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ABSTRACT

English, which is defined as an international language, is used by more than one and a half billion people (Strevens, 1992) as a first, second, or foreign language for communication purposes. Consequently, the purpose of teaching English has shifted from the mastery of structure to the ability to use the language for communicative purposes. Thus, the issues of whether learners would communicate in English when they had the chance and what would affect their willingness to communicate gain importance. Recently, a “Willingness to Communicate” (WTC) model was developed by McIntyre et al. (1998) to explain and predict second language communication.

The objective of the present study was to examine whether college students who were learning English as a foreign language in the Turkish context were willing to communicate when they had an opportunity and whether the WTC model explained the relations among social-psychological, linguistic and communication variables in this context. The present study was a hybrid design that combined both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures. First, a questionnaire was administered to 356 randomly selected college students in Turkey. Then, interviews were conducted with 15 randomly selected students who had already answered the
questionnaire. The Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis was conducted to examine the interrelations among students’ willingness to communicate in English, their language learning motivation, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, attitude toward the international community, and personality. Qualitative interviews were utilized to extend and elaborate these quantitative results.

The results revealed that students were somewhat willing to communicate in English, were moderately motivated to learn English, had a positive attitude toward the international community, had low communication anxiety, perceived themselves somewhat competent to communicate in English, and were slightly extraverted. These students’ willingness to communicate was found to be directly related to their attitude toward the international community and their perceived linguistic self-confidence. Students’ motivation to learn English and their personality in terms of being an introvert or extrovert were found to be indirectly related to their willingness to communicate through linguistic self-confidence. Finally, their attitude toward the international community was correlated with their personality.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

English is used by more people than any other language on Earth. 
—Strevens, 1992, p. 28

More than one and a half billion native and nonnative speakers use English all around the world as a first, second, or foreign language (Strevens, 1992). While one fourth of all English users are native speakers, the remaining majority use English as a second or foreign language to communicate with both native and nonnative speakers of English (Strevens, 1992). Two thirds of these nonnative speakers of the language have learned English in the past twenty years, and the number of people who use the English language continues to increase. Today, English is used in areas from diplomacy, international trade, and tourism to international media, air-traffic control, and technology. All these suggest that English has become an international language that is used for communication among different nations and cultures (Alptekin, 2002; Norton, 1997; Smith, 1992; Strevens, 1992).

In the past, the aim of teaching English was the mastery of the structure of the language. However, in this age of communication, English seems to be playing a major
role, and the purpose of teaching the language has shifted from the mastery of structure to the ability to use the language for communicative purposes. Thus, the communication aspect of teaching English has gained importance. Moreover, the ultimate goal of language learning is currently defined as “authentic communication between persons of different languages and cultural backgrounds” (McIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, & Noels, 2002, p. 559).

1.1 Statement of the problem

When the purpose of teaching English is defined in terms of communication, the issues of whether the learners will communicate in English when they have the chance and what will affect their willingness to communicate gain importance. Recently, the “Willingness to Communicate” (WTC) model, which integrates psychological, linguistic, and communicative variables to describe, explain, and predict second language (L2) communication, has been developed by McIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1998). They define willingness to communicate as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using L2” (p. 547).

According to the WTC model, both “enduring” and “situational” factors affect one’s willingness to communicate in a second language, which is quite different from one’s WTC in her native tongue. Enduring influences are identified as the personality of the language learner, the social context in which she lives, intergroup attitudes between native speaker and second language groups, general self-confidence of the learner, and her motivation to learn English. Situational influences are identified as one’s desire to communicate with a specific person, and the self-confidence that one feels in a specific situation. In the WTC model, it is hypothesized that all these social, affective, cognitive,
and situational variables influence one’s willingness to communicate in the second language, which in turn predicts one’s actual use of that second language.

Although WTC is a recently developed model, several studies have already been conducted to test it (Baker, MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, Conrod, 2001; Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Donovan, 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002). These studies have illustrated that students’ perceived language competence (rather than their actual competence) and lack of communication anxiety are directly related to their WTC in a second language (Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Yashima, 2002). Moreover, recent studies (Clement Baker, & MacIntyre, 2003; Yashima, 2002) combine the notions of perceived language competence and lack of communication anxiety to form a notion of linguistic self-confidence.

It has been recognized that students’ motivation is directly (Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, Donovan, 2002; Yashima, 2002; MacIntyre, Baker, 2001; Baker, MacIntyre, 2000) or indirectly (MacIntyre, Charos, 1996) related to their WTC. Similarly, studies have illustrated a direct and/or indirect relationship between WTC and attitude. While Yashima (2002) indicates a direct relation between students’ WTC and their attitude toward international community in the EFL context, in the ESL context, Clement et al. (2003) shows an indirect relation through linguistic self-confidence between WTC and attitude toward the other language group.

Finally, an indirect relation between the language learner’s personality and her WTC has been demonstrated (MacIntyre, Babin, Clement, 1999; MacIntyre, Charos,
1996). MacIntyre et al. (1999) have illustrated that personality traits of introversion/extraversion and emotional stability are related to WTC through communication apprehension and perceived language competence. Similarly, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) have demonstrated that while personality traits of intellect, extraversion, emotional stability, and conscientiousness are related to WTC through perceived language competence, communication apprehension, and motivation, the personality trait of agreeableness is directly related to WTC.

Although these studies illustrate that the WTC model developed by MacIntyre et al. clarifies relations among linguistic, social psychological and communicative variables to explain language learners’ WTC in a second language, most of them were conducted in Canada with Anglophone students learning French as a second language (MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, Donovan, 2002; Baker, MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, Charos, 1996). Thus, only a limited number of studies have tested the model with students learning English as a second language (Clement, Baker, MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002), or as a foreign language in EFL context (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004; Kim, 2004). Furthermore, none of these ESL or EFL studies has researched the personality aspect of the WTC model, although personality is one of the enduring influences of WTC in the original model (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, Noels, 1998).

Therefore, the present study examines students’ willingness to communicate in the EFL context by using Turkish college students as participants. Unlike the previous studies in EFL context (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, & Shimizu, 2004; Kim, 2004), this study utilizes the personality aspect of the original WTC model in
addition to affective-cognitive, social, and communication variables. The objectives of the study are to understand whether students who are learning English as a foreign language in the Turkish context are willing to communicate in English when they have an opportunity and whether the WTC model (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, Noels, 1998) explains the relations among social-psychological, linguistic, and communication variables in the EFL context.

1.2 Research Questions and Hypothesis

Primary Question:
How willing are Turkish college students to communicate in English as a foreign language, and what affects their willingness?

Secondary Questions:

1- What are the students’ perceptions of their willingness to communicate in English, their motivation, linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and their personality?

2- What are the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?

3- Is the proposed model of WTC acceptable in terms of explaining the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?
Hypothesis:

1. Language learners’ attitude toward the international community, their motivation to learn English, and their linguistic self-confidence are directly related to their willingness to communicate in English.

2. Language learners’ attitude toward the international community is directly related to their motivation to learn English and indirectly related to willingness to communicate through motivation to learn English.

3. Language learners’ personality is directly related to their linguistic self-confidence and indirectly related to willingness to communicate through linguistic self-confidence.

In order to answer the research questions, both qualitative and quantitative methods were utilized. First, a questionnaire was administered to 356 randomly selected
freshmen attending a Turkish university in Izmir. Then, semi-structured oral interviews were conducted with 15 randomly selected students who had already answered the questionnaire. Interview participants were randomly selected so that the researcher could interview with both willing and less willing students. The quantitative data were analyzed through the Structural Equation Model (SEM), while the qualitative data were analyzed through following the conventions of qualitative data analysis and using the Meaning Condensation method (Kvale, 1996).

1.3. Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the terms were defined as follows although they have other definitions.

**Willingness to communicate:** It is defined as “readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons using a L2” (McIntyre, Clement, Dornyei & Noels, 1998, p. 547). Twelve items that McCroskey (1992) prepared were used to assess Turkish freshmen’s willingness to communicate in English in terms of the communication context (public speaking, talking in meetings, group discussions, and interpersonal conversations) and types of receivers (stranger, acquaintance, and friend). It is operationally defined as the sum of the points that the student achieve based on this WTC scale.

**Attitude toward the international community:** This term is defined as the combination of learners’ interest in foreign affairs (Yashima, 2002), their interest in international activities (Yashima, 2002), their integrative orientation (Gardner, 1985; Yashima, 2002), and their non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures (Yashima, 2002). It is
operationally defined as the sum of the points that participants achieve based on these four scales.

**Communication anxiety:** Anxiety, in general, is defined as “the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (Horwitz, Horwitz, Cope, 1986) and communication anxiety, in particular, is defined as apprehension about “communicating with people. Difficulty in speaking in dyads or groups (oral communication anxiety) or in public (“stage fright”), or in listening to or learning a spoken message (receiving anxiety)…” (Horwitz, Horwitz, Cope, 1986). In this research, communication anxiety is operationally defined as the sum of the points that the student acquire on the communication anxiety scale (Yashima, 2002) which assesses students’ communication anxiety in different communication contexts with different types of receivers.

**Perceived communication competence:** It is the learner’s self-evaluation of her language proficiency in oral communication situations. Twelve items taken from MacIntyre and Charos (1996) were used to assess the extent to which the respondents feel confident in communicating in English in various communication contexts with types of receivers. It is operationally defined as the sum of points that participants accumulate based on this twelve-item perceived communication competence scale.

**Motivation:** Motivation to learn a second or foreign language is defined as “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity” (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). In this research, motivation is operationally defined as the sum of the points that participants accumulate based on the following three aspects of the motivation construct: (1) desire to learn
English as a foreign language, (2) motivational intensity to learn English, and (3) attitudes toward learning English (Gardner, 1985).

**Personality**: It is defined as being an introvert or extravert depending on Goldberg’s (1992, 1993) Big-Five personality traits. It is operationally defined as the points that participants accumulate on a ten-item semantic differential scale. While lower scores indicate an introvert personality trait, higher scores indicate an extravert personality trait.

### 1.4 Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that:

1. Constructs such as a willingness to communicate, motivation, L2 self-confidence, and a student’s attitude toward the international community can be measured.

2. The 356 randomly selected participants cooperate and complete the questionnaire.

3. The 15 randomly selected students agree to be interviewed.

4. The participants tell the truth when they answer the questionnaire and the interview questions.

### 1.5 Significance of the Study

The present study has theoretical, methodological, and practical significance. First, the study tests the complex and promising WTC model, which integrates linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables. The comprehensive nature of this model allows us to research second language learning within a broad framework, which includes not only linguistic aspects of language learning but also communicative, affective, and social aspects. Thus, the findings of this study provide significant data to
expand our understanding of L2 learning and communication, especially since a limited amount of research has been conducted to test the WTC model.

Second, unlike most of the studies in the field, this study tests the model in the EFL context, which allows us to gain a deeper understanding of language learning in a context where English is not the medium of communication in the learners’ daily life. The findings of this study confirm and also modify part of the model for the EFL context. Thus, it allows us to predict learners’ communication behavior and promote their language use in the EFL context.

Third, this study is significant in terms of employing a mixed-method design that combined both quantitative as well as qualitative data collection and analysis methods. This allowed the researcher to examine the WTC model using multiple data collection techniques and make a comprehensive interpretation of the quantitative data. Results of the quantitative questionnaire were extended and elaborated by using semi-structured interviews. The qualitative aspect of the study allowed a better understanding of the interconnected complexities of Turkish students’ willingness to communicate in English.

Moreover, previous studies related to language learners’ willingness to communicate utilized only quantitative research methods and focused only on testing the willingness to communicate model without describing the learners’ willingness, motivation, attitude, anxiety, and competence. The current study went a step further and not only tested the model in the EFL context but also described the learners’ affective reactions in detail by employing qualitative data collection and analysis methods. The semi-structured interviews allowed for an unfolding of the complex nature of learners’ willingness and the factors affecting this willingness by providing thorough information.
Thus, the study both tested the WTC model and described each component of the model in detail.

Fourth, since Willingness to Communicate is a comprehensive model that involves psychological, linguistic, and communication variables, the results have implications for foreign language teachers, teacher trainers, and material designers. The results of the study inform foreign language teachers in terms of their students’ affective and communicative needs, as well as their linguistics needs. Teacher trainers may utilize the findings to develop more effective teacher education programs. Finally, material developers may be informed in terms of the communicative needs of language learners in the EFL context.

1.6 Turkish Context

Since this study was conducted in a Turkish university and focused on Turkish students’ willingness to communicate in English and the social, psychological, and linguistic factors that affect these students’ willingness, in this section brief background knowledge regarding the Turkish educational system in general and English education in particular is provided.

1.6.1 Turkish Educational System

The Turkish Republic was founded in 1923 out of the ruins of the six-century old Ottoman Empire (1299-1923), which was destroyed during the First World War. Under the leadership of Ataturk, the Turkish nation established an independent democratic state by taking the Western secular state as a model (Yildiran, 1997). After the establishment of the Turkish Republic, a series of political, legal, educational, social, and cultural
reforms were undertaken: the Ottoman royalty was abolished, a democratic constitution was created, the religious courts were closed and Swiss civil Law was adopted, the western calendar and metric system were accepted, and instead of Arabic script, the Latin alphabet was used. Education was taken seriously from the very beginning of the new Turkish Republic. In fact, the current Turkish educational system was established in 1920 during the Turkish Independence War (1919-1923) against the victorious nations of the First World War (Sahin & Simsek, 1996).

In 1924, with the Unification of Education Law, the Ministry of National Education became the central organization that manages the formal and non-formal education throughout the country (Yildiran, 1997), five-year elementary education became compulsory and education at every level was provided by the government free of charge to every citizen (Demircan, 1988). Still the Ministry of National Education is responsible for preparing the curriculum for elementary, middle, and high schools, providing teachers to public schools, preparing textbooks, and supervising and inspecting both the schools and the teachers.

Until 1997, the Turkish school system was built on a 5-3-3 frame. The first five years were the compulsory elementary education, followed by three years of middle school (junior high school) and three years of high school (senior high school). In 1997, the system was changed to an 8-3 frame. According to this current system, compulsory primary education has been extended to 8 years, which is followed by three years of high school.

According to their curricula, high schools can be grouped as: 1) academic, 2) special, and 3) vocational-technical. Academic high schools are the most common high
schools, offering general education and preparing students for higher education. Special schools such as “science high schools” and “Anatolian high schools” are academic high schools with specially designed curricula. While science high schools “offer enriched curricula with an emphasis on mathematics and basic science” (Turgut, 1997, p. 40), Anatolian high schools “offer programs that are enriched in Western languages as well as basic sciences” (Turgut, 1997, p. 40). In order to be able to attend these special high schools, students need to pass a very competitive selection exam. Since the selection ratio is very small, these schools are considered to be for gifted students (Turgut, 1997). The three or four years of vocational-technical high schools “give pupils vocational training for business and industrial jobs: (Turgut, 1997, p. 40). Four-year vocational schools admit their students based on the results of a competitive examination.

In Turkey, a great majority of schools (8 years of primary school and 3 years of high schools) are public schools that do not charge fees and are administered by the Ministry of National Education (Turgut, 1997; Yildiran, 1997). Private schools account for less than three percent of all schools (Yildiran, 1997) and are strictly controlled by the Ministry of National Education (Turgut, 1997). Although private schools follow the curriculum prepared by the Ministry, like special high schools (e.g. Anatolian high school), they emphasize foreign languages such as English, French, German, Italian etc and teach science and mathematic courses in the foreign language in which they specialize.

High school graduates are accepted by the institutions of higher education depending on their scores in the nationwide selection and placement examination, their GPA, their preferences, and “the quotas and prerequisites of the areas of higher learning
on their lists of personal preferences” (Ozcelik, 1997, p. 83). Higher education institutions involve faculties, schools of higher education, and research centers. “A faculty is primarily an administrative unit in charge of undergraduate programs” (Turgut, 1997). Faculty programs lead to bachelor’s degrees and professional degrees such as medicine and law, and require four to six years of study depending on the degree sought. Schools of higher education usually carry out vocational programs and require two years of formal study. Research centers are institutions where group of scholars conduct research and these centers do not have programs leading to a degree (Turgut, 1997).

The aims of higher education institutions in Turkey are to “(1) prepare the manpower needed by the nation, (2) provide education at various levels beyond secondary education, (3) give expert advice and (4) generate scientific research and publications” (Turgut, 1997, p. 64). Furthermore, as a developing country, Turkey considers universities as “instrument[s] for national development” (Simsek, Balci, 1997, p. 8) and students approach higher education “as a way of upward mobility” (Simsek, Balci, 1997, p. 8). Simsek and Balci’s (1997) study indicates that “beyond the three typical/generic functions of university (teaching, research, and service), universities in the developing world should still be seen as the engines of modernization and of nation building” (p. 20).

Until 1981 higher education was financed by the government. Since 1981 students who attend public higher education institutions pay a small fee that equals “twenty percent of the average current expenditures per student” (Turgut, 1997, p. 68). The fee amount changes from program to program, with students in medicine paying the highest amount and students in social sciences paying the lowest. The first private university,
Bilkent University, was founded in 1984 and admitted its first students in 1986. Currently, there are fifty-three public and twenty-three private universities in Turkey.

1.6.2 English Education in Turkey

Turk-American relations first started in the 1830s during the Ottoman Empire era. Although Americans founded a private school, Robert College in 1863, and English began being taught in public schools in 1908, during the Ottoman Empire period Arabic and Persian were the primary foreign languages (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998). Shortly after the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923, a Western foreign language became a compulsory school subject. During the early days of Republic the primacy was given to the French language, followed by German and English. However, in the 1950s due to “closer ties with the United States… [and] the increasing impact of American economic and military power” (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998, p. 27), English began to gain primary foreign language status replacing French.

In the 1980s, English became the dominant foreign language due to “increasing contact with the free market economies which brought into Turkey many new brands of products, new concepts and terminologies, and popular American culture and media” (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1998, p. 29). The English language influenced both Turkish life and Turkish language; the Turkish language borrowed words and concepts from English. Currently, Turkish is the official language of Turkey and English is the dominant foreign language taught at schools and used mainly in international business and tourism.

In Turkey, until 1997, English instruction started in the 6th grade in public junior high schools. However, with the new educational law passed in 1997, English instruction started in the 4th grade. Currently, in public schools, English is taught two hours a week
in the 4th and the 5th grades and four hours a week in 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th grades.

In private schools, English instruction starts as early as the kindergarten level, and students receive two or three times more English instruction compared to their counterparts in public schools. While private schools usually hire native speaker English teachers, the Ministry of National Education hires local teachers. Furthermore, in private schools since the medium of instruction is English (or another western language depending on the type of private school), students take their science and mathematic courses in English. On the other hand, students who pass a competitive selection test and are allowed to attend special public high schools such as Anatolian high schools receive one-year English-preparatory classes and after the preparatory year, they also take math and science classes in English.

In Turkey, at some universities the medium of instruction is in English. However, the students who graduated from general public schools have only beginning level English proficiency despite English instruction that they receive throughout junior and senior high school. Therefore, the students who pass the central university entrance examination and are placed at English-medium universities are required to take an English proficiency test. Depending on the results that students receive from the proficiency test, these students are either allowed to start their academic program or asked to take one-year English preparatory classes before taking their major area courses.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to explore Turkish college students’ willingness to communicate in English and the social psychological, linguistic, and communication variables that are related to the degree of these students’ willingness. In this section, relevant studies were reviewed under these subheadings: willingness to communicate, linguistic self-confidence, language anxiety, attitudes and motivation, and personality.

2.1 Willingness to Communicate

2.1.1 Willingness to Communicate in the Native Language

The construct “Willingness to Communicate” (WTC) was first used by McCroskey and his colleagues in relation to communication in the native language (McCroskey, 1992; McCroskey & Richmond, 1990; Zakahi & McCroskey, 1989). McCroskey and Richmond (1990) treat WTC as a personality trait and define it as “variability in talking behavior”. They argue that even though situational variables might affect one’s willingness to communicate, individuals display similar WTC tendencies in various situations. Moreover, they identified introversion, self-esteem, communication competence, communication apprehension and cultural diversity as antecedents that lead to differences in WTC.
McCroskey and Richmond (1990) researched WTC in the native language not only in the USA but also in Sweden, Australia, Micronesia, and Puerto Rico. They conducted a comparative study and investigated the relations among WTC, communication apprehension, communication competence, and introversion in these countries. They found that the degree of WTC, communication apprehension, communication competence, and introversion differed among countries as well as the degree of relations among these variables. While American students were found to be more willing to communicate, Micronesian students were least willing. The Swedish students were reported to have the highest perceived language competence, while Micronesian students have the lowest. Similarly, the difference between Swedish and Micronesian students in terms of the association between WTC and perceived language competence was quite high. Thus, McCroskey and Richmond (1990) suggested that any kind of generalization should be done with reference to culture.

MacIntyre (1994) by using the data collected by McCroskey and his colleagues developed a structural model to explain the variance in WTC. He hypothesized that communication apprehension and perceived competence would be the causes of WTC when introversion would be related to both communication apprehension and perceived competence, and self-esteem would be related to communication apprehension. His model was significant and he managed to explain the sixty percent of the variance in WTC. The model suggests that people are willing to communicate when they are not apprehensive about communication and when they perceive themselves as capable of communicating effectively.
MacIntyre, Babin, and Clement (1999) conducted a study to examine the antecedents and consequences of WTC at both trait and state levels. In order to investigate the trait aspect of WTC like self-perceived competence, communication apprehension, self-esteem, and big five personality traits, the authors gave questionnaires to college students. To explore the state aspect of willingness like anxiety, perceived competence, and communication tasks, the authors asked participants to complete four specific tasks and observed them in a laboratory setting.

