFL context would facilitate Korean students to understand what would affect their WTC in
English, which would help them achieve their goal of achieving English proficiency more successfully. Before the introduction of the model to the Korean EFL context for pedagogical and theoretical use, the researcher of the present study felt it necessary to examine whether the heuristic model of WTC in L2 would be reliable in the Korean context, which was different from the context where the heuristic model was conceptualized. The results of the current study found that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC was reliable in explaining the diversity of WTC among Korean university students learning English in the Korean EFL context. Along with the results that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 was reliable in the Korean EFL context, the following section will discuss the results of the present study in depth in relevance to MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 as well as previous studies.

5.2.1 The relations of L2 confidence with WTC in L2 and other affective variables

An L2 student’s confidence in L2 communication is an important factor in predicting his/her WTC in L2 (Ganschow & Sparks, 1991, cited in Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). L2 researchers have hypothesized that self-confidence in L2 involves two affective variables: perceived self-competence and language anxiety (Clément, 1980; MacIntyre & Carre, 2000, cited in MacIntyre et al., 2001). Perceived self-competence is positively related to self-confidence, while language anxiety is negatively related to self-confidence (Clément et al., 1994; MacIntyre et al., 1997; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). In regard to the relations among WTC in L2, self-confidence in L2, and L2 language anxiety, MacIntyre (1994) established a WTC model depicting that WTC in L2 would be affected by perceived self-competence in L2 and language anxiety. In the model, it was further shown that WTC would affect the frequency of L2 communication. MacIntyre et al.
(1998) in their heuristic model of WTC suggest that L2 confidence is an immediate precursor of WTC in L2, and L2 confidence can be determined by perceived competence in L2 and lack of language anxiety.

The present study with 191 Korean university students replicated the theoretical perspective of previous studies and MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC. The present study found that Confidence in English Communication was directly related to WTC in English in the structural model formulated in the current study. Furthermore, the current study found that Communication Anxiety in English was negatively related to Confidence in English Communication while positively related to Perceived Competence in English. The results of the current study suggest that Korean English-learning students control Communication Anxiety in English and increase Perceived Competence in English in order to enhance Confidence in English Communication, which in turn enhance WTC in English.

L2 researchers have identified many different kinds of sources of language anxiety. Among them, L2 students’ competitive natures and fear of evaluation are common in the L2 learning process. An L2 student would be anxious when he/she considers him or herself less competent than others, and when he/she expects others to evaluate his/her L2 activities negatively (see Bailey, 1983, cited in Ellis, 1994; Horwitz et al., 1986). Based on this perspective, Korean university students might feel more anxiety than other English-learning students from other English-learning contexts. In Korea, many, if not most, university students tend to learn English to prepare for tests such as the TOEFL, the TOEIC, and TEPS (see Sorensen, 1994; Yonhap, 2003, October 29; see also 2.1 English-learning environments in Korea as an EFL context in this study).
MacIntyre et al. (1997) argue that anxious L2 students who are reluctant to take some risks in L2 performance suffer from “a vicious cycle, whereas the anxiety level remains high because the anxious students do not accept evidence of increasing proficiency that might reduce anxiety” (p. 278). As previously reported, the selected Korean university students showed low levels of WTC in English. Since language anxiety is negatively related to L2 confidence, the selected Korean university students’ language anxiety might be responsible for their low WTC in English. This suggested that Korean EFL students need to take risks in L2 performance so that they can be enabled to break the vicious cycle and to enhance the possibility of greater success in developing their English proficiency. To encourage the Korean EFL students to take risks in English activities, it is important for EFL teachers in Korea to make efforts to build a secure and non-threatening English-learning environment (see Samimy, 1994). The Korean EFL students need to understand the common sources of language anxiety and control the negative effects of language anxiety for success in the attainment of English proficiency. In order to control language anxiety, the selected students should understand the existence and the nature of language anxiety (see Oxford, 1999). In the following section (5.2.4 Implications), the researcher of the current study will briefly discuss the nature of language anxiety in SLA.

5.2.2 The relations of L2 motivation with other affective variables

L2 researchers argue that motivation is one of the important factors determining success in SLA. It has been hypothesized that motivated L2 students tend to maximize opportunities to interact with their target L2 members so as to be more active with L2 use (see Gardner, 1985, 1988; Oxford, 1994). MacIntyre and Clément (1996) reported in the
results of their study performed in Canada that there was a direct link between motivation
and L2 communication (cited in Yashima, 2002). However, Yashima (2002) found that
there was no direct path from L2 motivation to WTC in L2. Yashima pointed out that
“merely having motivation does not seem to be sufficient for an individual’s being
willing to communicate; he or she needs to have confidence in his or her L2
communication” (p. 62). According to Yashima, the result of no direct path from L2
motivation to WTC in L2 might be unique to the research context, which was the
Japanese EEL context. In EFL contexts where the opportunity to interact with L2
speakers might be limited, the motivation to learn L2 could be more related to written
language than oral language (WTC in L2).

Corresponding to the result of Yashima’s study (2002), the current study
performed in the Korean EFL context found that there was no direct relation between L2
motivation and WTC in L2. As Yashima pointed out, this result could be unique to the
EFL context, like Korea and Japan, where the opportunity to interact with native English
speakers is limited. Probably, the selected university students’ motivation to learn
English was more related to written English than oral English. Supporting this
perspective, MacIntyre et al. (1998) point out that “the motivation for language learning
may take the form of WTC, but not necessarily so. Some learners may express their
motivation in silent study of a language and its literature” (p. 553). Although the result of
the current study did not correspond to the theoretical perspective that there was a direct
link between English Learning Motivation and WTC in English, it seemed to support the
perspective presented in MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC. In the heuristic
model of WTC, MacIntyre et al. suggest that whereas L2 confidence located in Layer III
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has a direct and proximal relation with WTC in L2, L2 motivation located in Layer IV has an indirect and remote relation with WTC in L2. In the results of the present study, English Learning Motivation had no direct relation with WTC in English, but an indirect relation with WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication; there was a direct path from English Learning Motivation to Confidence in English Communication.

The current study demonstrated that English Learning Motivation was significant for the increase of WTC in English essential for the success in English learning, not because it was directly related to WTC in English, but because it was indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication. The Korean university students need to dedicate more effort to conducting activities not only in written English but also in oral English in order to raise their lower level of WTC in English. EFL teachers of university students need to help their students understand that WTC in English is important for their success in the attainment of English proficiency. EFL teachers also need to motivate their students to seek opportunities to interact and communicate in English with members of the English speaking community. The increased frequency of interaction and communication in English can enable the students to improve their English proficiency.

5.2.3 The relations of attitudes with other affective variables

L2 researchers have argued that positive attitudes toward L2 learning are important for success in the attainment of L2 proficiency because attitudes are associated with the frequency and quality of L2 use with L2 speakers. It is likely that L2 students with positive attitudes tend to consider L2 learning enjoyable and beneficial, which may lead them to become more active with L2 use (see Gardner et al., 1978; Naiman et al.,
Although L2 researchers have regarded attitudes as important for success in the attainment of L2 proficiency, many studies on the relationship between attitudes and the success of SLA have had inconsistent results. In other words, some L2 researchers have reported a negative relationship between attitudes and the success of SLA (see Gardner, 1980; Oller et al., 1977). L2 researchers explain the inconsistent results on relationships between attitudes and the success of SLA with the theoretical perspective that attitudes alone may not affect SLA, but they may interact with other affective variables to influence SLA. In other words, attitudes may not have a direct relation with SLA, but an indirect relation with SLA through other affective variables (see Gardner, 1985, 1988).

