FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN ENGLISH OF THAI UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN THE IMMERSION PROGRAM

NITCHAMON SUVONGSE AND NATTAPONG CHANYOO
(Mahidol University, Thailand)

Abstract

This study investigates psychosocial and psychocultural variables influencing willingness to communicate in English (L2WTC) and determines the influence of those variables towards L2WTC of Thai undergraduate students in the immersion programs. This study used a mixed method research design. Four hundred and nine students from an immersion program participated in the study. Research tools included a questionnaire, interview questions, and an observation schedule. One-way ANOVA revealed variables that significantly influenced L2WTC at p less than 0.0005 in public, group, and dyad contexts. Multiple regression analysis revealed that the highest variables contributing to L2WTC was SPCC (β = .350), and that psychosocial and psychocultural variables could be accounted for 78% of L2WTC influencing power. The results of this study can explain the L2WTC contexts of Thai students in the immersion programs. Teachers, course designers, and scholars may use the findings to design effective learning environment for students to speak out where participation of English is required.

1. Introduction

'Communicative competence', or "an adequate ability to pass along or give information, or the ability to make known by talking or writing (McCroskey & McCroskey 1988)", is often regarded by most second language learners as the true goal of learning. It is stated that being competent in oral communication requires comprehensibility in areas of grammatical, sociolinguistic, and contextual competence. A high competent language user can correspond to multiple demands, which may include the ability to monitor and understand the input produced by the other interlocutor, and produce his or her own input as a response, which spontaneously occur at the same time (Lazaraton 2013). Nevertheless, according to (Dornyei 2010), it is often found that a highly proficient speaker would avoid engaging in communication despite having the capability. Such incident suggests a further layer of factors inflicting the intention to engage in a second or foreign language conversation of real events. To investigate the underlying factors influencing the intention to communicate of the high competent learners, a study of the construct labeled as 'Willingness to Communicate in English (L2WTC) was the major framework of this present study.

According to the model creators, (McCroskey & Baer 1985), Willingness to Communicate in the first language (L1WTC) primarily refers to 'the probability of engaging in communication when free to choose to do so'. The first L1WTC model aimed to investigate individual variables in the first language context, which comprises of personality trait including introversion and extraversion, or the personality variables, which often remain stable across the situations. Later, the concept of L1WTC model was adopted by (MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei & Noels 1998) into a second or foreign language context, or L2 context. The researchers proposed that the initiation of willingness to communicate in second or foreign language (L2WTC) could be significantly deterred by the change of language discourse from L1 to L2. According to them, L1WTC setting was less complex than that of L2WTC since the former model did not usually involve factors such as level of communicative competence, and

social and political implications compared to the latter. (MacIntyre et al. 1998) remarked that compared to L2 speakers, L1 speakers were capable of speaking in their native language with utmost communicative competence, whereas L2 speakers may not be as capable as them due to varied communicative competence, which could be from almost no competence (0%) to full competence in L2 (100%). Based on this principle, it led to the researchers' adaptation of L1WTC study to that of L2WTC, following (MacIntyre & Charos 1996)'s definition of L2WTC, which was referred to as 'a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2'. In order to investigate the interrelations among variables leading to L2WTC initiation of individuals, (MacIntyre et. al. 1998) developed a Heuristic Pyramid Model of L2WTC as their conceptual framework. According to the model (Figure 1), situational variables (Layer I-III) were proposed as determining factors leading to L2 communication, adding to individual influences (Layers IV-VI). The pyramid model hierarchy indicated some communication factors which were immediately influenced by both situational variables and individual influences. The situational variables may change depending on the contextual factors, while individual influences were relatively stable and long lasting through different communication settings. According to (MacIntyre et al. 1998), the top of pyramid (Layer 1) represents 'the point at which one is about to communicate in the L2.' Meanwhile, personality, which was the broadest variable, was likely the impeding variable to other variables contributing to L2WTC, and allegedly the cause of L2 communication.

Following (MacIntyre et al. 1998)'s model, previous studies have investigated the influencing variables to L2WTC. Nevertheless, the results were varied into two directions whether L2WTC variables either relied on situational contexts only or was permanent as individual variables (LaHuerta 2014). The most frequently reported variables in previous studies were communication apprehension (CA) and self-perceived communication competence (SPCC), motivation, and personality. For most studies, CA and SPCC have been reported consistently as the preeminent indicators to level of WTC. If a person has low level of CA and high level of SPCC, the person would have high WTC in the target language. On the other hand, the findings of motivation and personality as the impeding variables to L2WTC still varied across learning situations.