The trait aspect of WTC had similar results with MacIntyre’s (1994) previous study except this time in the structural model the path from communication apprehension to WTC was not significant. Instead the path from self-perceived competence to WTC was unexpectedly strong. Furthermore, self-perceived competence, and communicative apprehension were negatively correlated. Personality variables seemed to be related to self-esteem, perceived competence, and anxiety. Results indicate that extraverts are likely to feel less anxious, more competent about their communication ability, and have higher self-esteem.

The results of the state aspect of WTC indicated that volunteers for the laboratory study were more willing to communicate than the students who did not, students who initiated the conversation in the lab were more willing to communicate compared to the ones who did not initiate the conversation, and while perceived competence predicted the speaking time for easy speaking task, communication apprehension predicted the speaking time for difficult tasks.
2.1.2 Willingness to Communicate in the Second and Foreign Language

Later, MacIntyre and Charos (1996) applied the more comprehensive version of MacIntyre’s (1994) model to research communication in the second language (L2). They broadened the structural model by adding motivation, personality, and context as predictors of not only WTC but also the frequency of communication. They hypothesized that WTC and integrative motivation would explain the frequency of communication in L2. Furthermore, they theorized that the “Big-Five” personality traits would be related to both motivation and L2 WTC through attitudes, perceived competence, and L2 anxiety, while context would directly influence the frequency of L2 communication frequency. After a few modifications of the paths among personality traits, attitude, and perceived competence, the model explained the L2 communication frequency, even though they could not find a relation between motivation and WTC as expected.

In 1998, MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels developed a comprehensive model of willingness to communicate in L2. They integrated linguistic, communicative and social psychological variables to explain one’s WTC in her second language. By following McCroskey and his colleagues, MacIntyre et al (1998) defined WTC as “the probability of engaging in communication when free to choose to do so” (p. 546). However, MacIntyre et al did not treat WTC in L2 as a personality trait but as a situational variable that has both transient and enduring influences. Moreover, they theorized that WTC influence not only speaking mode but also listening, writing and reading modes.
They use a pyramid figure to illustrate the WTC model, which explains the probable causes of willingness to communicate in L2. The top of the pyramid shows the moment of L2 communication, which is followed by WTC, which predicts actual communication behavior. The state communicative self-confidence and desire to communicate with a specific person follow WTC as situational factors. At the bottom of the pyramid, intergroup climate and personality are placed as enduring influences. Intermediate layers include motivational propensities and affective-cognitive context, which incorporate motivation, intergroup attitudes, communicative competence, L2 self-confidence, and social situation. It is hypothesized that while the top layers of the pyramid have immediate influence the bottom layers have more remote influence on WTC.

Although it is a fairly recently developed model, scholars have been testing the various aspects of it since its proposal in 1998. Baker and MacIntyre (2000) examined the role of gender and immersion in L2 communication. They conducted a study with Canadian high school immersion and non-immersion students who speak English as a mother tongue and learn French as a second language. They compared, male, female, immersion, non-immersion students in terms of WTC, attitudes toward learning French, orientation for learning, communication anxiety, perceived communicative competence, and self-reported frequency of communication both in English and French. The students completed a questionnaire and wrote about their positive and negative experiences of communicating in French. The results indicate that compared to non-immersion students, immersion students are more willing to communicate, have lower French anxiety, have greater competence, and communicate more frequently in French. In addition, while
immersion students’ WTC in French is significantly correlated with French anxiety, frequency of communication in French, and WTC in English, non-immersion students’ WTC is significantly correlated with French anxiety, frequency of communication in French, perceived competence in French, and WTC in English. In terms of gender, while students in immersion program do not differ, female students in non-immersion programs are more motivated to learn French compared to male students in the same program.

MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, and Conrad (2001) studied the relations among WTC in second language, social support, and language learning orientations. They examined the 9th grade French immersion students’ WTC in speaking, writing, reading, and comprehension, these students’ reasons for studying French, and the social support that they get from their parents, teachers and friends. The results indicate a positive correlation between the students’ five orientations of language learning (travel, job related, friendship with Francophones, personal knowledge, and school achievement) and their WTC in French as a second language. Furthermore, results showed that social support especially friends’ support is associated with high WTC in French.

MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, and Donovan (2002) studied WTC, perceived competence, French anxiety, integrativeness and motivation in terms of sex and age among 7th, 8th and 9th grade junior high school students in a French immersion program. The results indicate that girls are more willing to communicate than boys, students in grade 8 and 9 are more willing than students at grade 7, and overall students WTC is higher in English (their mother tongue) than in French. In addition, the results showed that students at grade 8 and 9 communicate more frequently than students in grade 7; however, students’ motivation declines from grade 7 to grade 8 and 9. Furthermore, it is
observed that WTC, language anxiety, communication frequency, and perceived competence are correlated which suggests that students who are motivated tend to be more willing to communicate, have higher perceived competence, have lower French anxiety and communicate more frequently.

Hashimoto (2002) conducted a study with Japanese ESL students to investigate the effects of WTC and motivation on actual L2 use. His structural equation model, which was hypothesized according to the socio-educational and WTC models indicated that motivation and WTC can predict the frequency of communication in the classroom. Similar to the previous studies, language anxiety and perceived competence are shown to be strongly associated with WTC and unlike Macintyre and Chaos (1996) study, results indicated a relation between motivation and WTC.

Yashima (2002) tested her structural model, which was also developed according to the socio-educational and WTC models in Japan. Unlike the previous studies, this study applied the WTC model in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Another novel aspect of her study is that she assessed students’ attitudes toward the international community, rather than their attitude toward the native speaker group. The structural equation model, which she tested, indicated a relation between WTC and L2 self-confidence and international posture. Furthermore, she found that motivation affects self-confidence and proficiency in English. There was also a relationship between international posture and motivation.

Clement, Baker, and MacIntyre (2003) combined the WTC and social context models to examine individual and contextual factors that affect L2 use for both Anglophone and Francophone groups. Results indicated that Francophones, which are
the minority group and therefore have less ethnolinguistic vitality, are more willing to communicate in L2 (English), have more L2 confidence, more frequently interact in L2, and have a higher identification with the L2 group in comparison to Anglophones.

Kim (2004) replicated Yashima’s (2002) study in the Korean context to examine the nature of the willingness to communicate model in terms of its being trait-like or situational. He collected data from 191 Korean university students through distribution of a questionnaire. SEM analysis of the data indicated that Korean university students’ WTC was directly related to their confidence in English communication, and indirectly related to their attitudes and motivation through confidence in English communication. Unlike Yashima (2002), Kim (2004) did not find direct relationship between students’ attitude toward the international community and their willingness to communicate. However, Kim (2004) concluded that WTC was more trait-like than situational.

Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) conducted a study with 160 Japanese adolescent learners of English to examine the relations among WTC, the frequency of communication in English, and “international posture”. Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) illustrated that learners’ international posture was directly related to learners’ willingness to communicate in English and the frequency of communication in English. Learners’ international posture was also related to their motivation to learn English. Similar to the results of Yashima’s (2002) first study in Japanese context, in this study, Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) found that learners’ L2 communication confidence is directly related to their WTC in English and their motivation to learn English is indirectly related to WTC through L2 communication confidence. During the second phase of the study, Yashima, Zenuk-
Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) demonstrated that there was a significant correlation between frequency of communication and “students’ perception of interpersonal relationships and adjustments” (p. 140).

2.2 Linguistic Self-confidence

Linguistic self-confidence is defined in terms of self-perception of second language competence and a low level of anxiety (Clement, 1980, 1986). Studies continuously indicated negative relationship between learners’ self-perception of their communicative competence and anxiety (Cheng, Horwitz, Schallert, 1999; MacIntyre, Noels, Clement, 1997; Noels, Pon, Clement, 1996; Clement, Dornyei, Noels, 1994; Clement, Gardner, Smythe, 1980).

Clement (1980) conceptualized self-confidence in the second language acquisition context as a subcomponent of motivation within the framework of motivation, fear of assimilation, and integration. According to Clement (1980) in multicultural settings, a member of a minority group has a wish to become an accepted member of the society (integration) and at the same time has a fear of losing his own language and culture (fear of assimilation). This process was called “Primary Motivational Process”. According to this process, one who has a fear of assimilation will be less motivated to acquire the language and eventually will communicate less with the second language group as compared to an individual who has a high degree of “integrativeness”.

In addition to this primary motivational process, Clement (1980) proposed another motivational process, which he calls “self-confidence” that influences one’s willingness to communicate in her second language. Clement (1980) maintains that one’s self-confidence in her language ability and her anxiety level can better predict her
achievement than her attitude toward the second language group. Several studies supported Clement’s model that there is a strong relation between self-perception of language ability and lack of anxiety, and that this construct of self-confidence can predict language achievement (Cheng, Horwitz, Schallert, 1999; MacIntyre, Noels, Clement, 1997; MacIntyre, Gardner, 1989).

Moreover, Clement claims that self-confidence is formed through the frequency and the pleasantness of the contact with the second language community. Research conducted in this topic indicates that self-confidence is associated with the frequency and quality of second language use, achievement, and motivation (Noels, Pon, Clement, 1996; Clement, 1986; Clement, 1980; Clement, Gardner, Smythe, 1980). The study conducted in Canada with Francophone students indicates that one’s self-confidence develops through communication with the second language group and that self-confidence is related to integrativeness (Clement, Gardner, Smythe, 1980). Clement’s study (1986) with Francophone students in Canada revealed that students’ self-confidence is highly positively associated with their oral language production. Moreover, it indicates that students’ self-confidence is related to integrativeness and inter-ethnic contact. The study conducted by Noels, Pon, and Clement (1996) with Chinese university students in Canada revealed that self-confidence in English leads to greater involvement in Canadian society and frequent use of English.

Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1994) researched the role of self-confidence and motivation in the foreign language learning setting. They collected data from 301 high school students in Hungary to assess these students’ attitude, motivation, and anxiety toward learning English as a foreign language. Although, these students do not live in a
bilingual setting and therefore do not have immediate access to the second language group, the study revealed the existence of self-confidence constructs, which is related to foreign language achievement, and course difficulty.

2.2.1 Language Anxiety

General anxiety is defined as “the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system” (Horwitz, Horwitz, Cope, 1986, p. 125). Anxiety has been researched in many fields from three perspectives: trait anxiety, state anxiety, and situation specific anxiety. (MacIntyre, & Gardner, 1991). While trait perspective defines anxiety as a personality trait, state perspective considers it to be an emotional state in the current context. The situation specific perspective examines anxiety that can be consistently felt in certain contexts.

The interaction between the influence of anxiety and task performance is an often cited phenomenon (MacIntyre, 1995). However, the relation between anxiety and task performance is not linear but curvilinear. When the task is relatively simple, people experience low levels of anxiety. These levels of anxiety affect task performance positively by increasing the effort to complete the task successfully. This anxiety is called facilitating anxiety. However, when the task gets difficult, anxiety level raises and it begins to have a negative impact on task performance. This kind of anxiety is called debilitating anxiety (MacIntyre, 1995).

Although language anxiety was a part of Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery, foreign language anxiety as a construct distinct from general anxiety was first defined by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986). It is defined as “a distinct set of beliefs, perceptions, and feelings in response to foreign language learning in the
classroom” (Horwitz, Horwitz, Cope, 1986, p. 130). Moreover, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, (1986) identified three components of foreign language anxiety: 1) communication apprehension; 2) test anxiety; 3) fear of negative evaluation. Communication apprehension is the anxiety that one experiences while communicating in her foreign language. Since the learners have limited knowledge of L2 and problems in talking and understanding the message in a foreign language, communication anxiety is of importance in the foreign language learning process. Test anxiety is also a part of foreign language anxiety, since evaluation is a part of foreign language learning. Test anxiety happens due to the fear of failure. Fear of negative evaluation is similar to test anxiety; however, it is broader in terms of involving evaluative situations other than test taking. For instance, job interviews or public speaking may lead to anxiety stemming from fear of negative evaluation.

After Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope’s study (1986), MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1989, 1991) factor analysis of various anxiety scales illustrated the existence of distinct foreign language anxiety, which is related to foreign language learning and performance. MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) factor analyzed the eleven anxiety scales and described two components of anxiety, which they called general anxiety and communicative anxiety. They maintained that communicative anxiety is related to foreign language anxiety, since the communicative anxiety was related to both acquisition and production of foreign language vocabulary, while general anxiety was not associated with any kind of foreign language achievement. Later, in 1991, their next factor analysis identified three factors: social evaluation anxiety, state anxiety, and language anxiety. Again, language
anxiety was found to be related to foreign language learning, while other two factors were not.

Although, there are several specific anxieties related to school tasks like science anxiety, math anxiety and test-taking anxiety, it seems like foreign language classes provoke more anxiety in comparison to the other classes. (Macintyre, & Gardner, 1989; Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). The close connection between self-perception and self-expression in foreign language classrooms distinguishes foreign language anxiety from other academic anxieties such as math anxiety. The language learners’ self-perception may be threatened due to their limited language ability to present their real self. With their imperfect foreign language proficiency, learners cannot express themselves as they do in their first language. Thus, the nature of the discrepancy between the real self that a learner can express in her native language and the presented self in her foreign language seem to be the unique characteristic of foreign language anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1989, 1991) proposed a model to explain the development and continuation of foreign language anxiety. According to MacIntyre and Gardner, foreign language anxiety develops due to the negative experiences of language learners during the language learning process. At the beginning of the foreign language learning process, motivation and language aptitude are better predictors than language anxiety. However, after experiencing the language learning process for a while, the learner forms attitudes depending on both her positive and negative experiences. If the learner’s experiences are predominantly negative, she develops language anxiety, and consequently feels nervous and performs poorly.
Sparks and Ganschow (1991) questioned the existence of foreign language anxiety and claimed that learners who have difficulty in learning a foreign language may have native language learning problems. Thus, they proposed a Linguistic Coding Deficit Hypothesis, which claims that students’ language learning is affected by their “control over the phonological, syntactic, and semantic components of the linguistic code” (p. 10). Moreover, they claimed that learners’ affective reactions such as anxiety happen due to these students’ failure of control over both their native and foreign languages. However, studies have consistently demonstrated that anxiety is associated with foreign language learning and performance. (Cheng, Horwitz, & Schallert, 1999; MacIntyre, Noels, & Clement, 1997; Saito & Samimy, 1996; Samimy & Rardin, 1994; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Samimy & Tabuse, 1992; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989).

Samimy and Tabuse (1992) examined the relations between college students’ affective reactions and linguistic performances in beginning level Japanese classes. Results indicated that affective factors predict students’ success in language classes and that students’ language class discomfort (anxiety) rose and influenced student’s classroom participation negatively.

Samimy and Rardin (1994) conducted a qualitative study with college students who were taking a beginning level foreign language class to examine the influence of the Community Language Learning experience. The analysis of students’ reflection papers revealed that anxiety was the most frequently mentioned affective factor before the CLL experience, and after the CLL experience reduction of anxiety led to motivation and achievement.
In their study, MacIntyre, and Gardner (1994) examined the effect of language anxiety from a cognitive perspective in terms of input, processing, and output stages. They found a significant, negative correlation between course grade (language achievement) and each of the input, processing, and output anxiety scales, which suggests that anxiety negatively influences learners’ language learning process not only at the output stage (performance stage) but also the input (receiving information in a foreign language) and processing stages (processing information in a foreign language).

Saito and Samimy (1996) investigated the relationship between foreign language anxiety and language performance of American college students learning Japanese as a foreign language. The results indicate that anxiety had a negative effect on students’ performance. However, while anxiety was a predictive variable for intermediate and advanced level students, it was not for beginning students. Their study supported MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1989, 1991) model by suggesting that anxiety arises gradually depending on students’ experience in language learning.

MacIntyre, Noel, and Clement (1997) examined young adult Anglophone students’ perception of their second language competence, their actual competence and their language anxiety. MacIntyre et al found that learners’ actual competence, perceived competence, and language anxiety are correlated. Moreover, the results indicate that anxious students underestimate their language proficiency and communicate less than more relaxed students who overestimate their language proficiency. Furthermore, MacIntyre, Noel, and Clement (1997) claim that speaking, writing and comprehension are more anxiety provoking than reading because these are “more public and ego-
involving activities, raising one’s level of self-consciousness and reducing one’s control over the environment” (p. 279).

Cheng, Horwitz, and Schallert’s (1999) study of Taiwanese college students indicates that language anxiety is significantly and negatively correlated with both speaking, and writing achievement. Furthermore, this study confirmed the relationship between self-confidence and language anxiety by revealing the association between Taiwanese students’ negative self-perception of their language competence and their high level of writing and speaking anxiety.

Kaya (1995) conducted a study with 21 Turkish college students who were taking a one-year English preparatory class. She reported moderate anxiety among these college students. Furthermore, she reported a high negative ($r = -.83$) correlation between students’ anxiety and their self-confidence.

Kiziltepe (2000) conducted a quantitative study in Turkey with 308 high school students in four different high schools. Contrary to her previous assumptions, Kiziltepe (2000) found that these Turkish high school students did not have class anxiety. Kiziltepe (2000) reported that “they seem to be quite at ease and sure of themselves. They are not confused or nervous or self-conscious” (p. 157).

Gregersen and Horwitz (2002) examined the relationship between Chilean college students’ foreign language anxiety and perfectionism. The results of their study indicated a relation between language anxiety and perfectionism. Both perfectionist and anxious learners set unusually high standards, procrastinate, fear the evaluation of their instructors and peers, and are overly concerned about their errors.
Bernaus, Masgoret, Gardner, and Reyes (2004) conducted a quantitative study in Spain to assess 114 secondary school students’ anxiety, motivation, and attitude in relation to learning Spanish, Catalan, and English. Bernaus, Masgoret, Gardner, and Reyes (2004) administered an Attitude/Motivation Test Battery to these students who were immigrants from Asian, South American, and African countries. Results indicate that although students’ motivation and attitude change depending on the foreign language that they study, their foreign language anxiety does not change.

2.3 Attitudes and Motivation

Motivation studies in second language learning have been affected by Gardner and Lambert’s social psychological framework. (Gardner, Tremblay, 1994; Gardner, Lalonde, Moorcroft, 1985; Gardner, Lalonde, 1985). Although, Noels and her colleagues (Noels, Clement, Pelletier, 2001; Noels, Pelletier, Clement, Vallerand, 2000; Noels, Clement, Pelletier, 1999) applied Deci and Ryan’s self-determination theory to investigate the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in second language learning, Gardner’s socio-educational model has dominated the field.

Motivation studies in the Second Language (SL) field started with Gardner and Lambert’s research in Canada in 1960s. Later Gardner (1985) formulized his well-known socio-educational model to explain second language acquisition and motivation from a social psychological perspective. According to Gardner (1985), unlike other school subjects, learning a second language requires learners to familiarize themselves with the characteristics of other cultures, and the success of the learner, to some extent, depends on her attitude toward these other cultures.
The early version of the socio-educational model involves four components: social milieu, individual differences, second language acquisition context, and outcomes. This model did not determine the components of social milieu; rather, it acknowledged that language learning takes place in a cultural context. The individual differences that the model presented were intelligence, language aptitude, motivation, and situational anxiety. The model recognized both formal and informal second language acquisition contexts and linguistic and nonlinguistic outcomes of language learning process. Basically, the model takes both social and individual factors into account while considering second language learning in classrooms and in social settings with its linguistic and nonlinguistic outcomes. According to the model, cultural context and the beliefs of the community play an important role in individuals’ second language learning process. For example, Gardner (1985) argues that if the society believes that learning a second language is a difficult task, the general second language learning achievement level of that society will be lower.

According to Gardner (1985) the main operative focus of the model is motivation. He maintains that attitudes toward other ethnic groups and the language-learning context are the foundations of motivation. Gardner proposes that initially language learners’ motivation originate from the general attitudes of the learner, which develops in the home and in society; then, the learning situation further shapes this attitude. According to Gardner, two attitudinal constructs, integrativeness and attitude toward the learning situation, influence motivation to learn a second language. The first construct, integrativeness involves learners’ attitudes toward the language community, learners’ interest in integration or socialization with the other community, and learners’
openness to other ethnic groups and languages. The second construct, attitudes toward the learning situation, involves learners’ attitude to the language teacher, the language course, and the learning materials. These two constructs influence learners’ motivation, which has three aspects: (1) desire to learn the language, (2) motivational intensity, and (3) attitudes toward learning the second language. Gardner and Lalonde (1985) define the motivated individual as “one, who desires to achieve a goal, works hard to achieve that goal, and enjoys the activity involved” (p. 7).

The model was modified several times to accommodate both contextual and cognitive variables (Tremblay, Gardner, 1995; Gardner, MacIntyre, 1992; Gardner, Clement, 1990). First, Gardner and Clement (1990) presented a model that includes personality variables and a better defined language acquisition context. They redefined individual differences as cognitive characteristics, attitude and motivation, and personality attributes. While cognitive characteristics include language aptitude, and language-learning strategies, attitude and motivation involve the original categories of integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation. On the other hand, one new aspect of the model, personality variables, contains extraversion, field dependence/ independence, empathy, and anxiety. Moreover, Gardner and Clement (1990) discussed contextual aspects of second language acquisition in more depth. Although Gardner (1985) formulated the effect of milieu as part of the socio-educational model, Gardner and Clement (1990) broaden the perspective and presented the systematic conceptualization of context. They discussed the effect of the learning situation, the language teacher, parents, and the mass media in the EFL context, and the status of the
first and second language in the society, group membership, and interethnic contact in the ESL context.