In the heuristic model of WTC in L2, MacIntyre et al. also regard attitudes as having indirect relations with WTC in L2 essential for success in SLA. Attitudes, located in Layer V, have a more remote and indirect effect on WTC in L2 through the affective variables (see MacIntyre et al., 1998, pp. 551-552).

In regard to the relations of attitudes with other affective variables, the results of the current study supported the theoretical perspective on the role of attitudes in WTC and MacIntyre et al’s model of WTC. Corresponding to them, the current study showed that Attitudes (International Posture) were not directly related to WTC in English, but were indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication: There was a strong direct path from Attitudes to English Learning Motivation and from English Learning Motivation to Confidence in English Communication. That is, Attitudes (International Posture) are one of the important factors influencing WTC in English through their interaction with other affective variables, even though they are not directly related to WTC in English. If L2
students have positive attitudes to English learning, this will increase their English Learning Motivation, and English Learning Motivation will lead to Confidence in English Communication, which is directly related to WTC in English and important for the success in the attainment of English proficiency.

As previously reported, the results of the present study showed that the selected Korean university students appeared generally unwilling to communicate in English. Since attitudes were a factor influencing WTC in English indirectly, the selected students’ low levels of WTC in English could in part be explained by their attitudes. Although the relation between attitudes and WTC in English was not significant, it is worth noticing that the relation was negative \((r = -.21)\). The negative relation could be possibly explained by the Korean EFL context where the selected Korean university students studied English. Many, if not most, Korean students learning English believe that they must learn English and achieve English proficiency in order to become successful in the Korean society. In other words, they might be afraid of becoming isolated and disadvantaged in the Korean society because they fail to achieve English proficiency (see 2.1 English-learning environments in Korea as an EFL context in this study). Their fear of being isolated and disadvantaged in the Korean society might lead to their having negative attitudes toward English and its community. Oller et al. (1977) reported a negative relationship between attitudes of Mexican-American women workers and English proficiency. Oller et al. explained the result by the perspective that the negative attitudes might have been related to oppressive conditions caused by the lack of English proficiency in the U.S. It seems advisable that Korean EFL students consider English-learning in a more positive way, understanding what advantages the attainment
of English proficiency can bring to them rather than looking at disadvantages the failure of acquiring English proficiency can cause them.

The negative relation between attitudes and WTC in English might also be explained by “ethnocentrism” among Korean students. Associated with fear of assimilation, ethnocentrism directs L2 students to consider their L1 values as universal. Highly ethnolinguistic L2 students tend to evaluate L2 behaviors and values which differ from their L1 behaviors and values negatively rather than trying to understand the different L2 behaviors and values. Consequently, highly ethnocentric L2 students try to avoid or minimize contact with L2 members (see Gudykunst, 2004; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Yashima, 2002). In Korea, some social phenomena appear to imply ethnocentrism among Korean students (see Park, 2004, February 4). Concerning ethnocentrism among Korean students learning English, an American professor teaching at a university in Korea presented a seminar explaining the difficulty that Korean students suffer from in learning English (Kang, 2003, August 8). The professor ascribed the difficulty to Korean students’ attitudes toward other cultures. On the basis of his experiences of learning Korean and interacting with Korean students, the American professor suggested that Korean students should be open to other cultures, which may motivate them to learn other languages. The professor emphasized that learning a language requires acculturation to the target language culture; thus, it is important for Korean students to learn and understand the American cultures in order to acquire English proficiency more successfully, rather than to focus only on instrumental purposes of learning English (e.g., get a job, enter an upper-level school, and obtain a promotion) (Kang, 2003, August 8). Many Korean students may agree with the professor’s perspective on Korean students’
attitudes toward learning English. Korean EFL students should understand that, as the professor argues, the possibility of achieving instrumental purposes can be enhanced by integrative attitudes in learning English. In other words, Korean students need to understand that learning English necessitates learning its cultures, and that learning other cultures may help their L1 cultures flourish, instead of replacing L1 cultures with L2 cultures.

5.2.4 Implications

Reflecting on the theoretical perspectives and the results of this study, it is likely that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998) is reliable in explaining the diversity in WTC across L2 communicative contexts. In other words, MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC can be applicable to the Korean EFL context. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that due to the importance of WTC in L2 for success in SLA, L2 educators should design L2 teaching pedagogy and programs that can enhance L2 students’ WTC in L2. To achieve this goal, MacIntyre et al. further argue that L2 educators and students should first understand what factors affect the diversity in WTC in L2. MacIntyre et al. claim that by explaining what factors affect WTC in L2, their heuristic model of WTC in L2 can provide pedagogical and practical advantages for L2 education. The following section will discuss how L2 educators can apply MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC in designing programs that can encourage L2 students to increase their WTC in L2.

In accordance with MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC, the results of the current study suggest that attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence are significant factors influencing WTC in L2. L2 educators need to make an effort to assist their students to have positive attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence for the increase of WTC in L2.
To be practical in achieving this goal, L2 educators should understand how to encourage their L2 students to have positive attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence simultaneously. In order to answer this question, L2 educators need to understand that the affective variables are interrelated with one another because they share a common factor (see Hair et al., 1998, p. 91). In the case of the present study, the interrelations among attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence share a common factor in influencing WTC in L2. Once understanding the common factor among the affective variables in influencing WTC in L2, L2 educators can be more practical in facilitating the enhancement of their L2 students’ WTC in L2, by positively promoting the common factor that influences the affective variables. In the following section, the researcher of the current study will explore the common factor among attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence for the purpose of establishing the pedagogical implications of MacIntyre at al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998) for L2 education.

It is likely that the common factor influencing the affective variables – WTC in L2, attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence may be the “expectations” of L2 students in L2 communication. The following section will discuss the possibility that “expectations” can be the common factor of the affective variables, which the current study found significant in influencing WTC in L2.

(1) The relation between expectations and WTC in L2

The current study showed that WTC in L2 was interrelated with attitudes, L2 motivation, and L2 confidence either directly or indirectly. It is probable that WTC in L2 was interrelated with these affective variables because WTC in L2 shared a common factor with them. The researcher of the current study assumes that the common factor
that WTC in L2 shares with these affective variables is “expectations” of L2 students. In order to support his assumption, he discusses theoretical perspectives that can verify the relation between WTC in L2 and “expectations” in this section, and later between “expectations” and the other affective variables.

In identifying communication, Gudykunst (2004), a specialist in communication, refers to Barnlund’s perspective (1962) that “communication is a process involving the exchange of messages and the creation of meaning” (p. 28). Communication will be effective when an individual understands the meaning attached to the message similarly to what the counterpart intends. The listener will often predict and explain the speaker’s message on the basis of the listener’s social norms or communication rules. In other words, the listener will consciously or unconsciously confirm or disconfirm his/her predictions and explanations about the speaker’s message on the basis of the listener’s social norms and communication rules. Misunderstandings will occur when the social norms and communication rules of the listener are different from those of his/her counterpart’s. If an individual expects that his/her social norms and communication rules are similar to or the same as those of the counterpart’s, he/she tends to have much confidence in predictions and explanations, which may encourage the listener to perceive the communication with the counterpart enjoyable so as to be more willing to communicate. On the other hand, an individual may feel anxiety when he/she expects that his/her social norms and communication rules are different from those of his/her counterpart’s. The anxiety from the difference may discourage the individual from having communication with his/her counterpart. To become an effective communicator, an individual should recognize that others have their own social norms and
communication rules, and make efforts to understand others’ social norms and communication rules. This helps to reduce misunderstanding (Gudykunst, 2004; see also Kim, 1991, p. 263; Schumann, 1975, p. 215).

In rephrasing the perspective above, Gudykunst (2004) suggests that effective communication is dependent on the ability of the participants in a communication to reduce misunderstandings between or among the participants. The participants may reduce misunderstandings in a communication when they share the same or similar expectations with one another in regard to social norms and communication rules, in predicting and explaining the meaning of the message. When the speaker’s expectations are the same or similar to those of his/her counterpart, the speaker and the counterpart tend to perceive the communication enjoyable so as to become more willing to communicate. On the other hand, if the speaker’s expectations are different from those of the listener—that is, the uncertainty of expectations of social norms and communication rules is high between them, the speaker may expect that there will be misunderstandings between them. This may cause the speaker to feel anxiety and to be less willing to communicate with the counterpart. An individual can be subject to suffering from misunderstandings because he/she tends to rely on understanding the meaning of the message from others based on his/her own expectations of social norms and communication rules. To be effective in communication, an individual should make efforts to understand others’ expectations of social norms and communication rules (see Chapter 4: Having expectations for strangers in Gudykunst, 2004 for more reading).

Expectations involve our anticipations and predictions about how strangers will communicate with us. Our expectations are derived from social norms and communication rules. Expectations also emerge from
our stereotypes of strangers’ groups and our intergroup attitudes toward strangers. (Gudykunst, 2004, p. 113)

The current study asserted that WTC in L2 could be a predictor determining success in L2 learning. L2 educators need to encourage L2 students to have higher level of WTC in L2 so that L2 students can be more successful in L2 learning. According to theoretical perspectives, it seems that WTC in L2 is related to L2 students’ “expectations” of social norms or communication rules. L2 students tend to be more willing to communicate with their counterparts when expecting that they share the same or similar social norms or communication rules with their counterparts. On the other hand, when L2 students believe that they have social norms or communications different from those of their counterparts, L2 students may be less willing to communicate in L2, expecting that the different social norms or communication rules will cause miscommunications with their counterparts. L2 educators need to guide their L2 students to understand others’ expectations of social norms and communication rules in L2 communication. This can help L2 students reduce miscommunications with others, which may in turn motivate L2 students to be more willing to communicate in L2

(2) The relation between expectations and attitudes

According the findings of the current study, attitudes were indirectly related with WTC in L2. The indirect effect of attitudes on WTC in L2 was significant (r = .52), so attitudes were important in affecting WTC in L2. Influencing WTC in L2, attitudes are likely to be related to “expectations” as well. The following section discusses theoretical perspectives that can support the relation of attitudes with “expectations.”
In an attempt to define attitudes, Gudykunst (2004) refers to Davidson et al.’s statement (1980) that “an attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in an evaluative (from extremely favorable to extremely unfavorable) manner toward to some attitude object. Attitudes, therefore, create expectations for others’ behavior” (p. 130). L2 students’ attitudes toward the target L2 will be positive if their attitudes are associated with positive expectations about learning the L2 and about its community. For example, if an L2 student expects that German is associated with intellectual pursuits, he/she is more likely to have positive attitudes toward learning German as well as toward German people. Positive attitudes may lead to an increase of frequency and quality of L2 communication (see MacIntyre et al., 1998, pp. 552-553; Schumann, 1975, p. 215). In contrast, when L2 students have negative expectations about learning the L2, their attitudes toward learning the L2 and toward its community will be likely to be negative. As an example, L2 students may have negative attitudes toward learning their target L2 and toward its community if they expect that learning the target L2 can potentially result in the loss of their L1 and identity. In association with their negative expectations, their negative attitudes may lead them to be less willing to communicate and interact with members of the target language (Gudykunst, 2004; MacIntyre et al., 1998).

Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) proposed the Expectancy-Value model of attitudes in regard to the relation between expectations and attitudes. According to Fishbein and Ajzen, L2 students’ attitudes toward a behavior are derived from expectations of the behavior, and their expectations of the behavior are linked to outcomes of or the cost for the behavior. Grounded in Fishbein and Ajzen's perspective, it is likely that when L2 learners expect that L2 learning (a behavior) can generate largely desirable outcomes,
they tend to have favorable attitudes toward L2 learning. On the other hand, L2 students may have unfavorable attitudes toward L2 learning if they expect that L2 learning will be associated with mostly undesirable outcomes (cited in Ajzen, 1991, p. 191).

The findings of the current study indicated that attitudes were significant in affecting WTC in L2. In regard to the relation between attitudes and expectations discussed above, it is important for L2 students to have positive expectations of their L2 learning. With positive expectations of L2 learning, L2 students are more likely to have positive attitudes toward L2 learning. Theoretical perspectives assert that associated with positive expectation, L2 students’ positive attitudes can lead them to be more willing to communicate in L2. That is, L2 students’ positive expectations of L2 learning will increase the frequency and quality of communication and interaction with members of their target L2, which is important for the success in SLA.

(3) The relation between expectations and motivation

The present study showed that L2 motivation was indirectly related with WTC in L2. The indirect effect of L2 motivation on WTC in L2 was significant \((r = .66)\); thus, L2 motivation was an important factor determining WTC in L2. In affecting WTC in L2, it is probable that like attitudes, L2 motivation is related with “expectations” of L2 students. The researcher of the current study discusses theoretical perspectives that may verify the relation of L2 motivation and “expectations” in the following section.

It is likely that with positive expectations of success in L2 learning, L2 students may have higher motivation to learn their target L2 (Ehrman et al., 1995). In an attempt to explain the relation between expectations and motivation, Lewin (1951) established the Expectancy-Value theory (see Gardner et al., 1978; Ghaith & Shaaban, 2000; Oxford &
Shearin, 1994). According to the model, efforts oriented toward any action are dependent on the valance and expectancy that the action would yield favorable outcomes. Valance is defined as “an affective orientation toward particular outcomes” (Vroom, 1964 cited in Ghaith et al., 2000, p. 633), whereas expectancy is considered as “the probability of attaining successful performance” (Oxford & Shearin, 1994, p. 21; see also Ghaith & Shaaban, 2000, p. 633). Ghaith et al. (2000) relate these two concepts—valance and expectancy—to motivation: L2 students’ motivation to learn their target L2 is dependent on “their effort, perception of the degree of attractiveness of the goals (valance), perception of the probability of attaining the goals (expectancy), and appraisal of their ability to achieve the goals” (p. 633).