Second, Gardner and MacIntyre (1992) presented the socio-educational model with elaborated cognitive factors. They divided individual differences into two broad categories: cognitive factors and affective factors. Under the cognitive factors category, they discuss intelligence, language aptitude, and language learning strategies, while they discuss attitudes and motivation, language anxiety, and self-confidence under affective factors category. While the model did not have personality attributes any more, it had a new construct called self-confidence under the affective category. Since this model did not include personality variables, anxiety, which was considered a personality variable in the previous model, was discussed under the affective category. Another development in this model was that Gardner and MacIntyre made it clear that the socio-educational model argues reciprocal causation between attitude and motivation and achievement. Furthermore, they discuss attitude and motivation within a wider perspective, which includes teaching different languages as second or foreign language around the world and social/political attitudes of language learners.

Third, as a response to the suggestions of Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Dornyei, (1994), and Oxford and Shearin (1994), Tremblay and Gardner (1995) expand the motivation construct by taking into consideration other motivational theories such as self-efficacy, valence, causal attribution, and goal setting. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) make a distinction between motivational behavior and motivational antecedents. While motivational behavior can be observed, motivational antecedents cannot be observed but influence motivational behavior. They treated these motivational antecedents (self-
efficacy, valence, causal attribution, and goal setting) as mediators between language attitude and motivational behavior. They tested this model with 75 middle school students in Canada and confirmed these antecedents’ mediator role.

The most researched and discussed aspect of Gardner’s motivation theory is integrativeness, which basically involves learners’ positive attitude toward the target language group, and their interest in learning foreign languages to interact with and even become a member of target language group. Instrumental orientation, which involves the pragmatic reasons of learning a second language like obtaining a job, has not been emphasized although it plays a part in Gardner’s motivation theory. Gardner’s ideas are consistent with Speech Accommodation Theory, which asserts the more the learner identifies herself with the speakers of the target language the more successful she can be in language learning, and Schumann’s acculturation model, which suggests the degree of acculturation determines the level of success in language learning.

Although Gardner’s socio-educational model has been accepted widely in the field and has given direction to the research by providing a theoretical base, it was not without its challenges. While some scholars (Dornyei, 1994, 2003; Crookes, Schmidt, 1991; Oxford, Shearin, 1994) suggest that the scope of L2 motivation studies should be broadened by utilizing other motivation theories from the psychology field, others (Au, 1988) question the validity of the socio-educational model. Au (1988) argues that the results of motivational studies are ambiguous and do not present a clear relation between second language achievement and attitude and motivation. However, Gardner (1980, 1988) asserts that inconsistent results happened due to the use of different measures, the violation of statistical assumptions in data analysis and contextual
variations. Furthermore, the recent meta-analysis of motivation studies conducted by Masgoret and Gardner (2003) show that motivation, attitude, and integrative and instrumental orientation variables are related to second language achievement. Furthermore, studies consistently indicate that integrativeness, learners’ attitudes toward the learning situation, and motivation are related to learners’ achievement in the second language learning. (El-Dash, Busnardo, 2001; Gardner, Masgoret, Tremblay, 1999; Gardner, Tremblay, Masgoret, 1997; Gardner, Day, MacIntyre, 1992; Ely, 1986; Gardner, Lalonde, MacPherson, 1985).

Another criticism of Gardner’s model concerns the role of integrativeness in the foreign language learning context, where learners do not interact with the target language community but learn the foreign language in an academic setting (Dornyei, 1990). Dornyei (1990) states that “foreign language learners often have not had enough contact with the target language community to form attitudes about them” (p. 69). Thus, he argues that while integrative orientation is associated with achievement in the second language learning context, in the foreign language learning context, students learn the language for practical reasons and therefore, instrumental orientation would be associated with achievement in the foreign language learning context.

Even though Dornyei (1990) illustrates that instrumental orientation is associated with English language proficiency of Hungarian students up to an intermediate level of proficiency, he acknowledges that Hungarian students’ desire to learn English beyond intermediate level is associated with integrative orientation. Furthermore, Dornyei (2001) changed his previous position after a large-scale study in Hungary. He found “integrativeness to be the most powerful general component of the participants’
generalized language-related affective disposition, determining language choice, and the
general level of effort the students intended to invest in the learning process” (p. 51).

Kiziltepe’s (2000) study with 308 Turkish high school students indicates that
these students, in general, were instrumentally motivated to learn English although
integral motivation played a part as well. Kiziltepe (2000) reports that these students’
motivational intensity was high and they had positive attitude toward learning English.
Furthermore, students had a positive attitude toward American and British culture and
seemed to favor American culture. However, their overall scores for attitudes toward both
cultures were low.

2.4 Personality

Personality has been theorized to be an important part of WTC (Willingness to
Communicate) theory in communicating both in first and second languages. McCroskey
and Richmond (1990) conceptualized the introversion/extraversion personality trait as
one of the antecedents of Willingness to Communicate in the native language. They claim
that introverted individuals are introspective, less sociable, and feel less need to
communicate. Therefore, introverts prefer to withdraw from communication. On the
other hand, McCroskey and Richmond argue that extraverted individuals are people
oriented and value communication; therefore, they are more likely to be willing to
communicate compared to introverts.

In their WTC in L2 (Willingness to Communicate in the second language) model,
MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1998) propose that personality has an influence
on one’s willingness to communicate in her second/foreign language. Similarly,
MacIntyre et al maintain that certain personality types may predict one’s reaction to a
member of second/foreign language group. Following Altemeyer, MacIntyre et al. hypothesized that authoritarian personality types would not be willing to communicate with a member of an ethnic group who she believes to be inferior. Similarly, they argue that an ethnocentric person who believes that her ethnic group is superior to other ethnic groups, would not be willing to communicate in a foreign language.

Finally, they discussed a recent personality trait theory, “the Big Five,” whose taxonomy is based on lexical hypothesis that supports the use of personality-descriptive terms to measure personality traits (Goldberg, 1993). According to the Big Five theory there are five independent personality traits: (1) Introversion/Extraversion, (2) Pleasantness/Agreeableness, (3) Conscientiousness/Dependability, (4) Emotional Stability, (5) Intellect/Sophistication. Goldberg (1992) used bipolar inventory to illustrate and measure these five dimensions of personality. The introversion/extraversion dimension is represented through a continuum from silent, timid, and inactive to energetic, talkative, and bold. The pleasantness/agreeableness dimension is represented through a continuum from unkind, uncooperative, and selfish to kind, cooperative, and unselfish. The conscientiousness/dependability dimension is represented through a continuum from irresponsible, careless, and lazy to responsible, thorough, and hardworking. The emotional stability dimension is represented through a continuum from angry, nervous, and unstable to calm, at ease, and stable. Finally, the intellect/sophistication dimension is represented through a continuum from unintelligent, unanalytical, and unreflective to intelligent, analytical, and reflective.

The first studies in the SLA (Second Language Acquisition) field that examined the association of language achievement and personality did not produce clear findings
(Gardner, 1985). In his review, Gardner (1985) identifies that personality seems to correlate with field independence and anxiety. However, the findings regarding the association between language achievement and social ability (introversion/extraversion), and empathy were not easy to interpret due to the validity of personality measurements and the different forms of operationalization of language achievement. Especially, in the case of the introversion/extraversion personality trait, the association between language achievement and personality became either negative or positive depending on how the language achievement was measured. At the end of his review, Gardner (1985) proposes a theory that there is not a direct relation between personality and language achievement, but rather attitudinal/motivational variables mediate the connection between personality and language achievement.

Research on WTC seems to support Gardner’s theory by adding the self-confidence dimension. (MacIntyre, Babin, & Clement, 1999; MacIntyre, & Charos, 1996; MacIntyre, 1994). MacIntyre and Charos (1996) used a path analysis to examine the impact of personality, attitudes, and effect on the frequency of second language communication. The results indicated direct and significant paths from WTC, motivation, competence, and the opportunity to have contact with L2 speaker to frequency of second language communication. On the other hand, apart from the path from agreeableness to L2 WTC, all other personality traits (intellect, extraversion, emotional stability, and conscientiousness) were found to influence the frequency of communication through intergroup attitudes and L2 confidence.

MacIntyre, Babin, and Clement (1999) examined, among other things, the associations between WTC and personality variables (extraversion, and emotional
stability) through the structural equation model. The results indicate that personality traits, extraversion, and emotional stability influence WTC through self-esteem, communication apprehension, and perceived competence. Similarly, MacIntyre’s (1994) earlier study indicates that introversion influences WTC through communication apprehension, and perceived competence.

Kaya (1995) conducted a study in the Turkish context to examine the affective factors that influence Turkish college students’ classroom participation. Kaya (1995) reports that among other variables (self-confidence, motivation, and anxiety), students’ personality (introvert or extrovert) was related to their active class participation. According to the result of a questionnaire and her classroom observations, extraverted students participated in class more than introverted students.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study tested MacIntyre et al.’s (1998) Willingness to Communicate (WTC) model with freshmen in the EFL context at a Turkish university in Izmir. The study examined Turkish college students’ perception of their willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language, their motivation, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, attitude toward international community, personality, and how these social-psychological, communicative, and linguistic variables were related to the students’ WTC in English.

3.1 Research Design

The present study was a hybrid design, which combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches during the data collection and data analysis phases of the study (Creswell, 1994). However, it was “the dominant-less dominant design” (Creswell, 1994) in which the study was conducted within a quantitative paradigm with a small component of qualitative methods. The quantitative aspect of the study involved the statistical analysis of questionnaire results to (1) describe students’ perception of their willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language, their motivation, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, attitude toward
the international community, personality; and (2) test the complex WTC model in Turkish context, whereas the qualitative aspect of the study involved the qualitative analysis of the interview transcripts to expand and elaborate the quantitative results.

The main reason to use a hybrid design was to gather more and better information by converging the results of both qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell, 1999). Results of the quantitative questionnaire were extended and elaborated by using qualitative semi-structured interviews. Interviews allowed the researcher to understand and illustrate the interconnected complexities of Turkish college students’ willingness to communicate in English and the factors affecting this willingness. Thus, hybrid design provided a deeper insight in order to capture the complete picture of reality.

3.2 Research Site and Participant Selection

The research site was the School of Foreign Languages at Dokuz Eylül University (DEU) in Izmir, Turkey. Dokuz Eylül University, located in the western part of the country, was founded in 1982 and offers both undergraduate and graduate degree programs in 10 departments, five schools, five vocational schools, five graduate schools, and five institutes.

Dokuz Eylül University, like some other universities in Turkey, requires students to be proficient in English. Therefore, all first-year students have to take an English proficiency test at the beginning of the academic year. Since the required level of English proficiency is high, a majority of the students need to take English courses for one year before starting their programs. Depending on their proficiency test results, freshmen are grouped as beginner, intermediate, and advanced, and are required to take four English courses—the main course, reading, writing, and speaking—for two semesters before
taking any major area courses. Only a small number of students who have attended private schools or special government schools that provide intensive English courses are able to pass this test and start their academic program without taking the preparatory year of English.

The participants for this study were 356 freshmen who were taking one-year compulsory English preparatory courses at the School of Foreign Languages, Dokuz Eylul University in Turkey, before starting to take their major area courses. These students had recently graduated from high school and were 18 years of age or older. The students were placed in this university depending on the scores that they earned on the nationwide university selection and placement test, and they had already been assigned to their major areas of study. Until recently, all Turkish students were required to take English courses starting in junior high school. Lately, they have began studying English in fourth grade in elementary school. However, due to the inadequate number of English teachers, some of these students may have interruptions in their English language study or may have started studying English only in high school.

For the quantitative part of the study, the researcher used cluster random sampling to select the participants. Cluster random sampling is the “selection of groups, or clusters, of subjects rather than individuals” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000, p. 109). The researcher randomly selected intact classrooms and gave the questionnaire to all the students in those classrooms.

In order to estimate the adequate sample size to conduct the structural equation model analysis, the criteria that Hair et al. (1998) indicated were followed. According to Hair et al., sample size is related to four factors: model misspecification, model size,
normality, and estimation procedure. Model misspecification refers to a situation where the model misses one of the relevant variables. In the present study, all of the relevant variables in the WTC model are included. In terms of model size, Hair et al. (1998) states that “the absolute minimum sample size must be at least greater than the number of covariances or correlations in the input data matrix. However, more typical is a minimum ratio of at least five respondents for each estimated parameter, with a ratio of 10 respondents per parameter considered most appropriate” (p. 605). The parameter corresponds to every single- or double-headed arrow in the path diagram. In the present study the number of estimated parameters was 34, therefore the appropriate sample size would be between 170 and 340. For this study, data from 304 participants without missing values were utilized to conduct SEM analysis.

For the qualitative aspect of the study, the researcher randomly selected 15 students among 356 students who completed the questionnaire to conduct semi-structured interview. The sampling procedure for interviews was simple random sampling, in which each of these 356 students will have “an equal and independent chance of being selected” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000, p. 106). Interview participants were randomly selected so that the researcher could interview with both willing and less willing students. By following the criteria that Kvale (1996) mentions, the number of interviews was set as 15. Kvale (1996) states that “in current interview studies, the number of interviews tends to be around 15 ± 10” (p. 102).

3.3 Instruments

While quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire, qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interview questions. Both instruments were
translated into Turkish to increase the return rate and to collect more qualitative data. Furthermore, the Back-translation method, which involves translating the original instruments into Turkish and translating them back to English, was used to establish the accuracy of translation.

The questionnaire used in this study measured students’ willingness to communicate, their linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, personality, and their background. Linguistic self-confidence was defined in terms of the lack of communication anxiety and perceived communication competence. The latent variable, motivation, was defined by three indicator variables: (1) desire to learn English, (2) motivational intensity, and (3) attitude toward learning English. Similarly, four indicator variables defined students’ attitude toward the international community: (1) integrative orientation, (2) approach-avoidance tendency, (3) interest in international vocation/activities, and (4) interest in foreign affairs.

1. Willingness to Communicate: Twelve items (Cronbach’s alpha = .94) from McCroskey (1992) were used to assess Turkish freshmen’s willingness to communicate in English in terms of the communication context (public speaking, talking in meetings, group discussions, and interpersonal conversations) and types of receivers (stranger, acquaintance, and friend). The respondents chose the percentage of the time ranging from 0% to 100% that they would be willing to communicate in each case.

2. Perceived Communication Competence: Twelve items (Cronbach’s alpha = .95) used by Yashima (2002) and MacIntyre and Charos (1996) were utilized to assess the extent to which the respondents feel confident communicating in English. The respondents self-evaluated their English competence by selecting a number ranging from
0\% \text{ (entirely incompetent)} \text{ to } 100\% \text{ (entirely competent)}. In this scale, the context and receivers of communication were the same with the WTC scale.

3. Communication Anxiety: This was measured by twelve items (Cronbach’s alpha = .93) used by Yashima (2002). The respondents self-assessed their communication anxiety in English by indicating a percentage between 0\% \text{ (do not feel anxiety at all)} \text{ and } 100\% \text{ (always feel anxiety)}. The items covered the same context of communication and receivers as WTC and Perceived Communication Competence scales.

4. Desire to Learn English: Six items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.60) that were adapted from Gardner (1985) were used to measure this component of motivation. However, instead of the original format of multiple-choice, a 7-point scale was utilized. The respondents rated the degree that they agreed with each statement ranging between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

5. Motivational Intensity: This component of motivation was measured by six items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.74) adapted from Gardner (1985). Again, instead of using the multiple-choice format, a 7-point scale was utilized. The respondents indicated how much they agreed with each statement by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

6. Attitudes Toward Learning English: Five items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.74) adapted from Gardner (1985) were used in a 7-point scale format. The respondents rated the degree to which they agreed with each statement by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

7. Integrative Orientation: Four items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.88) adapted from Yashima (2002) and Gardner (1985) were used. The respondents indicated the degree to
which they agreed with each statement in relation to their reason for studying English on a 7-point scale by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

8. Approach-Avoidance Tendency: Seven items (Cronbach’s alpha = .77) adapted from Yashima (2002) were used to measure the respondents’ tendency to approach or avoid English-speaking foreigners in Turkey. Again, students indicated their degree of agreement on a 6-point scale by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). An example item is “I want to make friends with international students studying in Turkey.”

9. Interest in International Vocation/Activities: Five items (Cronbach’s alpha = .62) adopted from Yashima (2002) were used to measure the degree of interest that a respondent showed in having an international career or living abroad. The respondents recorded their ratings on a 7-point scale by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). An example item is “I want to live in a foreign country.”

10. Interest in Foreign Affairs: Two items (Cronbach’s alpha = .80) adopted from Yashima (2002) were used to measure the respondents’ interest in international matters. An example item is “I often read and watch news about foreign countries.” Again, students indicated their degree of agreement on a 7-point scale by choosing a number between 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree).

11. Personality: Ten items (Cronbach’s alpha = .87) adapted from Goldberg (1992) were used to measure extraversion-introversion dimension of the personality. The respondents indicated their choice on a 9-point semantic differential scale. An example
item is silent____ talkative. The respondents selected a number from 1(silent) to 9 (talkative) to indicate the degree to which they are silent or talkative.

12. Background Information: The respondents indicated their age, gender, major area, whether they had been abroad, how often they had communicated with a native or nonnative speaker of English face to face or through the Internet in the last year, and how long they had studied English (elementary, middle, high school, private tutorial).

Reliability and validity of the quantitative instruments for these particular participants had been established before the study was conducted. Reliability of the instrument refers to “the consistency of the scores obtained-how consistent they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000, p. 176). In order to establish the internal-consistency reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted. One year before the present study, the instrument was administered to 28 freshmen at the same university. Cronbach’s alpha had been calculated for each section of the instrument. The reliability coefficient ranges from 0 to 1. While 0 indicates that the whole measurement is error, 1 shows that the measurement totally lacks error. The following were the reliability coefficients of the each instrument: Motivational intensity: .75, desire to learn English: .69, intercultural friendship orientation: .91, approach-avoidance tendency: .78, interest in international vocational /activities: .70, communication anxiety: .92, perceived communication competence: .88, willingness to communicate: .88.

Validity of an instrument refers to an instrument or a test “that accurately measures what it is supposed to measure” (Vogt, 1999, p. 301). Since the researcher utilized well-established instruments prepared by the experts in the field, the content
validity of the instrument was established. Content validity, which refers to the degree to which that instrument measures intended content area, “is not a statistical property; it is a matter of expert judgment” (Vogt, 1999, p. 301).

Semi-structured interviews were used to collect the qualitative data. A semi-structured interview “has a sequence of themes to be covered, as well as suggested questions. Yet at the same time there is an openness to changes of sequences and forms of questions in order to follow up the answers given” (Kvale, 1996, p. 124). The themes that were covered in the interviews included the following: (1) students’ willingness to communicate in English not only in oral mode but also through the writing, reading, and listening modes; (2) their perceived competence in English; (3) their communication anxiety in English; (4) their motivation to learn English and use it for communication purposes; (5) their attitude toward the English language, English-speaking countries, and native and nonnative speakers of English; (6) background information (their English language learning experiences, their parents’ attitudes toward English, their communication experiences in English with both native and nonnative speakers of the language).

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

The data were gathered in May and June 2004 during the spring semester of the academic year at Dokuz Eylul University in Izmir, Turkey. During the ninth week of the spring semester, quantitative data were collected from 356 randomly selected students through a questionnaire. After the quantitative data had been collected and descriptive analysis had been conducted, qualitative data were collected through interviews from 15 randomly selected students who had already filled out the questionnaire.
In this study, the researcher first obtained the list of classrooms from the director of the school and randomly selected 25 classes out of 100 English preparatory classes. First, the recruitment letters were distributed in those 25 classrooms to inform the students about the research project. Then, the researcher presented the consent form, which includes detailed information about the research and assures confidentiality. Finally, the questionnaire, which was numbered to provide confidentiality, was administered to the students during the regular class hour.

Then the researcher randomly chose 15 students of the 356 total students to interview. The researcher accessed the respondents through the classroom teachers. Teachers informed and sent the randomly selected students during their class hours. Although the researcher had planned to give money to respondents as a token of appreciation, considering the classroom teachers’ advice and the school culture, she did not offer money.

Before starting each interview, the researcher briefly discussed the purpose of the interview and the use of the audio-recorder. In order to protect their identities, respondents were asked to choose a pseudonym that the researcher could use to refer to him/her.

Each interview took approximately forty minutes and was conducted in a quiet room at the university. Each interview was recorded by using audiotape, and the researcher took notes during the interview. The researcher provided a context for the interviews by briefing the participants before the interview and debriefing them at the end (Kvale, 1996). At the end, the researcher signaled the end of the interview and allowed each interviewee to ask questions or to raise issues.
3.5 Data Analysis

Due to the hybrid design of the study, both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the data were conducted. First, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to conduct the descriptive analysis of the questionnaire. Then the qualitative data that came from the interviews were analyzed following the general qualitative analysis techniques (Merriam, 1998, Erickson, 1986, Miles, & Huberman, 1994) and specific interview analysis techniques (Kvale, 1996). Finally, the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) statistical program was used to conduct quantitative Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis. The researcher integrated the qualitative and quantitative data while answering the first research question and discussing the results at the interpretation stage.

The quantitative data that came from the questionnaires were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) statistical programs. SPSS was used to conduct descriptive statistics and reliability analysis of the instrument, and AMOS was used to conduct multivariate analysis, called the Structural Equation Model (SEM), which allows the researcher to examine “a series of dependence relationships simultaneously” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 578).

Basically, by using SEM, one can specify, estimate, and evaluate models of relationships among variables. Furthermore, this multivariate technique not only estimates “multiple and interrelated dependence relationships” but also represents “unobserved concepts in these relationships and account[s] for measurement error in the estimation process” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 584). Unobserved variables are called latent variables, which are not measured but approximated by
observable measures. SEM incorporates both these unobserved latent variables and observed (manifest) variables into the model.

SEM has two essential components: (1) structural model and (2) measurement model. The structural model is a “path” model, which illustrates the hypothesized pattern of relationships among latent and observed variables. Depending on theory and prior experiences, the researcher develops a path model, which shows “which independent variables predict each dependent variable” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 17). The measurement model “(1) specifies the indicators for each construct, and (2) assesses the reliability of each construct for estimating the casual relationships” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 581).

These quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures, which were used to answer each research question, are described in detail below:

1. What are the students’ perceptions of their willingness to communicate in English, their motivation, linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and their personality?

Both quantitative and qualitative data were used to answer this question. Quantitative data were analyzed through descriptive statistics; the maximum and minimum scores, mean, and standard deviation were observed for each variable. The results were presented in a table.

The qualitative data that came from interviews were analyzed by following the conventions of qualitative data analysis (Merriam, 1998; Erickson, 1986, Miles, & Huberman, 1994) in general and the Meaning Condensation method (Kvale, 1996) in particular. First, the data that came from interviews were prepared through the Meaning
Condensation method (Kvale, 1996) by structuring and clarifying. Structuring of complex interview data was done by transcription. Then, the transcript was clarified by eliminating repetitions and digressions. Finally, the meaning condensation method, which involves the condensation of interviewees’ statements and meaning into shorter formulations, was conducted. Thus, the lengthy interview transcript was reduced into briefer and concise formulations that were used to formulate assertions for each theme.

Then, the data were identified by dividing the transcripts into “analytically meaningful” segments (Merriam, 1998). For this study, the segments were the predetermined themes of the interviews such as students’ motivation to learn English and their communication anxiety. These segments were formed for each respondent and the data were manipulated by sorting and rearranging these segments for each respondent. By reading the transcripts and comparing the respondents’ comments with each other, the researcher formed the assertions (Erickson, 1986). In order to establish evidentiary warrant for these assertions, the researcher reviewed the transcripts multiple times and searched for confirming and disconfirming evidence. Direct quotes from the interviews were used to warrant the assertions. The results were organized in relation to these themes and presented in a descriptive narrative style.

2. What are the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?

In order to be able to test the WTC model by using SEM, seven stages were followed: “(1) developing a theoretically based model, (2) constructing a path diagram of casual relationships, (3) converting the path diagram into a set of structural and
measurement models, (4) choosing the input matrix type and estimating the proposed model, (5) assessing the identification of the structural model, (6) evaluating goodness-of-fit criteria, and (7) interpreting and modifying the model, if theoretically justified” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 17).

Based on the theory illustrated in the introduction and literature review sections of the study, it was hypothesized that one’s willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language is directly related to her linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and motivation constructs. Moreover, it is hypothesized that the personality trait of introversion/extraversion is related to WTC through one’s linguistic self-confidence. This theoretically based model is illustrated as a path diagram of causal relationships in figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1 Path diagram of causal relationships](image-url)
As a third step, the path diagram was converted into a set of structural and measurement models. WTC was measured by 12 items, and three indicators were determined for WTC with friends, WTC with acquaintances, and WTC with strangers. Attitude was measured through four indicators: integrative, approach-avoidance, vocation, and foreign affairs. Motivation was represented by three indicators: desire, intensity, and language-learning attitude. Personality was measured by 10 items, and the three indicators were called personality1, personality2, and personality3. Self-confidence was measured through two indicator variables called communication anxiety and perceived competence.

At the fourth stage, the correlation matrix was chosen as an input matrix. However, before inputting the correlation matrix, diagnostic tests were performed to identify the normal distribution, missing data, and outliers. Finally, the statistical program AMOS was used to estimate the model through Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE).

At Stage 5, the researcher assessed the identification of the structural model. One of the most frequent problems in SEM is the identification problem, which is defined as “the inability of the proposed model to generate unique estimates” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 608). In order to establish the identification of a model, one should check order condition and rank condition. “Order condition states that the model’s degree of freedom must be greater than or equal to zero” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 608). Rank condition requires the researcher to “algebraically determine if each parameter is
uniquely identified (estimated)” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 608). However, since this is a complex process, one can check the “three-measure rule” according to which each construct with at least three indicators will always be identified.

At stage six, the researcher evaluated the goodness-of-fit at several intervals: overall model, measurement model, and structural model. First, the researcher examined the results for offending estimates, which are coefficients that exceed acceptable limits. Next, the overall model fit was examined by three types of goodness-of-fit measures: Absolute fit measures, incremental fit measures, and parsimonious fit measures. After the overall model fit, measurement of each construct was assessed. Finally, the researcher examined the structural model fit by investigating the significance of the estimated coefficients.

3. Is the proposed model of WTC acceptable in terms of explaining the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?

At stage seven, the researcher interpreted and modified the proposed model depending on SEM results and theory. In order to modify the model, the researcher examined the standardized residuals and modification indices (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The standardized residuals “represent the differences between the observed correlation or covariance and the estimated correlation or covariance matrix…Residual values greater than +,- 2.58 are now to be considered statistically significant at the .05 level” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 615). Modification indices indicate “…the reduction in chi-square that would occur if the coefficient were estimated. A value of 3.84 or greater suggests that a statistically
significant reduction in the chi-square is obtained when the coefficient is estimated” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 615).

After the examination of standardized residuals and modification indices, the researcher modified the model depending on the theory and SEM results. Then, the researcher tested the new modified model by using AMOS. Finally, the modified model was evaluated in terms of its goodness-of-fit and the researcher interpreted the results.

3.5.1 Non-response Error Control

The researcher compared the mean scores of the non-respondent and respondent groups in terms of their willingness to communicate in English, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality to test whether respondents and non-respondents differed in terms of these variables. The t-test was used to observe whether the differences between the means of two groups were significant (Fraenkel, & Wallen, 2000). To test the null hypothesis that mean scores of respondent group were equal to the mean scores of non-respondent group, the researcher established the level of significance as .05. The t-test for independent means was used to compare the respondent and non-respondent groups (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). When the probability associated with the calculated t-test (p-value) is greater than alpha (.05), the researcher accepts the null hypothesis and concludes that non-respondent group is the representative of the sample.

Since Levene’s test indicated equality of variance for respondent and non-respondent groups, whose sample sizes were not equal, equal variance estimates were used for students’ willingness to communicate in English, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, motivation, attitude toward the international
community, and personality. Results indicated that the probability associated with the calculated t-test (p-value) is greater than alpha (.05) and the respondent and non-respondent groups did not differ on these variables. Results are illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64.98</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. T-test scores for respondent and non-respondent groups. (Continued)

WTC: Willingness to communicate, PC: Perceived communication competence, CA: Communication Anxiety, MO: Motivation, AT: Attitude toward international community, PE: Personality.
Table 3.1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>7.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-13.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>10.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>-.958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WTC: Willingness to communicate, PC: Perceived communication competence, CA: Communication Anxiety, MO: Motivation, AT: Attitude toward international community, PE: Personality.

In order to test whether respondents and non-respondents differed depending on the demographic variables such as gender, whether the participants had been abroad, whether they plan to visit a foreign country, whether they had taken private English courses, and whether they had communicated in English during the last year, the researcher conducted a chi-square test. The chi-square test, which is used to analyze categorical data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000), was utilized to observe whether there were statistically significant differences between respondent and non-respondent groups. The
null hypothesis was that there were no differences between two groups. The researcher set the alpha level as .05. Following Hopkins, Hopkins, and Glass (1996), the minimum expected frequency level was set to be 2. Only the variable abroad (whether participants had been abroad or not) did not meet the criteria (expected count = 1.3). However, since the value was not less than 1 (Field, 2000), the chi-square test was used for this variable as well. The results of the test indicated that there were no associations between groups and the pattern of responses for respondent and non-respondent groups was not different. The results are presented in the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent    Count</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>215.4</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Chi-square test for Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Haven’t been Abroad</th>
<th>Have been Abroad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Count</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>299.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Chi-Square test for Abroad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don’t Want to Visit a foreign country</th>
<th>Want to Visit A foreign country</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>270.9</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Chi-square test for visit
### Table 3.5. Chi-Square test for private course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not attended Private course</th>
<th>Attended Private Course</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>277.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5. Chi-Square test for private course
Table 3.6 Chi-Square for Communication

The results of the t-test and chi-square test indicated that the non-respondent group did not differ from the respondent group in terms of their willingness to communicate in English, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality; and in terms of demographic variables such as gender, whether the participants had been abroad, whether they plan to visit a foreign country, whether they had taken private English courses, and whether they had communicated in English during the last year.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the findings of the statistical analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire and the qualitative analysis of interview transcripts to answer the primary question of how willing Turkish college students are to communicate in English as a foreign language and what affects their willingness. The following are the secondary research questions that are presented in this chapter:

1- What are the students’ perceptions of their willingness to communicate in English, their motivation, linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and their personality?

2- What are the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?

3- Is the proposed model of WTC acceptable in terms of explaining the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?
4.1 Description of the Program

The data were collected at Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir, Turkey, from the college freshmen, who were taking a one-year English preparatory program before beginning to take their major area courses. At Dokuz Eylul University, like other prestigious Turkish universities, the medium of instruction in some schools is in English (refer to table 4.1 for the list of these schools). However, not all students who are placed in those English-medium schools are performing at an adequate English proficiency level. Therefore, the university offers an English preparatory program to raise the English proficiency level of these students so that the students can follow their major area courses in English.

All the students who are placed in these English-medium schools based on their nationwide university selection and placement test scores, are required to take an English placement-proficiency test at the beginning of the semester unless they can prove their English proficiency level by submitting their TOEFL results or similar test results. Students who score 70 or higher out of 100 on the English proficiency-placement test are given the “Certificate of Achievement in Prep Program” and allowed to take their major area courses. Students who score less than 70 are grouped as beginner, intermediate, or advanced and begin their one-year period of English instruction. Advanced groups receive 20-hour of English instruction per week, while intermediate groups receive 25 hours and beginner groups receive 30 hours of instruction. Students at all levels take four English courses entitled “Reading,” “Writing,” “Speaking,” and “Main Course.” Students are required to attend 85% of these classes.
Throughout the year, students have quizzes, monthly exams, two midterms (one during the autumn semester, the second one during the spring semester), and one final exam at the end of the year. Students are required to reach at least 70 as a final score of the year, and score at least 60 on the final exam to be able to pass the preparatory class. The final passing score is the combination of 10% of the quizzes, 30% of the monthly exams and midterms, and 60% of the final exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS</th>
<th>DEPARTMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>Computer Engineering&lt;br&gt;Mechanical Engineering&lt;br&gt;Textile Engineering&lt;br&gt;Civil Engineering&lt;br&gt;Industrial Engineering&lt;br&gt;Mining Engineering&lt;br&gt;Geophysics Engineering&lt;br&gt;Electric Engineering&lt;br&gt;Environmental Engineering&lt;br&gt;Metallurgy Engineering&lt;br&gt;Geology Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>Business Administration&lt;br&gt;Tourism Management&lt;br&gt;International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>Labor Economics and Industrial Relations&lt;br&gt;Economics&lt;br&gt;Econometrics&lt;br&gt;Public Administration&lt;br&gt;Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITIME BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Maritime Business Administration&lt;br&gt;Maritime Business and Management, Deck Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS AND SCIENCE</td>
<td>Mathematics&lt;br&gt;Chemistry&lt;br&gt;Physics&lt;br&gt;Statistics&lt;br&gt;American Culture and Literature&lt;br&gt;Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURE</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning&lt;br&gt;Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>Teaching English as a Foreign Language&lt;br&gt;Computer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL</td>
<td>Nursing&lt;br&gt;Physical Therapy&lt;br&gt;Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. List of schools in which the medium of instruction is English.
4.2 Participant Demographics

This section summarizes the demographic characteristics of the 356 Turkish college students who answered the survey questionnaire and the 15 students who participated in the interview. These characteristics are shown in Table 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.

4.2.1 Survey Participants

As shown in Table 4.2, a majority of the 356 students who answered the survey questionnaire were male (63%) while less than half were female (36%). The age of these students ranged from 18 to 27, with a mean of 19.5. While 40% of the students were 19 years old, 32% of them were 20 years old. Almost half (47%) of the students who answered the survey questions majored in business-related fields such as business, economics, and maritime business. More than one third (35%) of the students majored in engineering.

The English proficiency level of the students ranged from lower intermediate to advanced level. Most (83%) were at lower intermediate and intermediate level while only 17% of them were at higher intermediate or advanced level. The number of years of English instruction that these students had received ranged from zero to 12, with a mean of five. While 14% of these students had been studying English for one year or less, 30% of them for three or four years, and 37% of them for seven years. In addition to the English instruction that they received at school, 16% of these students had attended a private course to learn English at some time during their school life.

Although 80% of the students wanted to visit a foreign country within the next 10 years, so far only 11% of the students had been abroad. More than half (58%) of the students indicated that they had not communicated in English either face to face or
through the internet with either native or nonnative speakers of English during the last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of English Instruction</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intermediate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intermediate</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken private English course outside the school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been abroad</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to visit a foreign country</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated in English during last year</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Survey Participants

4.2.2. Interview Participants

As shown in Table 4.3, among 15 interview participants eight of them were female and seven of them were male. Only one of the interview participants was at the high intermediate level, while seven of the remaining students were at intermediate level,
and the other seven were at the low intermediate level. Most of the interview participants majored in business-related fields (eight) and engineering (five).

All of the students had studied English at either middle school and/or high school before they entered the university. In addition to English, nine of them studied German, one of them French, and one of them Arabic at middle school and/or high school. Only three of the 15 had been abroad (Russia, Italy, and Saudi Arabia). However, none of them had been to an English-speaking country.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Foreign Languages</th>
<th>Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Intermediate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Papatya</td>
<td>Textile Engineering</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ilik Sut</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yelda</td>
<td>Econometrics</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Deniz</td>
<td>Teaching English as a Foreign Language</td>
<td>English, Arabic</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ayse</td>
<td>Geophysics Engineering</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Denizci</td>
<td>Maritime Business Administration</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Electric Engineering</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td>Mining Engineering</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intermediate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Aysegul</td>
<td>Labor Economics and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>English, French</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Pelin</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>Labor Economics and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Atron</td>
<td>Maritime Business Administration</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Murat</td>
<td>Labor Economics and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Paskal</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>English, German</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Interview Participants

Foreign Languages: Foreign languages that they have studied.

As seen in Table 4.4, a majority of the students wanted to go to a European country such as Germany, and France, or an English-speaking country (USA, Canada,
and England). If they had not had to learn English, most of the students indicated that they would have learned one of the European languages. Five of them said they would learn Italian, three of them would learn French, and one would learn Spanish.

Furthermore, five of the students said that even if they did not have to learn English, they would study it. So far, 13 of the interview participants have had a chance to communicate in English either face to face or through the Internet. Most of the face-to-face communication took place during the summer, when the students talked to tourists. On the other hand, two of the participants had never used English outside the classroom to communicate with either a native or a nonnative speaker of English.
Table 4.4 Interview Participants

Country: Countries that interview participants want to visit.
Language: Languages that these students would study if they did not have to learn English.
Communication: Participants’ communication experiences in English.

4.3. Research Question 1

“What are the students’ perception of their willingness to communicate in English, their motivation, linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and their personality?”
In order to be able to answer this question, the researcher utilized both quantitative and qualitative data. The researcher first presents the results of the quantitative data for each section of the question and then, the results of the qualitative data.

4.3.1 Quantitative results

4.3.1.1 What is the students’ perception of their willingness to communicate in English?

As can be seen in table 4.5, overall, students were somewhat willing to communicate in English (M=47.88). They preferred to communicate in English with friends and acquaintances rather than with strangers. Similarly, they seemed to prefer to communicate in a dyad, or a small group, rather than communicating in front of a large group. They were most willing to “talk in English to friends,” while they were least willing to give a presentation in English before a group of strangers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Communicate</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.32</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>29.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Give a presentation in English to a group of friends</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>30.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.34</td>
<td>30.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Talk in English in a large meeting among friends</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>31.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Talk in English to friends</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55.18</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>30.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Talk in English to acquaintances</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>33.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>30.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Talk in English to a stranger.</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.48</td>
<td>31.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Talk in English to a small group of friends</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td>30.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Students’ perceived willingness to communicate in English
4.3.1.2. What is the students’ perception of their motivation?

In general, participants were somewhat motivated to learn English (refer to tables 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8.). They had some motivation to learn English, and had positive attitude toward learning English.

Students slightly agreed that English should be taught at school and that they concentrated on their study during English classes (Table 4.6). However, they slightly disagreed with the statement “I would like the number of English classes at school increased” and the statement “I would read English newspapers or magazines outside my English course work.” Although they believed that English should be taught at school and that they concentrated on what was taught at school, they seemed to be reluctant to take more English classes or read in English outside the English course work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire to Learn English</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I have assignments to do in English, I try to do them immediately</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would read English newspapers or magazines outside my English course work</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During English classes I’m absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the number of English classes at school increased.</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe absolutely English should be taught at school</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find studying English more interesting than other subjects</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Students’ perception about their desire to learn English

As seen in table 4.7, participants seemed to be persuaded that they need to learn English and agreed that they would improve their English proficiency after they graduated from the college. Moreover, they slightly agree with the statement “If English were not taught at school, I would study on my own.” However, they slightly disagree
with the statement “I think I spend fairly long hours studying English”. This may indicate that even though they wanted to learn English, and to improve their English proficiency after they graduated from the college, they did not study English diligently and did not spend long hours learning it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational Intensity to Learn English</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compared to my classmates, I think I study English relatively hard</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the words and ideas which I learn about in my English classes</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If English were not taught at school, I would study on my own</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I spend fairly long hours studying English</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really try to learn English</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Students’ Perception of Their Motivational Intensity to learn English

Overall, students have a positive attitude toward learning English (Table 4.8). They expressed that “Learning English is not a waste of time” and that “Learning English is really great.” They agreed that they “plan to learn as much English as possible” and they slightly agree that they “love learning English” although they did not disagree with the statement “I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.” This may suggest that they wanted to spend their time learning other subjects as well as English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward learning English</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Learning English is really great</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Learning English is a waste of time</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-I plan to learn as much English as possible.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-I love learning English.</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Students’ perception of their motivational attitude toward learning English
4.3.1.3 Communication Anxiety

Table 4.9 suggests that in general, participants did not seem to experience much anxiety in communicating in English although they seemed to experience slight anxiety in some situations. Communicating among strangers in a large meeting was the most anxiety-provoking situation followed by giving a presentation to a group of strangers. However, even in those situations, their anxiety level was moderate. Talking to friends and/or an acquaintances in English were the least anxiety-provoking situations. While giving presentation, speaking in a group or speaking with strangers seemed to provoke somewhat anxiety, talking to a friend, an acquaintance, and small group of friends or acquaintances seemed to cause less anxiety. In sum, the learners did not seem to experience severe communication anxiety in English in any of the situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Anxiety</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.04</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Give a presentation in English to a group of friends</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.15</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.44</td>
<td>29.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.21</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Talk in English in a large meeting among friends</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>28.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Talk in English to friends</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>26.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Talk in English to acquaintances</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.18</td>
<td>29.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Talk in English to a stranger.</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>30.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Talk in English to a small group of friends</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>28.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Students’ Perceived Communication Anxiety in English
4.3.1.4 Perceived Communication Competence

In general, students perceived themselves as more or less competent speaking in English (Table 4.10). They felt more competent talking with a friend and an acquaintance, or talking in English to a small group of friends, while they felt less competent talking in English in a large meeting among strangers and giving a presentation before a group of strangers. It seemed like while students felt somewhat competent speaking in English with people that they knew (friend or acquaintance), and in dyad or in small group, they felt less competent speaking in English with strangers and in a large group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Competence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Have a small-group conversation in English with acquaintances</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>26.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Give a presentation in English to a group of strangers</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Give a presentation in English to a group of friends</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.59</td>
<td>26.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Talk in English in a large meeting among strangers</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Have a small-group conversation in English with strangers</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>26.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Talk in English in a large meeting among friends</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Talk in English to friends</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.92</td>
<td>25.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Talk in English in a large meeting with acquaintances</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.19</td>
<td>26.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Talk in English to acquaintances</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Give a presentation in English to a group of acquaintances</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>28.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11- Talk in English to a stranger.</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.96</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- Talk in English to a small group of friends</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>27.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Students’ perceived communication competence in English
4.3.1.5 What is the students’ perception of their attitude towards the international community?

In general, students were willing to interact with foreigners in Turkey, interested in international vocations and foreign affairs, and had a positive attitude toward different cultures (see tables 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, and 4.14).

As can be seen in table 4.11, the participants seemed to have a positive attitude toward foreigners in Turkey and were willing to interact with them in English. The students did not feel uncomfortable having foreign next-door neighbors and agreed that they would assist a foreigner to solve her communication problems. Furthermore, they slightly agreed that they “want to make friends with international students studying in Turkey” and that they “wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or a room with an international student.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Interact with Foreigners in Turkey</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- I want to make friends with international students studying in Turkey.</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I would talk to an international student if there is one at school</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or a room with an international student</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I want to participate in a volunteer activity to help foreigners living in the neighboring community</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- I would help a foreigner who has trouble communicating in a restaurant or at a station.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Negative item 2 and 6 are reversed.