Ghaith et al. (2000) conducted a study with 180 L2 students to explore what factors influenced their motivation to learn L2. For data collection, Ghaith et al. used a 40-item scale instrument including three parts: demographic questions (n = 6), questions (n = 16) measuring integrative motivation, instrumental motivation, and effort, and questions (n = 18) measuring the factors of valance, expectancy, and ability. The results indicated that there was a very high and positive correlation between the participants’ expectancy and total motivation (r = .90, p < .01), whereas valance had a low but measurable correlation with integrative motivation, with instrumental motivation, with effort, with expectancy (highest r = .49), with estimation of ability, and with total motivation. Ghaith et al., on the basis of the data analysis, concluded that “students’ expectancy and their perception of their ability to achieve those goals are strong determinations of their motivation” (p. 639).
On the basis of the findings of the current study, L2 learning motivation was important for the increase of WTC in L2. Theoretical perspectives seem to assert that like attitudes, L2 learning motivation is connected to “expectations.” That is, associated with L2 learning motivation, “expectations” can be an important factor predicting the level of WTC in L2. L2 educators make efforts to encourage L2 students to have positive expectations of their L2 learning in order to enhance L2 students’ motivation to learn their target L2. For example, L2 teachers guide L2 students to understand what advantages the attainment of L2 proficiency can bring to them. It is probable that positive expectations of their L2 learning lead L2 students to have positive L2 learning motivation, essential for WTC in L2.

(4) The relation between expectations and confidence

According to the findings of the current study, confidence in L2 communication was a direct predictor determining the level of WTC in L2 (r = .83). In the current study, confidence in L2 communication was defined by two affective variables: communication anxiety in L2 and perceived competence in L2. Communication anxiety in L2 was negatively related to confidence in L2 communication (r = -.35), while perceived competence in L2 was positively related to confidence in L2 communication (r = .62). To increase L2 students’ confidence, L2 educators need to help L2 students reduce communication anxiety and enhance their perceived competence in L2. It is likely that L2 educators may achieve this goal by understanding the relation between “expectations” of L2 students and these affective variables. The following section discusses theoretical perspectives that can explain the relation.
Ganschow and Sparks (1991) suggest that an L2 student’s self-confidence is related to his/her perception of the ease of L2 learning (cited in Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000). In other words, an L2 student may have confidence in L2 learning as much as he/she expects that the L2 learning will be easy. Clément (1980) hypothesizes that self-confidence involves two cognitive variables: perceived self-competence and language anxiety. L2 researchers have found that language anxiety is negatively related to self-confidence, whereas perceived self-competence is positively related to self-confidence (see also the result of this study reported in 4.3). Concerning language anxiety, a number of L2 researchers have related language anxiety to expectations. Onwuegbuzie et al. (1999) argue that “students’ expectations of their future performance are the best predictor of their levels of language anxiety” (cited in Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000, p. 5). In addition, Onwuegbuzie et al. (2000) concluded their study by reporting that “students’ expectations of their overall achievement in L2 courses were the biggest predictor of L2 anxiety, which seemed to support the finding of Gynan (1989) and Horwitz (1984, 1988) that beliefs about L2 learning can be a source of anxiety” (p. 228). Samimy and Rardin (1994) conducted a longitudinal study between 1987 and 1992 in order to explore how affective variables influence the adult language learning process. One hundred reflection papers from students who enrolled in L2 classes indicated that their anxiety was linked to their different expectations and beliefs about their class members and activities.

MacIntyre and Gardner (1991c) claim that “foreign language anxiety stems from negative expectations that lead to worry and emotionality” (cited in Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999, p. 228). Krashen (1980) also claims that “the low expectations of many foreign language students make them unreceptive to language input, thereby debilitating the
learning process” (cited in Onwuegbuzie et al., 2000, p.5). Onwuegbuzie et al. (2000) reported findings of their own study that the participants who attained the lowest achievement tended to have the highest level of language anxiety and the lowest expectations of their overall achievement in foreign language courses. Therefore, it is important for L2 students to have positive expectations in order to control the negative aspect of language anxiety in SLA.

In addition, the negative nature of language anxiety is related to L2 students’ unrealistic expectations of L2 learning. Ehrman and Oxford (1990) found that three of the participants in their study reported anxiety problems associated with their “overly high self-expectations” of classroom performance (p. 320). Phillips (1992) argues that L2 students should have realistic expectations of L2 learning in order to control the negative effects of language anxiety. Phillips asserts that “realistic expectations include the understanding that language learning is a lengthy procedure and that errors are a natural part of the process” (p. 20).

In brief, language anxiety is linked to L2 students’ negative or unrealistic expectations of their L2 performance and achievement. It is important for L2 students to have positive and realistic expectations of their L2 performance and achievement to control the negative effect of language anxiety on L2 learning.

The findings of the current study indicated that confidence in L2 communication was directly related to WTC in L2, and that confidence in L2 communication was negatively related to communication anxiety in L2 while positively related to perceived competence in L2. According to theoretical perspectives, “expectations” of L2 students in L2 learning can be the predictor determining these affective variables. To enhance L2
students’ confidence in L2 so as to increase WTC in L2, L2 educators need to make efforts to guide their L2 students to have positive and realistic expectations of their L2 learning. Suggestions for the approach to encouraging students to have positive and realistic expectations of L2 learning will be further discussed in the following section.

5.2.5 Suggestions for L2 education

It seems that expectations can be the common factor among the affective variables—attitudes, L2 motivation, L2 confidence, and WTC in L2. To enhance L2 students’ WTC, L2 educators can guide L2 students to have positive and realistic expectations of L2 performance and achievement. L2 educators can encourage their L2 students to understand that WTC is an important factor determining success in SLA. To increase L2 students’ motivation to learn and communicate in L2, L2 teachers can make it possible for them to expect that SLA will benefit them in achieving their goals such as getting a job, entering an upper-level school, or acquiring a promotion, instead of causing them to lose their L1 and L1 identity.

In regard to self-confidence, which is directly related to WTC, L2 educators should help L2 students control the negative nature of language anxiety. As previously discussed, negative anxiety is associated with negative or unrealistic expectations of L2 learning. That is, L2 teachers need to direct L2 students to have positive and realistic expectations of L2 learning. L2 students tend to have negative expectations of their L2 learning if having experiences of being evaluated negatively. On the other hand, L2 students will have positive expectations if their experiences are associated with positive evaluations (see Horwitz et al., 1986). Thus, it is important for L2 educators to be
sensitive in evaluating L2 students’ L2 activities in terms of positive versus negative evaluation.

Concerning the relation between unrealistic expectations and language anxiety, L2 teachers make efforts to assign L2 students realistic L2 tasks corresponding to L2 students’ proficiency levels. L2 teachers may tailor L2 tasks to be realistic for L2 students according to L2 students’ proficiency levels and target instructions. Gardner (1980) argues that “different expectations can be applied to students in their ability so that they are neither bored by tasks beneath their capabilities nor frustrated by tasks that cannot yet manage” (p. 263). Moreover, in many cases, L2 students are subject to perceiving L2 learning negatively or unrealistically because expectations of L2 learning are often uncertain or unknown to them. Horwitz et al. (1986) argue that “because individual communication attempts will be evaluated according to uncertain or even unknown linguistic and socio-cultural standards, second language communication entails risk-taking and is necessarily problematic” (p. 128). (see also Gudykunst, 2004, pp. 22-25). In accordance with this perspective, L2 teachers need to establish clear and reliable criteria for L2 activities. Dublin and Olstain (1986) claim that a syllabus is “a document which ideally describes what the learners are expected to know at the end of the course” as well as an approach to evaluating students’ activities (p. 2).

L2 students should also make efforts to establish realistic expectations of their L2 activities. It is important for L2 students to understand that other L2 students or teachers will perceive them as L2 learners, not as fluent L1 speakers in L2 learning settings, and that others will regard L2 errors or mistakes as natural in the L2 learning process (Onwuegbuzie et al., 1999; Horwitz et al., 1986). Moreover, L2 students need to
apprehend that the best way to understand others’ expectations of their L2 activities is to ask them directly what they expect rather than to guess and attempt to satisfy all possible criteria such as pronunciation, grammar, speech speed, and vocabulary knowledge in L2 for evaluating L2 activities. To understand the uncertain/unknown expectations of others, it is recommended that L2 students continue interacting with others.

5.3 Conclusion

The present study, performed with 191 Korean university students, has demonstrated that Korean university students who learn English as an L2 in the Korean EFL context appear to have low levels of WTC in English. Grounded in the theoretical perspective that WTC in L2 is one of the important factors determining success in SLA, their low WTC in L2 is in part responsible for their limited or unsuccessful results in achieving English proficiency. To help Korean university students achieve more success in English learning, English educators in Korea need to dedicate their efforts to enhancing their students’ WTC in L2. In other words, Korean EFL teachers need to make efforts to design a program that can enhance their students’ WTC in English. MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that “a proper objective for L2 education is to create WTC. A program that fails to produce students who are willing to use the language is simply a failed program” (p. 547). To achieve this goal, Korean EFL teachers should first understand what factors influence their students’ WTC in English: MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC (1998) in L2 can assist them to understand what factors influence WTC in L2.
MacIntyre et al. (1998) conceptualized a heuristic model of WTC in L2 in order to explain what factors influence WTC in L2. MacIntyre et al. claim that their heuristic model of WTC is practical and theoretical, and that it has practical and pedagogical uses in L2 education. The researcher of the current study attempted to apply the heuristic model to the Korean EFL context after a thorough examination of the reliability of the model in the Korean context, in association with the theoretical perspective that the model’s reliability is dependent on the decision of whether WTC is a personality-based, trait-like predisposition or WTC is situational. Based on the results, the present study further claims that MacIntyre et al’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 is reliable in the Korean EFL context in explaining the relations among the affective variables influencing WTC in L2. This claim also means that WTC in L2 is more likely to be a personality-based predisposition than situational; that is, WTC in L2 is relatively consistent across a variety of L2 communication contexts.

In regard to the relations among affective variables, the present study argues as follows. First, Attitudes (International Posture), defined by four indicator variables—Intercultural Friendship Orientation, Interest in International Vocation/Activities, Interest in Foreign Affairs, and Intergroup Approach Avoidance Tendency, are not directly related to WTC in English, but are indirectly related to WTC in English through English Learning Motivation and Confidence in English Communication. Second, English Learning Motivation, defined by three indicator variables—Motivational Intensity, Desire to Learn English, and Attitudes Toward Learning English, is not directly related to WTC in English, but is indirectly related to WTC in English through Confidence in English Communication. Finally, Confidence in English Communication, defined by two
indicator variables—Communication Anxiety in English and Perceived Competence in English is directly related to WTC in L2. Therefore, Korean students who are learning English need to develop positive attitudes, have higher motivation, and have higher self-confidence in English in order to enhance their levels of WTC in English, which is important for success in the attainment of English proficiency.

Furthermore, the researcher of the current study asserts that L2 students’ “expectations” of their L2 activities can be the common factor among the affective variables such as attitudes, L2 learning motivation, and confidence in L2 communication in influencing WTC in L2. In other words, L2 students’ expectations of their L2 performance and achievement can influence the affective variables, which in turn influence WTC in L2. As previously discussed, theoretical perspectives assert that positive expectations are associated with positive attitudes toward L2 learning, higher L2 learning motivation, and higher confidence in L2 activities. That is, L2 students’ positive expectations of their L2 activities can enhance their WTC in L2. Therefore, it is important for Korean EFL students to have positive expectations of their English learning in order to enhance their WTC in English. EFL teachers in Korea also guide their L2 students to have positive expectations of English learning for success in English learning (see 5.2.4 Implications and 5.2.5 Suggestions for L2 education for some examples). The assertion made by the researcher of the current study, however, needs to be empirically tested in the future.

In regard to anxiety, which the current study showed negatively related to confidence in L2 communication, EFL teachers in Korea need to guide their L2 students to have realistic expectations of English performance and achievement so that L2
students may be able to control language anxiety. For example, Phillips (1992) argues that “realistic expectations include the understanding that language learning is a lengthy procedure and that errors are natural part of the process” (p. 20). In many cases, L2 students tend to have unrealistic expectations of their L2 performance and achievement, especially due to the uncertainty of evaluation criteria (see Horwitz et al., 1986; Gudykunst, 2004). The researcher of the current study suggests that EFL teachers in Korea make efforts to reduce the uncertainty of evaluation criteria for Korean EFL students’ English performance and achievement in classroom settings: They explicitly explain what criteria such as grammar rules, vocabulary, speech speed, and intonation will be applied for evaluating their students’ English performance and achievement. EFL teachers in Korea and their students need to understand that the best way to reduce such uncertainty is to communicate and interact with one other as an attempt to understand what others expect in regard to English activities and achievement. This can help Korean EFL students to control their anxiety in English communication. By controlling anxiety, Korean EFL students may have higher confidence in English communication, which lead them to have higher WTC in English.

On the basis of their accepted roles and the influence of the Korean culture in the classroom, it was predicted that Korean EFL students would show low levels of WTC in English. Their role in the classroom and the Korean culture seem to influence Korean EFL students to be reluctant to communicate in English (see 2.1 English-learning environments in Korea as an EFL context). The researcher of the current study has suggested that Korean EFL teachers need to dedicate much effort to encouraging Korean EFL students to have positive and realistic expectations of their English learning, which
may stimulate their students to be more willing to communicate in English (5.2.4 Implications and 5.2.5 Suggestions for L2 education). In the effort to achieve this, Korean EFL teachers need to understand that their students’ expectations of English learning are shaped by their classroom culture and their social culture.

Ethnographers have emphasized that the classroom is communicatively constituted, i.e. classroom events, social relations and roles are constructed through language. Learning is born in social interaction on the basis (partly at least) of cultural norms, values and expectations which derive from the learners’ immediate community or from society at large. (Cortazzi & Jin, 1998, p. 171)

That is, the responsibility for enhancing Korean EFL students’ WTC in English is not limited only to either Korean EFL teachers or Korean EFL students. Instead, all members in the Korean society, who shape the Korean culture, should share the responsibility with one another. Therefore, in regard to Korean EFL students’ accepted roles and the influence of the Korean culture in the classroom where English teaching and learning mainly occurs, all social members in the Korean society need to work together to encourage Korean EFL students to have higher WTC in English. This can lead to the success in the attainment of English proficiency.