Table 4.11 Students’ tendency to approach or avoid foreigners in Turkey

81
Students were interested in international activities and getting a job that involves traveling abroad (Table 4.12). They slightly agreed that they “want to work in an international organization as the United Nations” and expressed that they would not avoid “the kind of work that sends [them] overseas frequently.” On the other hand, they did not disagree with the statement that “I would rather stay in my hometown.” It seemed as if instead of living in a foreign country, they would prefer to stay in their hometown. It might suggest that although they wanted to be involved in international activities and were interested in getting a job that requires international travel, they would prefer to live in their country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in International Vocation/Activities</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- I would rather stay in my hometown.</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- I want to live in a foreign county.</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- I want to work in an international organization as the United Nations</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- I don’t think what’s happening overseas has much to do with my daily life</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative items 1, 4, and 5 are reversed

Table 4.12. Students’ Interest in International Vocation and International Activities

Overall, the participants were fairly interested in foreign affairs (Table 4.13). They slightly agreed that they “often read and watch news about foreign countries” and that they “often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with family and/ or friends.”
Table 4.13. Students’ Interest in Foreign Affairs.

In general, these students had a positive attitude toward different cultures (Table 4.14). They agreed that they wanted to have foreign friends. Furthermore, they slightly agreed that being able to speak English would allow them to participate in the activities of other cultures, to “get to know various cultures and people” and to communicate with various people and learn about their cultures.

Table 4.14 Students’ non-ethnocentric attitude toward different cultures.

4.3.1.6 What is the students’ perception of their personality?

These students in general were moderately extroverted (M=6.81), although their scores were within the range of normal distribution (Table 4.15). They perceived themselves as spontaneous, sociable, assertive, and enthusiastic individuals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Introverted - Extroverted</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Unenergetic - Energetic</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Silent - Talkative</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Unenthusiastic - Enthusiastic</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Timid - Bold</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6- Inactive - Active</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7- Inhibited - Spontaneous</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8- Unassertive - Assertive</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9- Unadventurous - Adventurous</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10- Unsociable - Sociable</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 Students’ personality in terms of being introvert or extrovert.

4.3.2. Qualitative Results

4.3.2.1. What is the students’ perception of their willingness to communicate in English?

The researcher applied the broader definition of communication and investigated participants’ not only oral communications, though main focus was on oral communication, but the other modes of communications through writing, reading, and listening. This section summarizes the participants’ willingness to communicate in English, their communication experiences in all modes, and the factors that hinder their communication experiences.

While a majority of the interview participants (9) seemed to be reluctant to communicate in English, some of them (6) seemed to seek opportunities and be willing to communicate in English. However, both willing and less willing students noted the issue of limited opportunities to have communication in English in their daily life. It seemed like students did not have much of a chance to have oral communications with foreigners in their school context. There were only two American and two British English
instructors who offered conversation classes to advanced proficiency level students.

Therefore, the majority of the students did not have opportunities to communicate with these foreign instructors. Similarly, students did not have much of a chance to communicate in English outside the school unless they had access to the Internet.

Participants indicated that since they did not have access to foreigners in Izmir, where the university was located, they mostly communicated in English during the summer time with tourists who were both native (mostly British) and nonnative (Dutch, Slovak, Czech, Russian, German, French, Israeli, Danish, etc.) speakers of English. Some representative comments include:

“I am extremely willing, I wish there was somebody to talk [in English]. The other day, I saw two tourists while I was walking. I began talking right away. We don’t have an opportunity to speak in English here. We may create an opportunity during summer by going to a tourist destination” (Denizci).

“I go to Marmaris in summers. I work there. We sell carpet there. There are a lot of tourists want to buy carpet. I talk to them in English” (Mika).

“I did not have a chance to talk to a foreigner, if I had a chance I would talk. I did not have a friend to chat. I could not reach them” (Ali).

Although students could communicate in English with their classmates and Turkish instructors, they did not prefer to communicate in English with their Turkish classmates and Turkish teachers, thinking that communicating in English with a Turk is, as one student said “absurd.” It seemed like they wanted to use English not for practice purposes but in real life situations for meaningful communications.

“You cannot speak English with a Turkish friend, it is absurd. In order to be able to speak in English, there must be a foreigner. Then you are required to speak in English. It does not make sense to speak in English with a Turk” (Atron).

“I use English when I need to. For example, when I search on the net, if there is something [in English] that I do not understand, I translate that. I do not specifically search English sites or use Internet to read in English” (Murat).
In this setting, the Internet seemed to be the key tool that allows students to have real-life communication in English. Students who had access to the Internet indicated that they chat with their peers (Brazilian, Korean, Spanish, Australian, Canadian, Ethiopian, American, etc.) either through computer game sites or through chat programs like ICQ.

“We start conversing, where are you from, where do you live, have you been to Turkey. If they’ve been to Turkey, they wrote Cesme, Bodrum, Antalya [names of the towns that attract tourists] but after a short while it ends. I don’t talk to same person again because neither he nor I enjoy it, because after a while the conversation ends you know” (Murat).

All these conversations on the Internet were not oral but written. Both parties typed their responses instead of speaking. They exchanged a small conversation where they learned each other’s names and nationality before starting to play computer games. However, their conversations did not seem to extend beyond the brief exchange of information during these online chats.

Their other communication experiences in English include reading computer game instructions during installation and set up of the game, reading on-line materials, books, magazines (like Newsweek, Reader’s Digest, National Geographic), and newspapers.

“I worked at an Internet Café…computer games were in English. When we had a problem, I [read the instructions] looked up the words in the dictionary and tried to solve the problem” (Phoenix).

“I read Newsweek. Sometimes I read books like a book of E. A. Poe. But I don’t read them all the time” (Atron).

Other than reading in English, the participants indicated that they listened to news in English, watch BBC, and CNBC, MTV, and listened music in English. Only a few of them (2) indicated that they wrote in English and keep a journal.

“I listen to foreign music [in English]. I memorize the lyrics of the songs…I watch MTV and try to understand. I sometimes watch BBC” (Fatma).
Students’ voluntary engagements in these activities suggested that they were somewhat willing to read and listen in English. However, less willing students expressed their unwillingness to read in English when they can read the same material in Turkish, or unwillingness to watch TV in English when there is an option to do so in Turkish. Moreover, both willing and less willing students seemed to prefer having oral communication or two-way written communication (chat on the net, pen pal) rather than reading or listening in English. Most of the participants expressed their desire to have foreign friends and pen pals to whom they can write or talk.

“We don’t need to read in English, they are translated into Turkish anyway. I don’t prefer to read in English or watch TV in English, when they are available in Turkish. I like to have a pen pal to improve my English proficiency” (Pelin).

“If I want I can read. I have an opportunity to do that but I don’t think it is necessary. I don’t even read magazines or newspapers in Turkish. Therefore, I don’t read magazines in English. I don’t find it necessary… I want to have a pen pal from England and write to him” (Paskal).

“When there are Turkish newspapers and magazines, it does not make sense to read English ones… I want to have a foreign friend and want to chat online. That’s it” (Murat).

While some less willing students wanted to have pen pals or foreign friends to communicate in English, other less willing students seemed to be reluctant to communicate in English in any way due to lack of confidence. These students indicated that they were not seeking to communicate in English because they were concerned about their English proficiency.

“My English proficiency is low, it is not good enough… I don’t seek to communicate in English because I don’t feel confident” (Aysegul).

“I don’t want to use English more in my daily life. I think that [what we have at school] is enough… I may want to communicate in English through internet but I don’t have that much confidence, I don’t think I know that much English” (Papatya).

Another factor that hindered both willing and less willing students’ communication experiences seemed to stem from the nature of the English preparation
program, which appeared to emphasize accuracy and focus more on grammar and reading rather than oral communication in English. Therefore, students seemed to have limited opportunities to practice their communication skills at school.

“Here, we try to pass the [English] course. In order to get 70 to pass the class, most of us need to get 80, 90 from the final exam. In fact, we couldn’t use English in our daily life because we put all our effort to pass the course. For example, TV could have been used in the classroom, there could have been more listening opportunities, and foreign instructors could have talked with us time to time. Our Turkish instructor helps us but it is different to talk to somebody who can’t speak Turkish, because we speak in Turkish [while talking with their Turkish instructor], our instructor warns us but we know that he knows Turkish. But with a foreign instructor you have to speak English” (Yelda).

“Here, we learn grammar. We can’t speak in English with this knowledge. What we learn here is mostly help us to answer exam questions. But when I talk to people [Czech, Russian, Slovak tourists] they don’t pay much attention to grammar either but we understand each other” (Atron).

Since the communication in English did not appear to be the main focus of the program, students did not have many opportunities to communicate in English at school. Only the very willing students seemed to seek opportunities to use English by having online chats with their peers, reading, and watching TV in English. Moreover, during the summer time they went to places where they could meet foreigners and converse. However, in general students seemed to be not very willing to use English or to be reluctant to seek opportunities to communicate in English.

4.3.2.2. What is the students’ perception of their motivation?

All of the students indicated that they wanted to learn English. However, while some of them believed that they did not make enough effort to learn it, others indicated that they did not like to study English. Further some others expressed that they wanted to take their major area courses and take English courses along with their major area courses instead of focusing only on English, and spending a year to learn it.
“I want to learn English very much, I want to be proficient but I don’t make much effort. I don’t know, maybe I don’t have the capacity” (Murat).

“I want to learn English very much but it is boring to study English every day. I am a mathematician. I can spend hours to solve a mathematical problem but studying English is boring, I don’t like to memorize” (Phoenix).

“Everybody wants to learn English. It is nice to learn English but some of us think we lost a year because of English preparatory program. We could learn this in a regular English class. English preparatory program is not necessary” (Papatya).

In general, the students seemed to be instrumentally motivated to learn English. Although some of them mentioned that they wanted to use English to communicate with foreigners, when they were asked what the main reason for them to learn English, all of them indicated that they were learning English to get a better job. Some of them believed that due to their majors and the requirement of their future jobs, they have to learn English. Still others indicated that they have to know English since the resources or computer programs related to their fields are in English. They appeared to perceive that learning English is not an option for them but a requirement to find a job or to be able to do their job.

“I want to learn English first of all to get a better job. When you apply for a job first they ask whether you know English then whether you know any other foreign languages. I also want to learn English to work abroad as an attaché” (Murat).

“I want to learn English to find a job. English is necessary to find a job. I may go abroad in the future English is necessary there. In order to use computer, English is necessary. English is necessary for everything. You can’t do without it” (Paskal).

“I want to learn English to reach to more resources. Since my aim is to be an academician. I need resources. I need knowledge. In general, the whole world uses English. That is why I want to learn English” (Ali).

“I want to learn English because I have to. All the computer programs we use are in English. There are more than 200 programs about constructing a building. All of them are in English. I do not want them to be Turkish. I prefer to have them in English. If I go abroad to work I can use these programs. When you know English you can use those programs. And if I work for government, I will be paid extra money because of my English proficiency” (Iliksut).

“As a graduate of Econometrics, I cannot find a job anywhere without being proficient in English. It is not a question of necessity any more it is a must” (Yelda).
Furthermore, these students wanted to learn English for economic reasons. They appeared to believe that being proficient in English would allow them to have an above average lifestyle, since knowing English would give them competitive edge in job market. The English language seemed to be a tool through which these students can gain access to a better life.

“If you don’t want to live an average life in this country, you have to learn English. If you want to go abroad, you have to learn English. And in this country in order to earn more money and live like a human, you have to learn English. The only way to reject this is to live in a certain way with less money. But not many people accept to live like that” (Atron).

“When you apply to a job in Turkey, they ask you right away whether you know a foreign language, whether you know English. English comes first, even the computer terms are in English” (Ali).

“English is necessary to get a job but it is not sufficient. You have to learn another foreign language” (Fatma).

“I need to learn English for my future, for my career. Knowing English is not an exception any more. In order to be at a better position in life, English is a must. If a person who works for government knows a foreign language he earns more. In addition, English is necessary for social status” (Denizci).

“If you have certain goals, English is a must. In order to be at higher places, we have to learn English” (Aysegul).

While the primary motivation of the students is instrumental, some of the students indicated their integrative motivation in addition to their instrumental one by showing interest in communicating with foreigners and understanding other cultures.

“When I first learned English at middle school and high school, I learned it to be able to talk with foreigners, to be able to understand their cultures, to understand what they think, but currently I learn it to get a job. I have to do that there is no other way” (Yelda).

“To me it is very nice to learn a foreign language because one can communicate with people. I want to learn English mostly for this reason. In the future, I will try to increase my proficiency level… I want to learn English to communicate with foreigners because I want to work in a foreign country” (Ayse).

“I want to learn it to communicate not only with Turkish but also with foreigners. When you speak the same language, at least you share the culture of the language. It is also necessary for my job” (Aysegul).
On the other hand, a few students made it clear that they would use English for communication purposes when they were required not because they wanted to.

“I want to learn English not to communicate with foreigners but not to experience communication problems when I am required to communicate with foreigners. For example, when I go to England, I have to speak English. Or my job may require English” (Phoenix).

4.3.2.3 Communication Anxiety

Participants expressed that they experienced anxiety at the beginning of a conversation, mostly due to their concern about making mistakes. Initially, they felt anxious to speak English accurately. Then, when the conversation continued, they felt less anxious. Some indicated that when they realized that their counterparts also made mistakes and did not speak English perfectly, they felt relaxed.

“At first, I felt nervous, but when we continued to talk, it turned out that they did not pay attention to grammar. They did not pay any attention to grammar. They even got surprised that I strictly followed the grammatical rules. They understood that I learned English later in life and that I did not talk like them” (Phoenix).

“I feel nervous about whether I will be able to make correct sentences, whether I will be able express my point. At the end, somehow we manage to understand each other” (Aysegul).

“I feel nervous. I worry about whether I say it correctly or not, but I enjoy it” (Fatma).

“When I start speaking in English, I feel very nervous about what the person I talk to will say. I don’t know a lot of vocabulary. I both try to understand them and worry about whether I make correct sentences. But after I talk a while, I start feeling better” (Ayse).

“I feel very nervous about whether I will say things correctly; sometimes I forget even the easiest words” (Papatya).

Anxiety seemed to be related to students’ perception of their competence. While some students believed that their English proficiency level was not high enough and therefore experienced anxiety and avoided communication, others did not worry about their proficiency level and sought communication.

“If my English proficiency were higher, it would be better. But since it is not, I feel anxious” (Aysegul).
Denizci, who was motivated to learn English and very willing to communicate in English, expressed that he did not experience any anxiety: “Eager to know everything [he said it in English] as a person who is eager to know everything, I start conversation ambitiously. It would have been nice to speak English with you [the interview was in Turkish]. When I speak, I don’t think like, if I speak I make mistake therefore I better not speak.”

Deniz, who lived in Saudi Arabia for six years and attended an international high school and used only English for the last two years, also expressed that she did not experience communication anxiety: “I don’t feel nervous at all. I have a conversation in English as if I had it in Turkish. There isn’t much tension. I did not speak Turkish for two years except when I talked to my parents. I watched TV in English, read newspaper in English.”

It seemed like participants’ anxiety level varied depending on the person with whom they communicated. While talking to a stranger was the most anxiety-provoking experience for them, talking with a person who they knew and liked was not anxiety provoking:

“When I first start talking, I worry about what will happen…Of course, there is tension at the beginning when you talk to a stranger. Even when you speak in Turkish, you feel nervous to talk to a stranger” (Atron).
“I like to speak English with somebody I know; I can be relaxed since I know the person” (Iliksut).

Previous positive or negative experiences seemed to influence their current anxiety level as well. Yelda, who communicated with an American regularly during her internship at a bank, had positive communication experiences. She expressed her joy at communicating with foreigners. She did not express any tension or communication
anxiety: “I like to talk to foreigners. When I compare things, they are relaxed people, when you talk to them you feel relaxed as well. They understand whatever you say. They try to help you. I feel relaxed when I talk to them.”

In general, students seemed to experience communication anxiety at the beginning of their conversations mostly due to their worry over making mistakes but later overcame this anxiety. Overall, these students did not appear to show a great deal of anxiety. In general, their anxiety level does not appear to be high enough to interfere with their communication.

4.3.2.4 Perceived Language Proficiency

Listening in English seemed to be the most challenging skill for the students while reading is the least challenging. Most of the students expressed that they had difficulty in listening comprehension due to the speed of the conversation, accent of the speakers, and the informal nature of the talk. Students indicated that they had trouble in understanding when they watch the TV. They did not comprehend when a person talked fast, had an unfamiliar accent, or used informal English.

“Listening is difficult. Foreigners speak fast. Sometimes they have accent” (Aysegul).

“Sometimes, I can’t understand what I listen to. Sometimes foreigners speak so fast that we can’t understand” (Fatma).

“I find reading and writing comfortable. I like speaking too but listening, listening comprehension is difficult. Especially the everyday English is very different therefore it is difficult. We learn formal English” (Ayse).

Most of them did not seem to be very confident speaking in English since they did not have much chance to practice. While some (Ali, Fatma, Aysegul, Yelda, Atron, Mika) found writing difficult, some others (Pelin, Paskal, Murat, Deniz, Ayse) indicated that they could write in English.
“I comprehend what I read or what I listen but we don’t have much chance to speak either at school or outside the school. We can read alone but we can’t study speaking by ourselves. Therefore, we are not very comfortable in this area. We mostly focus on theory, we practice very little” (Papatya).

“I think speaking and writing are the most difficult part of English. For example it is not easy to write a paper. The easiest thing is reading, reading comprehension” (Mika).

“I found writing difficult. Especially during the first a few months, I found it very difficult” (Yelda).

Reading seemed to be the least difficult skill for the participants. Most of them expressed that they could comprehend what they read and did not experience problems in reading. Moreover, they expressed that unlike speaking they can study reading by themselves. In general, they seemed to be highly confident in reading comprehension.

“I understand 90 percent of what I read. If somebody speaks fast, I don’t understand. I may make a few mistakes but I can write. I can speak but may not understand what the other person says” (Murat).

When asked to assess their language proficiency, most of the students mentioned grammar. While some of them found grammar difficult, some found it easy. For some students grammar was like mathematics with formulas, which they can study by themselves and master. For the type of students who approached grammar like mathematical formulas, applying these grammatical rules to speaking was challenging.

On the other hand, some students like Deniz and Atron, who had an opportunity to communicate with foreigners in English, found grammar difficult. They expressed that although they could communicate with foreigners in English, they found grammar difficult.

“I find writing and grammar easy because one can study rules. That is how we learned since elementary school. They give you rules and you study them, get good grades. That is why grammar is easy. But it is a different thing to apply those rules. Therefore, it is difficult to speak. You know it, but cannot speak” (Yelda).

“It is difficult to memorize words. I am not good at memorizing things. Grammar is like mathematics, it is easy but remembering words is difficult” (Iliksut).
“If we don’t consider grammar and think English proficiency in terms of communicating with other people, I can communicate in English and understand other party. If you ask about grammar, it is not good, it is the difficult part” (Atron).

“I can speak well. I practiced two years. I can write and read. The only thing is grammar. I have difficulty in grammar” (Deniz).

4.3.2.5 Attitude toward the English language

Students seemed to be in agreement that English is an international language that they could use to communicate with different people around the world. They perceived English as a necessary tool through which they can connect to the rest of the world.

“How English is a common language; it is like a common sign language. It is everywhere from Britain to Saudi Arabia from China to Alaska” (Denizci).

“In a few years, English will be the language spoken by everybody” (Mika).

“English is a common language and in our country it is also the most important one” (Ayse).

However, they were not aware of the nonnative varieties of English and considered British and American varieties of English as the legitimate standard varieties.

Moreover, they seemed to prefer British English to American English. They seemed to favor British pronunciation and British English, although they acknowledge that American English is also a native standard variety.

“British English and American English are different. I prefer British English. I think British pronunciation is better.” (Fatma).

“I would like to have British accent, I want to go to Britain to study and correct my accent. I want to speak like real British” (Deniz).

On the other hand, they questioned the status and power of English and resisted the imposed necessity of learning this foreign language. While Phoenix considered English to be the “language of others,” Iliksut questioned the reasons for learning “another language” in her “own country.” These students seemed to perceive that they had to learn English whether they liked it or not. It was a process that they could not
avoid. For them, learning English was not a choice that they freely made but an imposed necessity that they could not escape.

“I don’t like English very much. As I said I wish Turkish were a universal language instead of English, I wish everybody spoke Turkish. But even though I don’t like it I want to learn it very much because I have to” (Murat).

“It bothers me that English is required. I have to learn another language in my own country. It bothers me that I have to spend a year for that… It is good to have a mutual language in the world…but why English, why not another language?” (Iliksut).

“If it were not required, nobody would speak [English]. Nobody wants to speak the language of others” (Phoenix).

“To me it [English] doesn’t have good associations. In the end, English is spoken all around the world because most of the countries are the colonies of it. French is similar as well. But we cannot escape from it. We have to learn [English]. It is necessary for our future” (Aysegul).

On the one hand, the students seemed to have resistance toward learning English, but on the other hand, they seemed to perceive English as a language of power, which could allow them to have a better life. They seemed to believe that English would enable them to find a better, well-paid job by putting them into advantageous position in comparison to their monolingual counterparts. It would give them a competitive edge in today’s international business market.

4.3.2.6 Attitude toward English-speaking countries

When asked to give examples of “English speaking countries,” a majority of the students mentioned England, U.S.A., Canada, and West European countries. In addition to this, Murat mentioned Nigeria and Ghana as English-speaking countries, Deniz, who attended an international high school in Saudi Arabia and made friends with Indian, Egyptian, and Philippines students mentioned India, Egypt, Pakistan, and Philippines as English speaking countries, and finally Mika and Pascal mentioned Japan as an English speaking country.
Almost all of the students did not consider the outer circle countries such as India to be English speaking. It seemed like they were not aware of the status of English in these outer circle countries.