5.4 Limitations of the study

This study was intended to examine the generalizability of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 to the Korean EFL context. The researcher of this study acknowledges that the generalizability of a study requires a random sample that can represent the target population (see Miller, 1999). The researcher of this study recruited
191 Korean university students majoring in 37 different academic fields at 5 different universities in Seoul, the capital city of Korea, and its vicinity. The recruited university students voluntarily participated in this study. In other words, the sample used in this study was not a random sample. The researcher of this study realized that it was difficult to secure a random sample of human subjects. However, the researcher of the current study expected random sampling would not be important as long as the current study would focus on WTC in English rather than the differences between the sample and the target population in such variables as age, gender, or socioeducational status, which were out of the issues of the current study.

It’s not important if the sample differs from the population in ways that don’t have any bearing on the subject matter of the survey (if we can be sure that this is true). For example, if I am surveying to determine extent of functional literacy, I probably don’t care if my sample differs from the population in terms of their choice of favorite color. However, I would be concerned about differences in percentage of males vs. females, or family income, or years of schooling, since these variables might well be related to functional literacy. (Orr, 1995, p. 293)

The researcher of the current study believes that this study is useful in understanding the diversity in WTC in English among Korean university students. However, the researcher advises the reader of the current study to be aware of the characteristics of the sample used in the current study and that the generalizability of the current study requires much caution due to the sample characteristics.

Furthermore, the data collection of the current study mainly relied on survey questionnaires. The researcher of the current study understands that there are many different methods of collecting data such as observation and oral interviews. Using different methods of data collection can enable the researcher to collect diverse resources
that would facilitate understanding of the complicated nature of WTC in L2. As previously indicated, it was not easy to gain access to and secure human participants within a limited time and with limited expenditure. With this limitation, future research should consider more diverse research methods for the purpose of understanding the findings of this study with Korean university students learning English in the Korean EFL context more comprehensively.

5.5 Suggestions for future studies

Basically, suggestions for future studies are associated with the concerns and limitations of the current study. The primary research method of data collection employed in the current study mainly relied on survey questions which can enable researchers to deal with a large number of participants. However, because of the complicated nature of WTC in L2, it is recommended that researchers employ different methods of collecting data such as observation and oral interviews in order to collect diverse resources. This can help researchers to understand the complexity of WTC in L2 comprehensively.

Many L2 researchers may agree that a better way to understand what affects L2 students’ WTC in L2 is to ask them directly. In addition, direct observation can facilitate researchers to explore whether or not participants are actually involved in L2 communication. The method of direct questions and observations can enable researchers to understand what affects WTC in L2 in more depth. Moreover, the method can also enable researchers to explore WTC in a specific communicative context in regard to
informal or formal contexts. Nonetheless, the method may require more time and
expanse, compared to the survey method. With this concern, the researcher of the current
study suggests that any researchers interested in WTC in L2 integrate the survey method
with the method of direct observation and questions according to the research purpose.

The current study was designed to examine the reliability of MacIntyre et al.’s
heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998) in explaining the interrelations among affective
variables influencing WTC in L2 in the Korean EFL context. The findings of the current
study showed that MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 was reliable in the
Korean context. Nevertheless, MacIntyre et al. (1998) state that more studies should be
conducted to explore what affective variables can be added to the heuristic model and
what affective variables should be excluded from the model. The researcher of the
current study suggests that future researchers perform studies in an attempt to respond to
MacIntyre et al.’s concern (1998). On the other hand, MacIntyre et al. (1998) argue that
their heuristic model of WTC in L2 can provide pedagogical and practical use for L2
education. It seems that a number of L2 pedagogical approaches and models established
in ESL contexts have been less successful in EFL contexts seemingly because those
appear to conflict with EFL classroom and social cultures (see Coleman, 1996; Li, 1998).
For example, students’ role and the culture in the classroom keep L2 students staying
silent in the classroom while communicative language teaching (CLT) requires dialogic
interactions between the teacher and students (see 2.1 English-learning
environments in Korea as an EFL context). In association with this concern, the
researcher of the present study suggests that researchers explore how the application of
MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 to the Korean EFL context can overcome
the conflict with students’ role and the culture in the EFL classroom in Korea. Their efforts are essential in facilitating MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC in L2 to be more effective in the Korean EFL context.

Finally, the researcher of the current study asserts that L2 students’ expectations of their L2 activities can be a common factor influencing the affective variables such as attitudes, L2 learning motivation, and confidence in L2 communication in influencing the level of WTC in L2. In other words, L2 students’ expectations can be an important factor determining their levels of WTC in L2. It seems that few studies have been conducted to investigate the relation between L2 students’ expectations of their L2 activities and their levels of WTC in L2, especially in the Korean EFL context. In regard to this concern, the researcher of the current study suggests that future studies explore the relationship between Korean EFL students’ expectations of their English activities and WTC in English (positive vs. negative and realistic vs. unrealistic). Findings from future studies may facilitate the pedagogical application of MacIntyre et al.’s model of WTC to the Korean EFL context to be more effective and practical by helping EFL teachers in Korea understand how to enhance their EFL students’ WTC in English.

In brief, the researcher of the current study has made suggestions for future studies as follows.

1. Future researchers employ many different research methods of collecting data including survey method, oral interviews, and direct observation in order to collect diverse resources, with which they can understand the complicated nature of WTC in L2 comprehensively.
2. Future studies explore what affective variables can be added to MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model of WTC in L2 (1998) and what affective variables should be excluded from the model in explaining the complicated nature of WTC in L2. Future studies also explore how the pedagogical application of MacIntyre et al.’s heuristic model (1998) to the Korean context can overcome the conflict with Korean EFL students’ role and the culture in the classroom.

3. Future studies investigate the relation between Korean EFL students’ expectations (positive vs. negative and realistic vs. unrealistic) of their English activities and their levels of WTC in English.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: A flyer for recruiting participants

Do You Need to
Improve Your English Proficiency?

If so, be a participant in this study. This study is designed to help English-learning students develop their English proficiency by explaining what determines the success in the attainment of English proficiency.

Why should I participate?
To develop your English proficiency
&
For a big chance to win a Free OSU T-shirt

What do I need to do to participate?
You just fill out a packet of survey questionnaires that assess your English communication behaviors and tendencies. It will take approximately 20 or 30 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

How to participate in this study?
Contact Seung Jung Kim (a doctoral candidate at the Ohio State University) at kim.899@osu.edu

To participate in this study, you must be over 18 years of age, and currently taking an English class in your school. Your participation will surely contribute to the development of English education in Korea, which will benefit you, your friends, and family in developing English proficiency more successfully. You will not regret participating in this study.
APPENDIX B: Questionnaires

Demographic Information

Name: _______________ Gender: ____ Male ____ Female ____ Age: ________

Academic Major: ______________

T-shirt size: XS S M L XL XXL

Have you been in English speaking countries such as U.S.A.? ____ Yes ____ No

If yes, how long? _____ year(s) _____ month(s) ________________ day(s)

Directions: How much does each of the following statements apply to you?

e.g.) I love Korea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

Interest in Foreign Affairs (IFA)

1. I often read and watch news about foreign countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

2. I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/or friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree Strongly agree
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**Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency (AAT)**

1. I want to make friends with international students studying in Korea.
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

2. I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

3. I would talk to an international student if there is one at school.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

4. I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

5. I want to participate in a volunteer activity to help foreigners in the neighboring community.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

6. I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

7. I would help a foreigner who is in trouble communicating in a restaurant or at a station.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree
Motivation Intensity (MI)