In general, students appeared to perceive the inner circle countries such as England, USA, Canada, and technologically developed countries like Western Europe, and Japan as English speaking. These countries in general were perceived as technologically developed, and powerful. Most of the students indicated their desire to see these countries and work there.

“I haven’t seen these countries. I only saw them on TV. I heard that England is cold. In the USA, they treat African-Americans (zenci) bad. Racism. But it is also said that America is a country of freedom. I don’t know how true that is. A lot of people want to live there. I think it is because of the developed technology and big companies, job opportunities” (Ali).

“I think Japan is the first because one can find the most advanced technological developments there like cell phones, camera, car, other electronics. Germany is the second” (Mika).

“I know that crime rate is low in Canada. There people live happily. I would want to live there” (Ayse).

“They [Britain, USA, Canada] are colonist, powerful, and technologically advanced…I want to go to USA and France. USA is like a city of the world. I want to see there. I want to see how people live there.” (Aysegul).

“America is a powerful country in every respect. In order to communicate with them easily, all countries use that language [English]. There are economic, political reasons…I want to work for an American firm. I especially want to work with foreigners because it is easier to work with them. I don’t need to show unnecessary respect to my manager. They [Americans] are more flexible”(Yelda).

4.3.2.7 Attitude toward native and nonnative speakers of English

They believed after they graduated they would speak English with both native and nonnative speakers of the language. However, they seemed to prefer communication with native speakers of English rather than other nonnative speakers because they believed they would experience communication problems while talking to nonnative speakers of English.
“I want to have English speaking friends whose real language is English. I want to talk with them on interesting topics” (Ali).

“It is more reasonable to speak English with the British rather than Japanese. In the end, people from other countries learn English later in their life but others use English from birth, it is their mother tongue. They are more relaxed when they speak and that makes you relaxed.” (Atron).

“I don’t think I can speak in English with an Arab; we can’t communicate” (Papatya).

“We may experience communication problems while talking to other nonnative speakers. When we speak in Turkish, we think only about speaking [what we will say] but when we speak in English, we think about the structure of the sentence, about which word to use where. We think about not what we talk about but about other stuff. Therefore, it would be difficult to communicate [with other nonnative speakers]. If we practice more we can communicate better” (Ayse).

“I prefer to speak with the British or Americans because other countries’ English is different” (Deniz).

Although Deniz, who attended an international high school in Saudi Arabia, communicated with her classmates from Egypt, Pakistan, and India and did not experience communication problems, she still preferred to communicate with the speakers of standard native varieties of English. The students also appeared to prefer to speak with native speakers of British English rather than the native speakers of American English. Papatya was the only one who preferred American English to British English.

“I probably prefer the British because it is their mother tongue. I can communicate easily with them” (Phoenix).

“I would prefer to talk with the British because British English and American English are different. I prefer British English. I think British pronunciation is better.” (Fatma).

“I prefer to speak with the British. It [English] is their native language. It is Americans’ native language as well but I prefer formal, accurate English. If they speak accurately, I may want to talk with an American too” (Iliksut).

“I would prefer to speak with Americans. It [American English] is easier compared to British English. Also it is their mother tongue as well” (Papatya).

On the other hand, a few students indicated their desire to speak both native and nonnative speakers of the language.

“For business purposes, I would prefer to speak with Japanese and Chinese in English, for other purposes it doesn’t matter” (Pelin).

“For business purposes with the British or European for other purposes doesn’t matter” (Murat).
“I don’t have any preference. I can talk anybody who can speak English. Nationality doesn’t matter” (Paskal).

“If we speak English with native speakers only, we will accept their point of view. But if we speak with the rest of the world, we learn various things; we brought various things together. When our native language was not English we can reflect our culture in English. That way we can learn about the cultures of other nonnative speakers” (Ali).

4.4 Research Question 2

“What are the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?”

Depending on the theoretical model of MacIntyre et al. (1998) and the related literature, the relations among the variables were hypothesized as:

1. Language learners’ attitude toward international community, their motivation to learn English and their linguistic self-confidence are directly related to their willingness to communicate in English.

2. Language learners’ attitude toward the international community is directly related to their motivation to learn English and indirectly related to willingness to communicate through motivation to learn English.

3. Language learners’ personality is directly related to their linguistic self-confidence and indirectly related to willingness to communicate through linguistic self-confidence.

These hypotheses are illustrated as a structural model in Figure 4.1 below.
In order to assess each of the above latent variables in the structural model, the researcher specified a total of 13 indicator variables. Language learners’ willingness to communicate in English was assessed through one indicator: second language willingness to communicate. Learners’ attitude toward the international community was measured through four indicators: integrative orientation (intercultural friendship orientation), approach-avoidance tendency, interest in international vocation/activities, and interest in foreign affairs. Motivation was assessed by three indicators: motivational intensity, desire to learn English, and attitudes toward learning English. Personality was measured by three indicators: personality1, personality2, and personality3. Finally, second language self-confidence was assessed by two indicators: communication anxiety, and perceived communication competence. The reliability of each indicator variable is given in Table 4.16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 Reliability of the instruments (Number of valid cases =304)

4.4.1. Structural Equation Model Analysis

Since in SEM analysis the missing data can affect the calculation of input data and the following estimation processes (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998), instead of using the incomplete data from 356 participants, data from 304 participants without missing values were utilized to test this model.

Before testing the proposed WTC model with SEM analysis, the data set was examined to determine whether the assumptions of SEM were met. Like other multivariate data analysis methods SEM has three assumptions: independent observations, random sampling of respondents, and the linearity of all relationships (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The data collection procedure allowed random sampling of participants and independent observations. Participants of this study were
randomly selected and the each individual completed the questionnaire independent of other participants. In order to determine the linearity of all relationships, the researcher first calculated the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (correlation matrix is given in Figure 4.17), and then studied the scatterplots for each relationship. Examination of scatterplots did not indicate any nonlinear relationship.
<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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-MI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-MD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-AAT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-FA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-FO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-WTC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-PC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-CA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-PE1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-PE2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-PE3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 4.17 Correlation matrix


** Correlation significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Furthermore, SEM results may be affected by the distribution of the data. Departure from multivariate normality may inflate chi-square statistics (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). In order to determine the distribution of the data, the researcher examined the histograms for each variable. Then, by using the SPSS statistical package, she calculated z scores of the skewness and kurtosis values for each variable. None of the skewness and kurtosis values were greater than 2.58, which indicated a normal distribution of variables (.01 probability level).

4.4.2. Measurement and Structural Model of WTC

The proposed measurement and structural model of willingness to communicate is illustrated in Figure 4.2. The measurement model estimates the relationships between indicator variables (represented by squares) and latent variables (represented by ovals), and the structural model presents the relations among latent variables. The model included five latent variables, three of which were endogenous (dependent) variables and two of which exogenous (independent) variables. Each indicator (observed) variable had an error term (e1, e2, etc.), which represents measurement error. Furthermore, each endogenous latent variable (L2 wtc, conf, and mot) had a residual term (r1, r2, and r3). Residual terms symbolize error in the prediction of endogenous latent variables from exogenous latent variables (Byrne, 2001). Since both error and residual terms represent unobserved variables, they are represented by ovals.

In relation to the issue of identification, which requires a unique solution for the each value of structural parameters, the researcher determined the scale of every latent variable by fixing one parameter from indicator (observed) variables to the latent variable. This procedure is required since latent variables are unobserved and do not have
a metric scale. The fixed parameters are: from willingness to communicate to L2 willingness to communicate, from perceived communicative competence to linguistic self-confidence, from personality1 to personality, from motivational attitude to motivation, from approach-avoidance tendency to attitude toward international community. Similarly, each path from measurement errors to indicator (observed) variables and paths from residuals to endogenous latent variables were specified by assigning the value 1.00 to each of these paths (Byrne, 2001).
Figure 4.2 The proposed structural and measurement model of WTC
4.4.3. Evaluation of the Model

The proposed structural and measurement model was analyzed by Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 4.0. AMOS used Maximum Likelihood (ML) to estimate each parameter. The primary purpose of SEM analysis is to determine “the extent to which a hypothesized model “fits” or, in other words, adequately describes the sample data” (Byrne, 2001, p. 75). The standardized results of the analysis are given in Figure 4.3. The model was evaluated in several levels: first, the results were inspected to detect offending estimates; second, overall model fit was examined; and finally, measurement model fit and structural model fit were examined.

In order to detect offending estimates, the researcher examined whether there were “(1) negative error variances, … (2) standardized coefficients exceeding or very close to 1.0, or (3) very large standard errors associated with any estimated coefficient” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 610). The researcher did not detect any offending estimates.

Next, the overall model fit was examined in terms of absolute fit indexes, incremental fit indexes, and parsimonious fit indexes. First, absolute fit indexes, such as chi-square and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), were examined. Absolute fit measures indicate “the degree to which the overall model (structural and measurement models) predicts the observed covariance or correlation matrix” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 654). Chi-square goodness of fit index (180.805) with 61 degrees of freedom was significant at .01 level. In this case a significant chi-square value indicated poor fit. However, chi-square is sensitive to sample size, number
of categories in the response variable, and many other factors (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998); therefore, it needs to be interpreted cautiously. Another absolute fit measure, RMSEA (0.08) indicated mediocre fit (Byrne, 2001).

Second, incremental fit measures, which compare “the proposed model to some baseline model, most often referred to as the null model” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 657), were examined. Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) value was 0.91, which indicated an acceptable fit. However, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) value, which was 0.87, and Normed Fit Index (NFI) value, which was 0.85, indicated poor fit.

Third, parsimonious fit measures, which “relate the goodness-of-fit of the model to the number of estimated coefficients required to achieve this level of fit” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 658) were examined. While Parsimonious Normed Fit Index (PNFI) value, which was 0.67, indicated parsimony, Parsimonious Goodness-of-fit Index (PGFI) value (0.61) indicated moderate parsimony. Overall goodness-of-fit measures indicated that the model fitted the data poorly.

Finally, the researcher examined the measurement and structural model fits. Examination of the measurement model revealed that all paths except one from communication anxiety to linguistic self-confidence were statistically significant at .05 level. Contrary to previous findings, the path from communication anxiety to linguistic self-confidence (c.r. value -1.150) was not significant at .05 level. Examination of the structural model indicated that all of the paths were significant at either .05 or .01 level. While the path from attitude toward the international community to willingness to communicate (c.r. 4.41) was significant at .01 level, paths from motivation (c.r. 2.29) to willingness to communicate, and from linguistic self-confidence (c.r. 2.26) to willingness
to communicate were significant at .05 level. The test statistic used here was critical ratio (c.r.), “which represents the parameter estimate divided by its standard error” (Byrne, 2001, p. 76). Critical ratio tests the null hypothesis that in the population the estimate is statistically different from zero. At .05 level, c.r. value needs to be greater than plus or minus 1.96, and at .01 level, it needs to be greater than plus or minus 2.57.

Figure 4.3 SEM results of proposed WTC model.

* significant at .05 level, ** significant at .01 level
4.5. Research Question 3:

“Is the proposed model of WTC acceptable in terms of explaining the relations among students’ WTC in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation, attitude toward the international community, and personality?”

The assessment of the model indicated a poor fit to data and therefore it was decided to improve the model through modification. However, from this point on the nature of the study became exploratory rather than confirmatory (Byrne, 2001). In order to improve the model, the researcher examined the standardized residuals and modification indices (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The standardized residuals “represent the differences between the observed correlation or covariance and the estimated correlation or covariance matrix…Residual values greater than plus or minus 2.58 are now to be considered statistically significant at the .05 level” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 615). Modification indices indicate “the reduction in chi-square that would occur if the coefficient were estimated. A value of 3.84 or greater suggests that a statistically significant reduction in the chi-square is obtained when the coefficient is estimated” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998, p. 615).

High standardized residuals (such as 5.02, 4.04, 3.78, etc.) among the indicator variables of personality, and attitude toward the international community suggested a correlation between the latent variables of personality and attitude toward the international community. Moreover, a high value of modification indices (25.30) suggested correlation between personality and attitude toward the international
community as well. Therefore, the researcher added a path between personality and attitude toward the international community.

Furthermore, following the results of previous research in the EFL context (Yashima, 2002; Kim, 2004), the researcher decided to delete the path from motivation to willingness to communicate and to add a path from motivation to linguistic self-confidence. Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) version 4.0 was used to analyze this modified model. The Maximum Likelihood (ML) procedure was utilized to estimate each parameter. The results of the modified model are given in figure 4.4.
Figure 4.4 SEM results of the modified WTC model

* significant at .05 level, ** significant at .01 level
4.5.1. Evaluation of the Modified Model

First, the researcher examined the output in terms of offending estimates such as negative error variance, very high standardized coefficients, and large standard errors. She did not detect any offending estimates.

Second, the researcher examined the overall model fit indexes: absolute fit indexes, incremental fit indexes, and parsimonious fit indexes. Chi-square value (106.33) was still significant at .01 level with 60 degrees of freedom, although it decreased from 180.81 to 106.33. However, since chi-square is not a very reliable index in SEM analysis, the researcher interpreted the result in relation to the results of all fit indexes. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value was .05, which indicated a good fit (Byrne, 2001). Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Normed Fit Index (NFI) values range from 0 to 1.00 and values closer to 1.00 indicate a good fit (Byrne, 2001). For this model GFI value was .95, TLI value was .95, and NFI value was .92, all of which indicated a good fit to the data. Compared to the first proposed model, both the modified models’ absolute fit indexes and incremental fit indexes values indicate a much better fit to the data.

According to parsimonious fit measures, the modified model was as parsimonious as the first proposed model. Parsimonious Goodness-of-fit Index (PGFI) value of the modified model was .62 while the PGFI value of first proposed model was .61. Similarly, the modified model’s Parsimonious Normed Fit Index (PNFI) value, which was .70 was not very different than the first model value, which was .67. According to Hair et al. (1998), “when comparing between models, differences of .06 to .09 are proposed to be
indicative of substantial model differences” (p. 658). Since the difference of PNFI value between the two models was .03, it was decided that both models were parsimonious.

Finally, the researcher examined the measurement and structural model fits. Examination of the measurement model revealed that again, while all other paths were significant at .01 level, the path from communication anxiety to linguistic self-confidence was not statistically significant at .05 level. Examination of the structural model indicated that while the path from personality to linguistic self-confidence was significant at .05 level, all other paths were significant at .01 level.

Results of the modified model indicated a good fit to the data and the researcher accepted this model as valid. According to the final model, these students’ willingness to communicate in English was directly related to their attitude toward the international community and their linguistic self-confidence. These students’ motivation to learn English and their personality in terms of being an introvert or extravert were indirectly related to their willingness to communicate through their linguistic self-confidence. Finally, their attitude toward the international community was correlated with their being an introvert or extravert.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The objective of the present study was to examine whether college students who are learning English as a foreign language in the Turkish context are willing to communicate in English when they have an opportunity and whether the “Willingness to Communicate” (WTC) model (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, & Noels, 1998) explains the relations among social-psychological, linguistic and communication variables in this EFL context.

The present study is a hybrid design that combines both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis procedures. It consists of a questionnaire and interviews. First, the questionnaire was administered to 356 randomly selected college students in Izmir, Turkey. Then, interviews were conducted with 15 randomly selected students who had already answered the questionnaire. The Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis was conducted to examine the interrelations among students’ willingness to communicate in English, their language learning motivation, communication anxiety, perceived communication competence, attitude toward the international community, and personality. Qualitative interviews were utilized to extend and elaborate these quantitative results.
This chapter presents a summary of the findings, a discussion of these findings in relation to the previous studies in the field, the pedagogical implications of the study, the limitations of the study, and the recommendations for further research. In the summary and discussion sections, the researcher combines the results of both quantitative and qualitative analysis to illustrate the complex nature of the Turkish college students’ willingness to communicate in English and the factors affecting this willingness.

5.1. The Summary of the Findings

5.1.1 What are the students’ perceptions of their willingness to communicate in English, their motivation, linguistic self-confidence, attitude toward the international community, and their personality?

5.1.1.1 Willingness to Communicate in English

In general, participants were somewhat willing to communicate in English. The total mean score of 356 Turkish college students’ perception of willing to communicate was 47.88 out of 100, and 6 of the 15 interview participants expressed willingness to communicate in English. Quantitative results indicated that participants were more willing to communicate in English with friends or acquaintances than with strangers, and in a dyad or a small group rather than in large groups. However, interviews revealed that these students were not willing to communicate in English with their Turkish classmates or Turkish instructors, thinking that communication in English with a Turk is “absurd.” Since they shared the same first language, speaking in English with Turkish classmates and instructors did not make sense to them. This may suggest that these students want to use English not for purposes of practice but for real life communications.
Similarly, during the interviews, students revealed that they did not read magazines, books, newspapers or texts on-line for the sake of reading in English; they did not watch television in English or listen to music in English for the sake of listening in English. For instance, they read an English text when they need to download something online and the instructions were in English, or when they were interested in something and could not find it in Turkish. Similarly, they watch something in English not because it is in English but because they are interested in the content of the program. It appears that these students are willing to use English when they need to use it for meaningful communication but are unwilling to use English to practice or only for the sake of using it.

As the questionnaire results indicate these students were most willing to communicate in English with friends. Interview results further elaborated that even the students who were reluctant to communicate in English wanted to have native speaker friends with whom they could chat online or write letters. The interview participants expressed their desire to have a foreign friend, preferably a native speaker, and they explained that they had a willingness to communicate with this friend. However, only one of the interview participants (Mika) had a chance to have a British friend with whom he could chat online for a year. Both willing and less willing students indicated the difficulty of meeting foreigners inside or outside the school. It appears that in the Turkish EFL context, students do not have an immediate need or opportunity to communicate in English.

Willing students seemed to create opportunities to meet foreigners by going to tourist destinations during the summer or using online chat programs. Yet, their contact
with foreigners seemed to be brief and consisted of a quick exchange of information
during both the face-to-face and on-line communications. Their online communications
especially seemed to be limited to asking and answering questions about their nationality,
age, and study. Moreover, since they do not communicate with the same person again,
their online communication experience seemed to consist of the same routines of
questions and answers with different people. It appears that although students seem to be
willing to communicate in English online and indeed do communicate, their
communication experience is limited and does not extend beyond asking and answering a
few simple questions.

Lastly, the nature of the preparatory program, which puts emphasis on accuracy
and focuses more on English grammar and reading than on oral communication in
English, seems to hinder students’ willingness to communicate in English. As Yelda
expressed, since they “put all [their] effort to pass the course” even the willing students
feel that they do not have enough time and energy to create opportunities for
communication in English.

5.1.1.2 Motivation to Learn English

According to the quantitative results of the questionnaire, Turkish college
students are somewhat motivated to learn English. They have some desire to learn
English and have a positive attitude toward learning English. They agree that English
should be taught at school and that they concentrate on their course work at school. They
agree that after they graduate from college, they will continue to study English and try to
improve. Furthermore, they agree that they plan to learn as much English as possible. The
qualitative results of interviews also revealed that students’ main motivation to learn
English is instrumental rather than integrative, and extrinsic rather than intrinsic. Interview participants stated that they wanted to learn English mostly to get a better job, to earn more money, have an above average lifestyle. They seemed to believe that being proficient in English would allow them to have a higher social status and to earn more money.

Furthermore, it appears that these students want to learn English because they think they are required to in order to be successful in their professional life. They believe they can not find a decent job without proficiency in English. For these students, learning English is a must, not some option that they feel free to choose or reject. It seems that the comparatively higher mean scores of the quantitative results do not necessarily mean that these students choose to learn English and make an effort to do so. They believe they have to learn English and that English is necessary in life to be successful, but as the qualitative results indicated, they did not make much effort to use English in their lives or make it part of their lives. Moreover, they seem to resist the imposed necessity of learning a foreign language in their own country. On one hand they are motivated to learn English to have a better life, but on the other hand they question the imposed necessity of English and resist the idea that they have to allocate one year of their life to learn a foreign language so that they can have a decent life.

5.1.1.3 Linguistic Self-Confidence

Linguistic self-confidence is defined as the combination of a lack of communication anxiety and a higher perceived communication competence. It was expected that students’ communication anxiety would be highly negatively correlated with their perceived communication competence. However, quantitative results indicated
that these participants’ communication anxiety and their perceived communication competence did not correlate (r = -.08). Considering that zero means no correlation at all between the variables, r = -.08, although negative indicates there is no correlation between students’ communication anxiety and perceived communication competence. On the other hand, the qualitative results suggested a negative relationship between students’ perception of their language proficiency and their communication anxiety. During the interviews, a few students, like Aysegul, stated that they felt nervous during communications in English because their English proficiency was low. They believed they would have felt less anxious if their proficiency had been higher. Thus, although quantitative results did not confirm the existence of the construct of linguistic self-confidence, there were some qualitative results that supported the existence of this construct in Turkish context.

5.1.1.4 Communication Anxiety

Both quantitative and qualitative results indicated that these students experienced slight anxiety in communicating in English. The total mean of their communication anxiety was 43 out of 100. According to the questionnaire, the most anxiety-provoking situations for these students were “giv[ing] a presentation in English to a group of strangers” (M=56) and “talk[ing] in English in a large meeting among strangers” (M=56). However, considering the possible maximum score is 100, a mean of 56 indicates that the participants do not experience substantial communication anxiety in English even in situations that raise communication anxiety even in native language.