1. Compared to my classmates, I think I study English relatively hard.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

2. I often think about the words and ideas which I learn about in my English classes.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

3. If English were not taught at school, I would study on my own.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

4. I think I spend fairly long hours studying English.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

5. I really try to learn English.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

6. After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve.

   1           2             3             4             5            6            7
   Strongly disagree  Strongly agree
Interest in International Vocation or Activities (IVA)

1. I would rather stay in my hometown.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

2. I want to live in a foreign country.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

3. I want to work in an international organization such as the United Nations.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

4. I’m interested in volunteer activities in developing countries such as participating in Youth International Development.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

5. I don’t think what’s happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree

6. I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently.
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
   |
   Strongly disagree           Strongly agree
Desire to Learn English (DLE)

1. When I have assignments to do in English, I try to do them immediately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

2. I would read English newspapers or magazines outside my English course work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

3. During English classes I’m absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

4. I would like the number of English classes at school increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

5. I believe absolutely English should be taught at school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree

6. I find studying English more interesting than other subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree  Strongly agree
**Intercultural Friendship Orientation in English Learning (IFO)**
As a reason to study English
1. It will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

2. It will allow me to get to know various cultures and people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

3. I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

4. I’d like to make friends with foreigners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

**Attitudes toward Learning English (ALE)**

1. Learning English is really great.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

2. I really enjoy learning English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree

3. English is an important part of the school program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Strongly disagree  
Strongly agree
4. I plan to learn as much English as possible.

5. I love learning English.

6. I hate English.

7. I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.

8. Learning English is a waste of time.

9. I think that learning English is dull.

10. When I leave school, I shall give up learning English entirely because I’m not interested in it.
Willingness to Communicate in English

Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate in English. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left what percent of the time you would choose to communicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Present a talk in English to a group of strangers.
2. Talk in English with an acquaintance while standing in line.
3. Talk in English in a large meeting of friends.
4. Talk in English in a small group of strangers.
5. Talk in English with a friend while standing in line.
6. Talk in English in a large meeting of acquaintances.
7. Talk in English with a stranger while standing in line.
8. Present a talk in English to a group of friends.
9. Talk in English in a small group of acquaintances.
10. Talk in English in a large meeting of strangers.
11. Talk in English in a small group of friends.
12. Present a talk in English to a group of acquaintances.
Communication Anxiety (CA) in English

Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person feels different degrees of anxiety. Please indicate in the space below what degrees of anxiety you might feel in the following situations.

I usually don't feel anxious at all.

I always feel anxious.

e.g.)  0%  Talk to a stranger. (If you don’t feel anxious at all)

50%  Talk to a stranger. (If you feel somewhat anxious)

90%  Talk to a stranger. (If you usually anxious)

The following situations can occur in Korea or other countries. If you have not experienced the situations, please try to imagine how you might feel.

1. Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances.
2. Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers.
3. Give a presentation in English to a group of friends.
4. Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers.
5. Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers.
6. Talk in English in a large meeting among friends.
7. Talk in English to friends.
8. Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances.
9. Talk in English to acquaintances.
10. Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances.
11. Talk in English to a stranger.
12. Talk in English to a small group of friends.
Perceived Competence in English

Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person feels different degrees of communication competence. Please indicate in the space below what degrees of communication competence you might feel in the following situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Quite competence
(I can do it well)

The following situations can occur in Korea or other countries. If you have not experienced the situations, please try to imagine how competent you might feel.

1. Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances.
2. Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers.
3. Give a presentation in English to a group of friends.
4. Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers.
5. Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers.
6. Talk in English in a large meeting among friends.
7. Talk in English to friends.
8. Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances.
9. Talk in English to acquaintances.
10. Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances.
11. Talk in English to a stranger.
12. Talk in English to a small group of friends.

Thank very much for your kind participation in this study.
APPENDIX C: Reliability and validity test of the questionnaires

The questionnaires, translated from English to Korean, will be employed for a study in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the graduate school of The Ohio State University. The goal of the study is to help Korean students, who are struggling with developing English proficiency even with their eagerness and hard effort, achieve their goal of developing English proficiency more successfully, by explaining to them what determines the success of the attainment of English proficiency. The questionnaires consist of 10 sections, and each of which has questioning items. Please compare the questioning items translated in Korean from English with the original questioning items written in English, and indicate whether or not each of the items needs modification or correction. If it does, please write your suggestions on the underlines. For the title of each section, please write your suggestions on the underline by the title if it needs correction or modification. Otherwise, please leave the underline blank. Thank you for your kind help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Korean translated</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.) I am a girl.</td>
<td>나는 하나의 소녀입니다.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>저는 소녀입니다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: How much does each of the following statements apply to you?

작성 방법: 다음 질문에 대한 자신의 의견을 솔직하게 표현해 주세요?

Strongly disagree (전적으로 동의하지 않음)  Strongly disagree (전적으로 동의함)
**Interest in Foreign Affairs (IFA):**

세계 여러 나라들에 대한 관심도

1. I often read and watch news about foreign countries.  
나는 종종 다른 나라들에 관한 신문 기사를 읽거나 뉴스를 본다.  
   Appropriate Clear  
   Yes No Yes No

2. I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/or friends.  
나는 가족 또는 친구들하고 다른 나라의 상황이나 사건들에 대해 자주 이야기한다.  
   Appropriate Clear  
   Yes No Yes No

**Intergroup Approach-Avoidance Tendency (AAT)**

외국인과의 대화 접근 또는 거부 경향 정도

1. I want to make friends with international students studying in Korea.  
나는 한국에서 공부하는 외국인 학생들과 친구로서 사귀고 싶다.  
   Appropriate Clear  
   Yes No Yes No

2. I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can.  
가능하다면 나는 외국인들과 대화하는 것을 피하겠다.  
   Appropriate Clear  
   Yes No Yes No

3. I would talk to an international student if there is one at school.  
만약 학교에 외국인 학생이 있다면 그 학생과 대화하고 싶다.  
   Appropriate Clear  
   Yes No Yes No
4. I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student.  
(Yes No Yes No)
외국인 학생과 한 집에서 또는 한 방에서 함께 지내야만하더라도 게의치 않았다.

5. I want to participate in a volunteer activity to help foreigners in the neighboring community.  
(Yes No Yes No)
이웃에 살고 있는 외국인들을 돕는 자선 활동에 참여하고 싶다.

6. I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door.  
(Yes No Yes No)
만약 외국인이 옆집으로 이사온다면 같이 살아가는데 어느 정도 불편함을 느낄 것이다.

7. I would help a foreigner who is in trouble communicating in a restaurant or at a station.  
(Yes No Yes No)
식당이나 지하철, 또는 버스 터미널에서 의사소통에 어려움을 겪는 외국인을 돕겠다.

**Motivation Intensity (MI)**

1. Compared to my classmates, I think I study English relatively hard.  
(Yes No Yes No)
같은 과 친구들과 비교해 볼 때, 나는 영어를 상대적으로 열심히 하는 편이다.

2. I often think about the words and ideas which I learn about in my English classes.  
(Yes No Yes)
나는 영어 수업 시간에 배운 단어들이나 내용들을 종종 생각하곤 한다.
3. If English were not taught at school, I would study on my own.  
만약 영어를 학교에서 가르치지 않는다면 나 혼자서라도 공부하겠다.