Similarly, during the interviews, the participants did not express severe communication anxiety in English, although they stated that they felt anxious at the
beginning of their conversations, mostly due to their worry about making mistakes. It appears that they feel nervous because they think that they may not understand what has been said, and/or that they may not speak accurately. However, their initial anxiety seems to decrease as conversation continues and when they realize that their counterparts also make grammatical mistakes. It appears that their communication anxiety is related to their perception of language proficiency. The students’ anxiety seems to stem from their worry about their knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and listening comprehension.

In addition, according to both interview and questionnaire results, these students’ anxiety level alters depending on the person with whom they are communicating. They felt least anxious while communicating with friends (M = 32) and/or acquaintances (M = 32). During the interview, Atron stated that he felt anxious communicating with a total stranger even in Turkish, and Iliksut expressed how she wanted to speak in English with a person whom she knows, since she believes she would feel relaxed because she knows the person.

Moreover, students’ previous communication experiences seem to play a role in their perception of their communication anxiety. Deniz’s and Yelda’s previous successful communication experiences in English seem to be the one of the reasons that they have a positive attitude toward communicating in English and do not experience communication anxiety.

5.1.1.5. Perceived Communication Competence

Both quantitative and qualitative results indicate that in general these students do not feel competent speaking in English. Their overall mean score for communication competence is 51 out of 100. They feel most confident talking with friends (M = 61)
and/or acquaintances (M = 50) and felt least confident giving a presentation to a group of strangers (M = 40). During the interviews, students stated that they do not feel confident speaking in English because they do not have much chance to practice. It seems like although they feel more confident reading in English and studying grammar, they do not feel confident in speaking and listening in English. They expressed that while they can study reading in English alone and improve their reading skill without requiring much outside help, they cannot study speaking by themselves and need another person who does not know Turkish to practice.

Moreover, they complained that at school the emphasis is on grammar and reading and they do not have much chance to listen and speak in English. They expressed that since they study formal English at school, it is difficult for them to comprehend everyday conversations that do not follow the rules of formal English. Furthermore, they complained that they had difficulty in understanding English speakers due to the speed of their speech or the various accents. It appears that since at school, students do not become familiar with native and nonnative varieties of English in today’s world, when they watch TV, they do not comprehend what they hear.

Furthermore, when asked to assess their language competence during the interviews, most of the students assessed their proficiency in terms of their knowledge of English grammar. It seems like students who are willing and create opportunities to communicate in English find studying grammar difficult while the students who do not communicate in English much find grammar easy. The students who think that studying grammar is easy stated that they had been studying grammar since middle school and since grammar had rules they could learn these rules and got good grades. On the other
hand, these students stated that it was hard for them to apply those rules and speak. Other students, like Deniz, Denizci, and Atron, who communicated in English more than the rest, find that learning grammar is difficult.

It seems like there are two types of students. One group of students approaches English like a school subject, studies it as if they were studying mathematical formulas, and does not seek to use it for communication purposes. Another group of students approaches English like a foreign language that they are willing to use for communication purposes. While the former group approaches English merely as a school subject that they need to master to pass the class, the latter group approaches it as a tool that they can use outside school for communication purposes.

5.1.1.6 Attitude toward the international Community

In general, these students have a positive attitude toward the international community. They are willing to interact with foreigners in Turkey, are interested in international vocations and foreign affairs, and have a positive attitude toward different cultures. They agree that they would help foreigners who had trouble communicating in places like a restaurant or a station (M = 6/7), they are interested in working in an international organization (M = 5/7) and are interested in events in other countries (M = 5/7), and they want to make friends with foreigners (M = 6/7).

In interviews, participants who are both willing and less willing to communicate expressed their wish to have a foreign friend with whom they can communicate in English, and they desire to work in an international firm in Turkey or abroad. In addition to students’ attitude toward the international community, the interviews explored these
students’ attitude toward the English language, English-speaking countries, and the native and non-native speakers of English.

Students seem to consider English to be an international language that they can use to communicate with the rest of the world. They state that currently the English language is spoken all around the world, and some of them indicated their belief that in the near future everybody in the world would be able to communicate in English. However, it appears that except Deniz, who attended an international school in Saudi Arabia, none of the students are aware of the different varieties of English other than British and American native varieties. Although they are aware that English is spoken all over the world, it seems like they are only aware of British and American native varieties. None of the students mentioned Canadian or Australian English. Moreover, except Deniz, none of the students are aware that there are nonnative varieties of English that are different than British and/or American English. It appears that for these students the English language means either British or American English, and they seem to prefer British English over American English, believing that “British pronunciation is better” and British English is “formal [and] accurate English.” It appears that these students are aware of only two varieties of English and perceive British English as the legitimate, standard variety that they want to learn.

On the other hand, they seem to question the status and power of the English language and resist the imposed necessity of learning this foreign language in their “own country.” Although they express that English is an international language, it appears that they do not perceive it to be a neutral tool for international communication but rather a foreign language that they are required to learn. They used the terms like “language of
others” and “another language [other than their native tongue]” to describe English. It seems like they perceive English as foreign, as “other” rather than something familiar and a natural part of their lives.

When asked about English-speaking countries, it appeared that students mostly consider inner circle countries like USA, England, Canada and technologically developed countries such as those in Western Europe, as well as Japan to be English-speaking countries. The only exceptions were Deniz and Murat. Murat mentioned that English is used in Nigeria and Ghana, and Deniz who made friends with Indian, Egyptian, and Filipino students in an international school in Saudi Arabia, stated that people use English in those countries.

They seem to consider these English-speaking countries (USA, England, Canada countries in Western Europe and Japan) to be technologically developed, powerful countries. Most of them expressed their desire to visit these countries or work there. They seem to be curious about the people and their lifestyles in those countries.

Interview questions aimed to reveal their attitude toward the native and nonnative speakers of English indicated that these students prefer to communicate with native speakers of English because they believe that communicating with a native speaker would be easier than communicating with a nonnative speaker of English who learned the language later in life and may make mistakes. They seem to believe that they may experience communication problems while communicating with other nonnative speakers due to the level of their language proficiency, whereas a native speaker would understand them despite their grammatical errors. Moreover, they seem to prefer to communicate
with the native speakers of British English rather than native speakers of American English.

On the other hand, a few students (Paskal, Ali) expressed their willingness to communicate with both native and nonnative speakers of English. Ali seems to be the only participant who wants to communicate in English with nonnative speakers of English to understand various points of view instead of accepting the British point of view.

5.1.1.7. Personality

Although their scores are normally distributed, in general these students are slightly extraverted (M = 6.81/9). They seem to perceive themselves as spontaneous (7.54/9) rather than inhibited, sociable (7.23/9) rather than unsociable, assertive (7.18/9) rather than unassertive, and enthusiastic (7.08/9) rather than unenthusiastic. In general, they seem to be slightly extraverted individuals who are people-oriented. The results of this study indicate that participants’ perception of their personality is directly related to their linguistic self-confidence. The extraverted students seem to have higher self-confidence than the introverted students. Extraverts seem to have lower communication anxiety and higher perceived communication competence.

5.1.2 What are the relations among students’ willingness to communicate in English, linguistic self-confidence, motivation to learn English, attitude toward the international community, and personality?

It was hypothesized that students’ attitude towards the international community, their language learning motivation, and their linguistic self-confidence were directly related to their willingness to communicate in English. In addition, students’ attitude
toward the international community was indirectly related to their willingness to communicate through their motivation to learn English and their personality was indirectly related to willingness to communicate through their linguistic self-confidence.

However, results of this proposed model indicated that the model did not fit the data, and contrary to expectations, communication anxiety did not negatively correlate with perceived competence to form the construct linguistic self-confidence. In fact, communication anxiety correlates neither with perceived competence nor with other variables. Moreover, the overall model fit indices indicated that the model did not fit. Since this initial model failed to explain the relations among variables, the researcher modified the initial model depending on the statistical results and the previous studies conducted in EFL context.

The researcher hypothesized that students’ attitude toward the international community and their linguistic self-confidence were directly related to their willingness to communicate while their motivation to learn English and personality were indirectly related to willingness to communicate through linguistic self-confidence. Furthermore, students’ attitude toward the international community was indirectly related to their willingness to communicate through their motivation and linguistic self-confidence, and students’ attitude toward the international community and their personality were correlated. The result of this modified model indicated a good fit to the data. All of the hypothesized paths were found to be significant at .01 or .05 level. However, students’ communication anxiety again did not correlate with their perceived competence, nor did it contribute to the formation of linguistic self-confidence.
The results indicated that these college students’ attitude toward the international community is directly and significantly (.45) related to their willingness to communicate in English, and indirectly and significantly related to willingness to communicate (.73) through their motivation (.60) and linguistic self-confidence (.55). Furthermore, students’ attitude toward the international community is highly positively correlated (.35) with their personality.

Students’ linguistic self-confidence is directly and significantly (.73) related to their willingness to communicate in English, whereas their motivation to learn English is indirectly and significantly related to their willingness to communicate (.73) through linguistic self-confidence (.55). Participants’ personality (introvert-extravert) is indirectly and significantly related to their willingness to communicate (.73) through their linguistic self-confidence (.14) and correlate with their attitude toward the international community (.35).

5.2 Discussion

In the present study, the results indicated that students were somewhat willing to communicate in English, had some motivation to learn English, had a positive attitude toward the international community, had low communication anxiety, perceived themselves somewhat competent to communicate in English, and overall were slightly extraverted.

These students’ willingness to communicate was found to be directly related to their attitude toward the international community and their perceived linguistic self-confidence. Students who had a positive attitude toward the international community (were interested in foreign affairs and international activities, and had intergroup
approach tendency and intercultural friendship orientation) were more willing to communicate in English. Similarly, students who had higher perceived communication competence were more willing to communicate in English than the students who perceived their communication competence was low.

Students’ motivation to learn English and their personality in terms of being an introvert or extrovert were found to be indirectly related to their willingness to communicate. Students’ motivation to learn English (their desire to learn English, the intensity of their motivation, and their attitude toward learning English) was related to their perception of communication competence, which in turn influences their willingness to communicate in English. It seems like motivated students perceive their language competence to be higher than less motivated students, which leads them to be more willing to communicate in English. Furthermore, students’ attitude toward the international community was related to their motivation to learn English. It appears that students who have a positive attitude toward the international community are motivated to learn English and their level of motivation leads to willingness to communicate by affecting their perceived competence in English.

Students’ personality (introvert/extrovert) was also related to their willingness to communicate in English through their perception of their communication competence. Extroverted students seem to have a higher perception of their competence, which in turn leads them to have a willingness to communicate in English. Extroverted students seem to assess their communication competence positively compared to their introverted classmates. When a student perceives that her English proficiency is high, she seems to be more willing to communicate in English. Moreover, the data driven path indicated a
relatively high positive correlation (.55) between students’ personality and their attitude toward the international community. Extroverted students seem to be more interested in international activities and foreign affairs, and they seem to have an intercultural friendship orientation and have a greater tendency to approach foreigners.

However, communication anxiety, which was expected to highly negatively correlate with perceived competence, was not related to either students’ willingness to communicate or their perceived competence. Unlike the previous studies in EFL (Yashima, 2002, Kim, 2004, Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, Shimizu, 2004) and ESL (Baker, MacIntyre, 2000; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, Donovan, 2002; Hashimoto, 2002) contexts, in the current study, students’ communication anxiety did not correlate with their perceived communication competence and was not related to their willingness to communicate in any way. Moreover, in the current study, students’ communication anxiety was unexpectedly low. According to the questionnaire results, these students seem to perceive that they would not experience anxiety during communicating in English. The current result seems to be consistent with the result of a previous study (Kiziltepe, 2000) conducted in the Turkish context with Turkish high school students. Contrary to her previous assumptions, Kiziltepe (2000) found that Turkish high school students who learn English as a foreign language do not experience foreign language classroom anxiety.

These students’ lack of communication anxiety in the current study may be explained with MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1989, 1991) model of the development of foreign language anxiety. According to MacIntyre and Gardner, foreign language anxiety develops due to the negative experiences of language learners during the language
learning process. At the beginning of the foreign language learning process, motivation
and language aptitude are better predictors than language anxiety. However, after
experiencing the language learning process for a while, the learner forms attitudes
depending on both her positive and negative experiences. If the learner’s experiences are
predominantly negative, she develops language anxiety, and consequently feels nervous
and performs poorly.

Samimy and Tabuse (1992) demonstrated the rise of college students’ language
anxiety during beginning-level Japanese classes and how it influenced student’s
classroom participation negatively. Moreover, Saito and Samimy (1996) showed that
while language anxiety predicts language performance of intermediate and advanced
level students, it does not predict the language performance of beginning students. Their
study supported MacIntyre and Gardner’s (1989, 1991) model by suggesting that anxiety
arises gradually depending on students’ experience in language learning and use.

As interview results demonstrated, although the participants of the current study
had been studying English almost a year in the preparatory program, they did not have
much chance to use English inside or outside the classroom. They mostly focus on form,
the structure of English language rather than use of English. Therefore, it is possible that
students had not had enough communication experience either with native or nonnative
speakers of the language to develop communication anxiety.

Despite some variations, the results of the current study are consistent with the
results of the previous studies conducted in EFL and ESL contexts. Like Japanese
(Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, Shimizu, 2004) and Korean (Kim, 2004)
students, Turkish students’ linguistic confidence is directly related and their motivation to
learn English is indirectly related to their willingness to communicate in English. It seems like motivated students have a higher level of linguistic confidence, which leads to willingness to communicate in English. In Japanese, Korean, and Turkish contexts, it seems like students’ motivation to learn English is not directly related to their willingness to communicate but rather, is indirectly related. In the Turkish context, this may be explained due to the instrumental nature of the students’ main motivation to learn English. It appears that Turkish students want to learn English to pass the course and to be able to find a well paying job after graduation. They do not necessarily want to learn English to communicate in English. Therefore, their motivation to learn English is not directly related to their willingness to communicate in English but indirectly related to WTC through their perception of communication competence. Motivated students seem to perceive that their language proficiency is high and this perception leads to the willingness to communicate in English.

Although language learners’ attitude toward the international community seems to play an important role both in the Turkish and Japanese (Yashima, 2002; Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, Shimizu, 2004) contexts, in the Korean context (Kim, 2004) learners’ attitude toward the international community is not significantly related to their willingness to communicate. In the Turkish and Japanese contexts, it appears that students who have a positive attitude toward the international community are more willing to communicate in English.

Similar to the results of the previous studies (MacIntyre, Babin, Clement, 1999; MacIntyre, 1994), the results of the current study indicate that language learners’ personality in terms of being introverted or extraverted is related to their willingness to
communicate through their perception of communication competence. In addition to this, the current study indicates a correlation between language learners’ personality and their attitude toward the international community. Extraverted students seem to have a positive attitude toward the international community. They seem to be interested in international activities and foreign affairs, and have an intercultural friendship orientation and a tendency to approach foreigners. Since extraverts seem to be more “people oriented,” and more sociable (McCroskey, Richmond, 1990), it is not surprising that they are interested in international activities. Results seem to suggest that extraverted language learners are more open to the international community and react positively to different people. This result appears to be consistent with the theory of the WTC model (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, Noels, 1998) which suggests that personality plays a role in whether a person reacts positively or negatively to foreign people and thus in the formation of positive and negative attitudes.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Results indicate that students in general were somewhat willing to communicate in English. However, even the less willing students indicated their desire to have a foreign friend with whom they could communicate in English. Since these students do not have immediate access to foreigners either inside or outside of school to have real life conversations, instructors need to create environments for these students to communicate in English. The instructors could contact the Turkish-American Association in Izmir, the city where the university is located, and invite Americans to their classrooms to interact with their students. Furthermore, the instructors could contact other foreigners in Izmir and invite both native and nonnative speakers to their classrooms to expose their students.
to wide variety of English dialects and accents. They might consider forming a conversation club for all levels of students in which the students can interact freely with foreigners without worrying about their grades.

Another way for instructors to create environments for their students to communicate in English would be to contact their colleagues in other countries and enable their students to interact in English via the Internet. A computer lab connected to the Internet would allow these students to have a synchronous chat with their peers in other countries. Instructors can get technical help from a computer specialist to set up a lab and download free chat programs like ICQ. Since computer-mediated communication is believed to promote speaking, increase student motivation, and self-esteem (Compton, 2004), having online chats would not only enable students to communicate in English but also motivate them to learn English and increase their self-confidence.

Since SEM analysis indicated that self-confidence (students’ perception of their language proficiency) plays an important role in students’ willingness to communicate in English, increasing their self-confidence through online conversations would increase their willingness to communicate in English. Unlike face-to-face communication, during online communication, students have time to organize their thoughts and form sentences in English. Thus, they may feel more confident and motivated to communicate in English, since they can overcome their fear of making mistakes during communication.

The students’ attitude toward the international community seems to be playing a major role in Turkish college students’ willingness to communicate, yet students seem to have limited interaction with the international community. By creating environments for communication with foreigners, instructors give their students opportunities to share
cultural knowledge with foreigners and to form realistic attitudes toward various cultures. For online and face-to-face communications, instructors may want to prepare cultural tasks that would allow their students to share their own culture, learn about the culture of their counterparts, and gain an understanding of different cultures. Thus the language learners would be able to form an attitude toward the international community based on their experiences and facts rather than stereotypes and media-created images.

Students expressed their difficulty in understanding informal English spoken by English speakers with different accents. Moreover, they seem to be aware of only British and American native varieties of English, and have a limited understanding of the current status and role of English in today’s world. Most of them perceive English as a school subject that they need to master to pass the class and find a job. These students’ awareness needs to be raised by supplying them with information about the history of the spread of English, the current status of the English language, and its native and nonnative varieties. This way student can have a better understanding of the English language and the purpose of learning this language. Furthermore, instructors need to expose students to different varieties of English, both native and nonnative, so that students can effectively communicate and learn to appreciate the differences.

In conclusion, communicative aspect of language teaching needs to be emphasized and the students need to be prepared to communicate in English effectively with both native and nonnative speakers of English. However, as Alptekin (2002) indicated, the current pedagogic model of communicative language teaching, which is based on “the native speaker-based notion of communicative competence,” is utopian, unrealistic, and constraining in the sense that the idealized native speaker is a nonexistent
abstraction, it does not reflect the lingua franca status of English, and it makes both language teacher and learner dependent on the authority of native speakers. Therefore, instead of setting the goal of language teaching as gaining native speakers’ communicative competence, we should, as Alptekin (2002) suggests, set the goal as gaining intercultural communicative competence that identifies English as an international language and takes successful bilinguals as pedagogic models. Instructional materials that are used to teach English should involve local and international contexts and have discourse samples from nonnative speaker interactions as well as native speaker interactions. In this way learners can be equipped with linguistic and cultural awareness to develop intercultural competence and consequently have effective communications in English.

5.4. Limitations of the Study

Although the participants were selected randomly, since the accessible population is the students who are taking the English preparatory course at one university in Izmir, Dokuz Eylul University, the results can be generalized to this group with some certainty. Any further generalization from this study should be done with caution, taking the context and the participants of the study into consideration. Due to the time and monetary constraints, and the limited accessibility to the target population, which is college students in Turkey, the researcher could not randomly select students among all these colleges in Turkey. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to generalize the results to all college students in Turkey.

Since this was not an experimental study, causal statements are not possible. The present study only examines the relations among the variables and does not indicate
cause and effect relations. Furthermore, self-reported data collected through interviews and questionnaire has its limitations, since it gives the learners’ perception of the issue rather than the observable facts.

For the quantitative aspect of the study, the researcher used the narrow definition of WTC and focused only on the speaking mode. Although the researcher examined the students’ willingness to communicate in both oral and written modes and comprehension of these modes through interviews, the quantitative aspect of the study did not consider listening, writing, and reading modes.

In order to ensure the anonymity of the participants and to collect accurate data, the researcher asked students not to write their names on them. However, this process made it difficult to follow up with students who did not attend the class during the day of data collection and students who did not answer the questionnaire. Therefore, the researcher could not control the non-response error.

Reliability indices of some instruments such as motivational desire (.60), and interest in international vocation/activities (.62) were not high enough. Since the reliability of interest in international vocation/activities was not high in the Japanese context as well (Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, Shimizu, 2004), this instrument needs to be reconstructed.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

According to the willingness to communicate model (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, Noels, 1998) there are both enduring and situational variables that affect one’s willingness to communicate in a foreign language. However, the current study examined only the enduring variables of the willingness to communicate model. Further research is
needed to examine the effect of situation-specific variables, such as one’s desire to communicate with a specific person, and the self-confidence that one feels in a specific situation on one’s willingness to communicate in English. In order to examine the situation-specific variables, a longitudinal qualitative study needs be conducted to examine students’ willingness to communicate in various situations both inside and outside the classrooms. The researcher could employ different data collection methods, such as classroom observations, in-depth interviews, think-aloud protocol during online chat, recall protocol after communicating in English, analysis of textbooks and materials that students use in English classrooms to examine the issue in depth in this specific situation. Furthermore, students’ actual language use could be counted during the observations and the relationship between actual language use and one’s willingness to communicate could be examined.

In order to examine the effect of the program and the language instructors (Gardner, 1985) on students’ willingness to communicate in English, similar quantitative data could be collected at the beginning and end of the program to determine the possible changes that took place during the English preparatory program.

Students could be followed up after they completed the preparatory class and started taking their major area courses to observe their communication needs, how much they use English in their academic life, and whether their willingness to communicate in English has changed since they start using English for real life purposes. Similarly, students could be followed up after their graduation to study their English use at work and their willingness to communicate in English in the work places.
Since most of the students were not aware of various native and nonnative varieties of English, and they indicated that they preferred British or American English, a study may be conducted to examine English teachers’ attitude toward the English language and its varieties. Similar studies could be conducted with students who major in teaching English as a foreign language to become English teachers to determine their attitude toward native and nonnative varieties of English and the status of English in the world.