4. I think I spend fairly long hours studying English.  
나는 내가 생각하기에 아주 많은 시간을 영어 공부하면서 보내는 것 같다.

5. I really try to learn English.  
나는 진심으로 영어를 배우고자 노력한다.

6. After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve.  
대학 졸업후에도 나는 영어를 계속 공부하고 영어 능력을 향상하기 위해서 노력할 것이다.

Interest in International Vocation or Activities  
해외에서의 근무나 활동에 관한 관심 정도

1. I would rather stay in my hometown.  
 나는 그냥 내가 지금 사는 곳에 머무르겠다.

2. I want to live in a foreign country.  
 나는 외국에서 살기를 원한다.
3. I want to work in an international organization such as the United Nations.
나는 유엔 (U.N.) 같은 국제 단체에서 일하고 싶다.

4. I’m interested in volunteer activities in developing countries such as participating in Youth International Development.
나는 세계 청년 개발 조합 같은 곳에 참여하여 개발 도상국들을 돕는 자선 활동에 관심이 많다.

5. I don’t think what’s happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.
세계 여러 나라에서 일어나는 일들이 나의 일상 생활에 아무런 관련이 없다고 생각한다.

6. I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently.
해외 출장을 자주 보낸다면 차라리 직장을 그만 두겠다.

Desire to Learn English
영어를 배우려는 욕구 정도

1. When I have assignments to do in English, I try to do them immediately.
나는 영어 과제물이 있다면 바로 해 내려고 노력한다.

2. I would read English newspapers or magazines outside my English course work.
영어 수업이 외에도 영어 신문이나 영어 잡지를 읽곤한다.
3. During English classes I’m absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies.
나는 영어 수업시간중에 수업 내용에 빠져들거나 내 영어 공부에 집중한다.

4. I would like the number of English classes at school increased.
나는 학교에서 영어 수업 시간수가 늘어나기를 원한다.

5. I believe absolutely English should be taught at school.
나는 영어가 학교에서 가르쳐져야만한다고 전적으로 믿는다.

6. I find studying English more interesting than other subjects.
나는 다른 과목들보다 영어를 배우는 것이 더 흥미롭다고 생각한다.

---

**Intercultural Friendship Orientation in English Learning**

영어를 배움에 있어 타 문화 사람과의 우정 정도

As a reason to study English: (영어를 배우는 이유에 대해서)

1. It will allow me to meet and converse with more and varied people.
영어 능력은 좀 더 많은 사람들, 다양한 사람들을 만나고 대화할 수 있도록 도와준다.

2. It will allow me to get to know various cultures and people.
영어 능력은 다양한 문화와 사람들을 알 수 있게 도와준다.
3. I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. 나의 영어 능력은 다른 문화 사람들과의 활동을 좀 더 자유롭게 할 수 있게 해준다.

4. I’d like to make friends with foreigners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. 영어를 배우는 이유는 외국인 친구를 사귀고 싶기 때문이다.

Attitudes toward Learning English

영어를 배우는 태도에 관한 정도

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Learning English is really great.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. 영어를 배우는 것은 정말 중요한 일이다.

2. I really enjoy learning English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. 나는 영어 배우는 것을 진심으로 즐기는 편이다.

3. English is an important part of the school program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. 영어 교육은 학교 교육에서 중요한 부분이다.

4. I plan to learn as much English as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. 가능한 많은 영어를 배우겠다.

5. I love learning English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. 나는 영어 배우는 것을 무척 좋아한다.
6. I hate English.  
나는 영어 배우는 것을 정말 싫어한다.

7. I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.  
 나는 영어보다는 차라리 다른 과목을 공부하는 데 시간을 보내겠다.

8. Learning English is a waste of time.  
 영어를 배우는 것은 시간 낭비다.

9. I think that learning English is dull.  
 나는 영어 배우는 것은 따분한 일이라고 생각한다.

10. When I leave school, I shall give up learning English entirely because I’m not interested in it.  
 졸업하면 영어에 흥미가 없기 때문에 영어공부를 그만 둘 것이다.

**Willingness to Communicate**

대화를 하고자 하는 의지 정도

1. Present a talk in English to a group of strangers.  
 낯선 사람들이 모인 자리에서 낯선 사람들에게 영어로 이야기를 해준다.

2. Talk in English with an acquaintance while standing in line.  
 줄서서 기다리는 동안 아는 사람과 영어로 대화를 나눈다.
3. Talk in English in a large meeting of friends.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

친구들로 구성된 큰 회의에서 친구들과 영어로 이야기를 주고 받는다.

4. Talk in English in a small group of strangers.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

낯선 사람들이 모인 작은 모임에서 낯선 사람들과 영어로 이야기를 나눈다.

5. Talk with a friend in English while standing in line.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

줄서서 기다리는 동안 친구와 영어로 대화를 나눈다.

6. Talk in English in a large meeting of acquaintances.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

아는 사람들로 구성된 큰 회의에서 아는 사람들과 영어로 이야기를 주고 받는다.

7. Talk with a stranger in English while standing in line.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

줄서서 기다리는 동안 낯선 사람과 영어로 대화를 나눈다.

8. Present a talk to a group of friends.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

친구들이 모인 자리에서 친구들에게 영어로 이야기를 해준다.

9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.

Appropriate Clear

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

아는 사람들이 모인 작은 모임에서 아는 사람들과 영어로 대화를 나눈다.
10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.  
Yes No Yes No

11. Talk in a small group of friends.  
Yes No Yes No

12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.  
Yes No Yes No

Communication Anxiety

1. Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances.  
Yes No Yes No

2. Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers.  
Yes No Yes No

3. Give a presentation in English to a group of friends.  
Yes No Yes No

4. Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers.  
Yes No Yes No
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>소모임에서 낯선 사람들과 영어로 대화한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Talk in English in a large meeting among friends.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>큰 회의에서 친구들 틈에서 영어로 이야기한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Talk in English to friends.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>친구들과 영어로 대화한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아는 사람들로 구성된 큰 회의에서 아는 사람들과 영어로 이야기를 주고 받는다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> Talk in English to acquaintances.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아는 사람들과 영어로 대화한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아는 사람들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 발표한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Talk in English to a stranger.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>낯선 사람과 영어로 대화한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> Talk in English to a small group of friends.</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>친구들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 이야기한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceived Competence in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(소모임에서 아는 사람들과 영어로 대화한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(낯선 사람들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 발표하다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Give a presentation in English to a group of friends.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(친구들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 발표한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(큰회의에서 낯선 사람들 틈에서 영어로 이야기한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(소모임에서 낯선 사람들과 영어로 대화한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talk in English in a large meeting among friends.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(큰 회의에서 친구들 틈에서 영어로 이야기한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Talk in English to friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(친구들과 영어로 대화한다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(아는 사람들로 구성된 큰 회의에서 아는 사람들과 영어로 이야기를 주고 받는다.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Talk in English to acquaintances.
아는 사람들과 영어로 대화한다.

10. Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances.
아는 사람들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 발표한다.

11. Talk in English to a stranger.
낯선 사람과 영어로 대화한다.

12. Talk in English to a small group of friends.
친구들로 구성된 소모임에서 영어로 이야기한다.