Unlike the previous studies in the EFL context (Kim, 2004; Yashima, 2002), communication anxiety did not correlate with perceived communication competence and form the self-confidence construct. Furthermore, contrary to the expectations of the researcher, these students’ communication anxiety in English was not high. The construct of communication anxiety could be further researched in the Turkish context to explore the complex nature of language anxiety and the development of communication anxiety in this context.

Further research could examine students’ willingness to communicate not only in oral mode but also in other modes. Different instruments could be utilized to assess students’ willingness to communicate in writing and their comprehension of spoken and written English.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE (IN ENGLISH)
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by putting an “X” in the box that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

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

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

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

4- I think I spend fairly long hours studying English

5- I really try to learn English

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

7- When I have assignments to do in English, I try to do them immediately

8- I would read English newspaper or magazines outside my English course work

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

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

11- I believe absolutely English should be taught at school

12- I find studying English more interesting than other subjects

13- Learning English is really great.

14- I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1- Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2-</th>
<th>3-</th>
<th>4-Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>5-</th>
<th>6-</th>
<th>7-Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-</td>
<td>Learning English is a waste of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-</td>
<td>I plan to learn as much English as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-</td>
<td>I love learning English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-</td>
<td>I want to make friends with international students studying in U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-</td>
<td>I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-</td>
<td>I would talk to an international student if there is one at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-</td>
<td>I want to participate in a volunteer activity to help foreigners living in the neighboring community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-</td>
<td>I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-</td>
<td>I would help a foreigner who is in trouble communicating in a restaurant or at a station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-</td>
<td>I would rather stay in my hometown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-</td>
<td>I want to live in a foreign county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-</td>
<td>I want to work in an international organization as the United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-</td>
<td>I don’t think what’s happening overseas has much to do with my daily life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-</td>
<td>I’d rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-</td>
<td>I often read and watch news about foreign countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-</td>
<td>I often talk about situations and events in foreign countries with my family and/or friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a reason to study English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4. Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7. Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It will allow me to meet and converse more and varied people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It will allow me to get to know various cultures and people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I’d like to make friends with foreigners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person feels different degree of anxiety. Please indicate in the space below what degree of anxiety you might feel in the following situations.

Examples:

0. Ex. 1. Talk to a stranger (if you don’t feel anxiety at all).

50. Ex. 2. Talk to a stranger (if you feel somewhat anxiety).

90. Ex. 3. Talk to a stranger (if you usually feel anxiety).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel anxiety at all</td>
<td>I feel somewhat anxiety</td>
<td>I always feel anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following situations can occur in your country or abroad. If you have not had the experience, 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 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.
Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person feels different degrees of communication competence. Please indicate in the space below.

How competent in English do you feel is the following situations. The situations can occur in your country or abroad. If you have not had the experience, try to imagine how you might feel.

0%                      100%
entirely incompetent     entirely competent
(I cannot do it at all)   (I can do it well)

_____ 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 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.
Directions: Below are 12 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate.

Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space below percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 0 = never communicate, 100 = always communicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I never communicate</td>
<td>I sometimes communicate</td>
<td>I always communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____1. Present a talk to a group of strangers in English.
_____2. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line in English.
_____3. Talk in a large meeting of friends in English.
_____4. Talk in a small group of strangers in English.
_____5. Talk with a friend while standing in line in English.
_____6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances in English.
_____7. Talk with a stranger while standing in line in English.
_____8. Present a talk to a group of friends in English.
_____9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances in English.
_____10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers in English.
_____11. Talk in a small group of friends in English.
_____12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances in English.
How Accurately Can You Describe Yourself?

Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age.

Please circle one number that applies to you for each pair of adjectives.

Ex.
Emotional 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Unemotional

If you think you are emotional, circle 1. If you think you are unemotional, circle 9. If you think your being emotional or unemotional is not absolute but happens in degrees, choose the number that represent you best.

Intraverted 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Extraverted
Unenergetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Energetic
Silent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Talkative
Unenthusiastic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Enthusiastic
Timid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Bold
Inactive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Active
Inhibited 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Spontaneous
Unassertive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Assertive
Unadventurous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Adventurous
Unsociable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Sociable

1- Your Major:
2- Your Gender:
3- Your Age:
4- Have you been abroad? If yes, where did you go? How long did you stay?
5- If you have not been abroad, do you think you will visit foreign countries in the future? Which country (countries) would you like to visit?

6- How long have you been studying English?

   Secondary School________             High School________

7- Have you taken private English courses outside the school? If yes, how long?

8- How often have you communicated with a native or nonnative speaker of English face to face or through the Internet in the last year?

THANK YOU
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE (IN TURKISH)
Lutfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri ne derece katıdığınızı her ifadeden sonra sectiğiniz bölüm X isaretli koyarak belirtiniz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ifade</th>
<th>Derece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sinif arkadaşlarınızla kıyasladığında, İngilizceye daha sık çalıştığını düşünüyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>İngilizce derslerinde öğrendiklerimi sık sık tekrar ediyorum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eğer İngilizce okulda öğretmiyorsaydı, kendimde İngilizce öğrenmeye çalışırdım.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>İngilizce çalışmaya oldukça uzun zaman ayırığımı düşünüyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>İngilizce öğrenmek için gerçekten gayret sarfediyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Üniversiteden mezun olduktan sonra İngilizcemi geliştirmeye devam edeceğim.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>İngilizce odevlerimi hemen yapmaya çalışıyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>İngilizce odevlerimin dışında İngilizce gazete ve dergi okuyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>İngilizce derslerinde öğretilenlere konsantr oluyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Okuldaki İngilizce ders saatlerinin artırılmasını isterim.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Okullarda İngilizcenin mutlaka öğretmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>İngilizce dersine çalışmayı diger derslere çıkmaktan daha ilginç buluyorum.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>İngilizce çalışmak gerçekten onemli.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zamanımı İngilizce disindaki konulara calıarak geçirmeyi tercih ederdim.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-</td>
<td>Ingilizce öğrenmek tam bir vakit kaybı.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-</td>
<td>Mumkun olduğunca iyi seviyede İngilizce öğrenmeyi planlıyorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-</td>
<td>İngilizce öğrenmeye seviyorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-</td>
<td>Türkiye de okuyan yabancı öğrencilerle arkadaş olmak istiyorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-</td>
<td>Mumkun olduğunca yabancılarla konuşmaktan kaçınırmam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-</td>
<td>Okulda bir yabancı öğrenci olsa onunla konuşurdum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-</td>
<td>Yabancı bir öğrenciyle yurt odasını veya bir evi paylaşmaktan rahatsız olmayacağım.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-</td>
<td>Çivarda yaşayan yabancılarla yardımcı olacak aktivitelere katılmak için tonnu olurdum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-</td>
<td>Yan dairemize bir yabancı taşınsa biraz rahatsızlık duyardım.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-</td>
<td>Lokantada yada durakta iletişim sorunu yaşayan bir yabancıya yardım ederdim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-</td>
<td>Kendi ülkmde yaşamayı tercih ederim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-</td>
<td>Yabancı bir ülkede yaşamak isterdim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-</td>
<td>Birleşmiş Milletler gibi uluslararası bir organizasyonda çalışmak isterdim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-</td>
<td>Diğer ülkelerde neler olduğunu benim günlük hayatımla pek fazla ilgisi olduğunu düşünmüyorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-</td>
<td>Surekli yurtdışına gitmemi gerektirecek bir işe girmekten kaçırmadım.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-</td>
<td>Genelde yabancı ülkelerle ilgili haberleri okur ve izlerim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-</td>
<td>Ailem veya arkadaşlarımla yabancı ülkelerde olan olayları konuşur, tartışır.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ingilizce öğrenmek istememin sebepleri:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Tamamen Katılıyorum</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4. Fikrim Yok</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7. Tamamen Katılıyorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-</td>
<td>Farklı kültürleri tanımana yardımcı olacak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-</td>
<td>Farklı ülkelerden insanların sosyal faaliyetlerine katılabilmemi sağlayacak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-</td>
<td>Yabancılarla arkadaş olmami sağlayacak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-</td>
<td>İngilizce yabancı insanlarla tanışmami ve konuşmami sağlayacak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asagida her bireyn iletsisim kurmayi isteyebilecegi yada istemecegi 12 durum verilmistir. Yabancilarla Ingilizce konusacagınızı ve iletsisim kurup kurmamanın tamamen sizin seciminiz oldugunu varsayarak her bir durumda **Ingilizce iletsisim kurmaya ne derece istekli oldugunuzu 0 ile 100 arasında durumunuzu uygun herhangi bir sayi secerek her ifadenin basindaki bosluğa yazarak belirtiniz.**

| % 0---------------------------------% 50----------- ------------------------------%100 |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| **Ingilizce konusmam** | **ingilizce konusurum** |
| (iletisim kurmam) | (iletisim kurarim) |

| _____ | 1-Tanidigim kisilerle kucuk bir gru picinde Ingilizce konuşmak |
| _____ | 2-Bir grup tanimadigim kisije ingilizce sunus yapmak |
| _____ | 3-Bir grup arkadasima ingilizce sunus yapmak |
| _____ | 4-Kalabalik bir topluluktan tanimadigim kisiler arasinda ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 5-Tanimadigim kisilerle kucuk bir grup icerisinde Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 6-Kalabalik bir topluluktan arkadaslarim arasinda Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 7-Arkadaslarimla Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 8-Kalabalik bir topluluktan tanidigim kisilerle Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 9-Tanidiklarimla Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 10-Bir grup tanidigim kisiye Ingilizce sunus yapmak |
| _____ | 11-Tanimadigim birisiyle Ingilizce konusmak |
| _____ | 12-Bir grup arkadasimla Ingilizce konusmak |
Asagida her bireyin çesitli derecede guven hissedec egi 12 durum verilmistir. yabancilarla Ingilizce konusacaginizi varsayarak, her bir durumda kendinizi Ingilizce iletsim kurmakta ne derece yeterli hissedeceginizi 0 ile 100 arasında durumunuza uygun bir sayi secerek belirtiniz.

% 0---------------------------------% 50-----------------------------------------%100
tamamen yetersiz hissederim                     tamamen yeterli hissederim

_____ 1-Tanidigim kisilerle kucuk bir grup içinde Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 2-Bir grup tanimadigim kisiye ingilizce sunus yapmak
_____ 3-Bir grup arkadasima ingilizce sunus yapmak
_____ 4-Kalabalik bir toplulukta tanimadigim kisiler arasinda ingilizce konusmak
_____ 5-Tanimadigim kisilerle kucuk bir grup icerisinde Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 6-Kalabalik bir toplulukta arkadaslarim arasinda Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 7-Arkadaslarimla Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 8-Kalabalik bir toplulukta tanidigim kisilerle Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 9-Tanidiklarimla Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 10-Bir grup tanidigim kisiye Ingilizce sunus yapmak
_____ 11-Tanimadigim birisiyle Ingilizce konusmak
_____ 12-Bir grup arkadasimla Ingilizce konusmak
Aşağıda her bireyn çeşitli derecede kaygı (heyecan) hissedeciği 12 durum verilmiştir. Her bir durumda yabancılarla İngilizce konuşacakınızı varsayarak, İngilizce konuşurken ne derece kaygı duyarınızı 0 ile 100 arasında durumunuza uygun bir sayı seçerek belirtiniz.

% 0---------------------------------% 50---------------------------------% 100
hic kaygı duymam                                      asiri derecede kaygı duyarım

_____ 1-Tanıdigim kişilerle küçük bir grup içinde İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 2-Bir grup tanımadığım kişiye İngilizce sunuş yapmak
_____ 3-Bir grup arkadaşına İngilizce sunuş yapmak
_____ 4-Kalabalık bir toplulukta tanımadığım kişiler arasında İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 5-Tanımadığım kişilerle küçük bir grup içerisinde İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 6-Kalabalık bir toplulukta arkadaşlarım arasında İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 7-Arkaadalarımla İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 8-Kalabalık bir toplulukta tanıdigim kişilerle İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 9-Tanıdıklarınımla İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 10-Bir grup tanıdigim kişiye İngilizce sunuş yapmak
_____ 11-Tanımadığım birisiyle İngilizce konuşmak
_____ 12-Bir grup arkadaşımızla İngilizce konuşmak
Kisiliginizi Nekadar Dogru Olarak Tanimlayabilirsiniz?

Lutfen asagidaki genel kisilik ozelliklerini kullanarak kendinizi mumkun oldugu kadar dogru bir sekilde tanimlayiniz. Kendinizi geleekte olmak istediginiz sekilde degilde su anda oldugunuz sekilde tanimlayiniz. Genel kisiliginizi tanıdiginiz ayni cinsiyetteki yasitlarinizla kiyaslayarak tanimlayiniz.

Her bir cift sifat icin 1 ile 9 arasında kisiliginizi en iyi ifade eden sayiyi yuvarlak icine aliniz.

Ornek
Duygusal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Duygusal degil

Duygusal oldugunuzu dusunuyorsaniz, 1 sayisini yuvarlak icine aliniz. Duygusal olmadiginizi dusunuyorsaniz 9 sayisini yuvarlak icine aliniz. Kendinizi tam olarak duygusal yada duygusal degil diye tanimlamiyorsaniz, duygusalliginizin derecesine gore 1 ile 9 arasinda bir sayiyi yuvarlak icine aliniz.

Icekapanik 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disadonuk
Enerjikdegil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Enerjik
Sessiz 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Konuskan
Hevessiz 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Hevesli
Cekingen 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Cesur
Durgun 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Hareketli
Engellenmis 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Ozgur
Iddialidegil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Iddiali
Maceraperesdegil 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Maceraperes
Antisosyal 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Sosyal

1- Bolumunuz:

2- Cinsiyetiniz:

3- Yasiniz:
4- Yurtdisina ciktiniz mi? Ciktiniza hangi ulkeye gittiniz? Nekadar kaldiniz?

5- Yurtdisina ciktadinizsa, bir gun cikacaginiz hangi ulkeye (ulkelere) gitmek istermisiniz?

6- Kac yil Ingilizce ogreniyorsunuz?

Ortaokul____________ Lise____________

7- Okul disinda ozel Ingilizce kursuna gittiniz mi? Gittiyseniz hangi kursa, ne kadar sure gittiniz?

8- Gecen yil boyunca yabanci birisiyle internet araciligiyla yada yuzyuze ne siklikta Ingilizce konustunuz?

TESEKKUR EDERIM
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW THEMES AND QUESTIONS (IN ENGLISH)
- Would you choose a pseudonym (any name) that you want me to use when I refer to you in the study.
- What is your major?
- Where are you from?
- What type of elementary, middle, and high school did you attend? (Public, private, Anatolian high school etc.)
- Has English-medium nature of Dokuz Eylul University affected your decision to attend this university?

**A-Background information (students’ English language learning experiences, their parents’ attitude, their communication experiences).**

1- I would like you to go back the time when you first start to learn English in middle school. Would you describe your English learning experiences in middle school and high school? (How did you like it? How important was learning English for you?)

2- How did your parents involve in this process? (Did they support you, motivate you in any way, did they help you?)

3- Have you ever had the chance to communicate with a foreigner in English? (at school with foreign teacher, with a tourist, pen pal).

**B-Students’ WTC in English not only in oral mode but also through writing, reading, listening.**

4- (if answers Q3 positively), Do you regularly communicate with foreigners?

5- Do you seek to communicate with foreigners?

6- Do you have an access to the Internet? Would you talk about your Internet experiences? (Read English text online, chat in English)

7- Tell me about your reading experiences in English? (Do you read newspaper, magazine, book etc in English?)
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8- I would like to get a general picture of how much you use English in your daily life. Tell me about your reading, writing, listening, and speaking experiences in English.

9- Would you like to have more chance to use English in your life? For instance:
   - Read book, magazine, newspaper, text on the net.
   - Watch Television or movies in English
   - Have a pen pal (to write in English)
   - Talk to foreigners through internet or face to face.

**C- Students’ perceived competence in English.**

10- How would you grade your English language proficiency? Do you consider yourself proficient in English in terms of speaking, listening, reading, and writing?

**D- Students’ communication anxiety in English**

11- How do you feel when you need to use English to communicate? (Remember the times when you communicated in English, how did you feel?) Do usually feel nervous or at ease? Do you enjoy using English?

**E- Students’ motivation to learn English and use it for communication purposes.**

12- Why do you want to learn English?

13- Tell me how much you want to learn English.

14- How much do you want to use English to communicate foreigners? Why?

**F- Students’ attitude toward English language, learning English, English speaking nations, native speakers of English, and the international community.**

15- What do you think about English language? How would you describe your feeling about English language?

16- What do you think about the necessity of learning English?
17- Could you give me the examples of English speaking nations in the world? What do you think about these English speaking nations?

18- Have you ever been to abroad? Would you like to go abroad? Which country (countries)? Why?

19- I would like you to envision a future situation where you will have graduated from college and get a job. Would you use English? Would you use English to communicate mostly with foreigners from English speaking nations or foreigners from all over the world?
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW THEMES AND QUESTIONS (IN TURKISH)
- Kendi adınız dışında calısmada sizden bahsederken kullanabileceğim bir ad seciniz lütfen.
- Hangi bölümdesiniz?
- Nerelisiniz?
- Ne çeşitli bir ilkokul, ortaokul ve liseye devam ettiniz? (Devlet okulu, özel okul, Anadolu lisesi vb)
- Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesini seçmenizde eğitim dilinin İngilizce olmasının etkisi oldumu?

**A-Genel Bilgi (öğrenim tecrübeleri, ailelerinin tutumu, öğrencilerin iletisim deneyimleri).**

1- Ortaokulda ilk İngilizce öğrenmeye başladığın zamanı hatırlıyorsun. Ortaokulda ve lisedeki İngilizce öğrenme deneyimlerini anlatmışın? (Nasılsın, İngilizce öğrenmek hoşuna gittiymişti? İngilizce öğrenmek senin için ne kadar onemliydi?)
2- Ailenin tutumu nasıl? (Seni İngilizce öğrenmeye tespit ettiler mi? Desteklediler mi? Yada yardımcı oldular mı?)
3- Simdiye kadar yabancı birisiyle İngilizce konuşma imkanı olduğunu hiç? (okulda yabancı bir hocayla, turistle konuşmak yada mektup arkadaşıyla yazışmak gibi).

**B-Ogrencilerin sadece İngilizce konuşmaya değil, okumaya, yazmaya ve İngilizce dinlemeye olan isteklilikleri.**

4- (3.soruya doğru yanıt verildiği takdirde), Yabancılarla düzenli olarak iletisim kuruyormuşun?
5- Yabancılarla iletisim kurmak ya çalışmışın? 
6- Okulda, evde yada yurtta Internete grime imkanı var mı? İnternetetteki deneyimlerini anlatmışın? (İngilizce bir yazı okuyorsun? İngilizce sozlu görüşe yapıyorsun?)
7- İngilizce okuma deneyimlerinden bahseder misin? (İngilizce gazette, dergi, kitap vb okuyorsun?)
8- Genel olarak günlük hayatında ne derece İngilizce kullandığını anlamaya calışıyorum.

Bana İngilizce, okuma, yazma, dinleme ve konuşma deneyimlerini anlatır mısınız?

9- Gunluk yaşamında İngilizceyi daha fazla kullanma imkanı olsun ister miydin?

Ornegin:

İngilizce kitap, dergi, gazette, yada Internette yazı okumak gibi.

İngilizce Televizyon yada film izlemek gibi

İngilizce mektup arkadaşının olması gibi

Yabancılarla yuzyuze yada internet aracılığıyla İngilizce konuşmak gibi.

C- Ögrencilerin kendi İngilizce düzeylerini algilayışları.

10- Sence İngilizce düzeyin nasıl? İngilizce konuşmak, dinledigini anlamak, okudugunu anlamak, ve İngilizce metin yazmak açılarından dil düzeyini yeterli buluyormusun?

D- İngilizce iletişim kurma sırasında duyulan kaygı

11- İngilizce iletişim kurman gerektiğinde nasıl hissediyorsun? (İngilizce iletişim kurdugun zamanları hatırlıa, nasıl hissetmişsin?) Genelde kaygımı duyarmısın, yada İngilizceyi kullanıyor olmaktan hoşnut olursun?

E- Ögrencilerin İngilizce öğrenme ve İngilizceyi iletişim amaçlı kullanma motivasyonları.

12- Neden İngilizce öğrenmek istiyorsun?

13- İngilizce öğrenmeyi ne kadar istiyorsun?

14- İngilizceyi yabancılarla iletişim kurmak için kullanmayı ne kadar istiyorsun? Neden?

F- Ögrencilerin İngilizce diline, İngilizce öğrenmeye, İngilizce konuşan ulkелere, anadılı İngilizce olanlara, ve uluslararası topluma olan tutumları.
15- Ingilizce dili hakkında ne düşünüyorsun? Ingilizceye karşı olan tutumunu nasıl tanımlarsın?

16- Ingilizce öğrenmenin gerekliğine hakkında ne düşünüyorsun?

17- Dünyada Ingilizce konuşan bir kaç ülke ornegi verir misin? Bu ülkeler hakkında ne düşünüyorsun?


19- Okulu bitirip, iş bulduğunda Ingilizce kullanacağını düşünüyor musun? Ingilizceyi daha çok ana dili Ingilizce olanları yoksa dünyanın her yerinden değişim insanları konusacağını düşünürsün?