Furthermore, It was relatively argued that the variables that could influence an individual's decision to use English as a means for communication were not only the psychosocial variables. According to (Wen & Clement 2003) who conducted an L2WTC research among Chinese learners, they found that Chinese learners were influenced from the 'Confucianism', the belief which valued the wisdom and knowledge of teachers, which was more of a complicated cultural norms as compared to those existed in Western societies and it was not included in (MacIntrye et. al. 1998)'s pyramid model. (Zhou, Knoke, & Sakamoto 2005) also found that learners in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Korea, and Japan, were influenced by Confucian belief and the other psycho-cultural concept of 'face', which people tend to protect the self-image and feelings of the other persons, making Chinese or Japanese students who studied abroad feel more or less discomfort to speak up their opinions if it contradicts to those of their teachers' and classmates (Maftoon & Ziafar 2013).

In case of the target context of this present study, which was Thailand, L2WTC was influenced by classroom contextual factors as mentioned by some studies. According to (Suksawas 2001), who investigated the contextual factors underlying L2WTC, higher level of L2WTC was found among learners when they participate in classroom tasks, which demanded brainstorming and discussion. (Thong-Iam 2010), who investigated L2WTC as an underlying factor on Thai learners' English communication behavior in classroom context, reported that background knowledge on the topic predicted a higher level of L2WTC among the participants. Both studies also found that the group with strong relationships among members had more frequent classroom communication in English than groups with weak relationships. (Ponata

2015) who investigated CA among Thai EFL learners found that the learners' CA were underlined by fear of negative evaluation and was related to classroom management in terms of communication, informal testing, and the teacher's characteristics. The study noted that students with moderate and high anxiety level had very low SPCC when they were required to take informal tests. Also, the participants of this study had the highest anxiety level as influenced by fear of negative evaluation and fear of the consequences from failing English classes. According to (Pattapong 2010) who conducted L2WTC studies among Thai undergraduate students, variables found in her qualitative study can be categorized into four major contexts including 'Cultural context' (Kreng-Jai, unity, fear of negative evaluation, and Teacher Status), 'Individual and social context', 'Classroom context' (interlocutors, class management, and classroom tasks), and 'Social and psychological context' (communication apprehension, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-confidence, goal orientations, language learning orientations, interest, and emotions). The research suggested the psychocultural factors and contextual factors as contributing variables to L2WTC of the participants. The contexts as suggested by (Pattapong 2010) were not addressed in the original heuristic model of (MacIntyre et. al. 1998)

Even though a few previous L2WTC researches in Thai context had investigated on variables influencing L2WTC, most of the researches' participants had low English proficiency level that it was difficult to identify the underlying variables to L2WTC. With regards to this, this present study aimed to investigate the psychosocial and psychocultural variables influencing L2WTC and determine the influence of these variables towards L2WTC of Thai undergraduate students in the immersion program. The research questions of this present study are as follows:

1. What are the psychosocial factors and psychocultural factors that influence on willingness to communicate in English of Thai students in immersion program?

2. What is the contribution of overall and each individual psychosocial and psychocultural factor to willingness to communicate in English of Thai students in immersion program?

2. Methods

2.1 Participants

The target population of this study was Thai undergraduate students in immersion programs in a Thai public university. Immersion programs referred to "full-time academic programs in which English was used as a medium for teaching and learning. The immersion program is an academic program where students are exposed to more frequent L2 contact, and experience with supportive environment of possessing the abilities to perform their target language, regardless of any academic language situation, as compared to those who study in the non-immersion program". The number of all Thai students who were currently studying in the program was 3,068 students. The students majored in six different fields of studies, which were Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.), Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.) International Hospitality Management, Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.), Bachelor of Communication Arts (B.Com.Arts.), and Bachelor of Engineering (B.Eng.) Computer Engineering. The English proficiency level of the students was equal to B2 of Common European Framework (CEFR) scale as corresponding to their minimum required TOEFL score at 79 or IELTS score at 6 for their admittance to the college.

2.2 Sampling Size and Sampling Methods

The sampling size of this present study was 341 students. The number was determined by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) at 95% level of confidence, and finalized at 409 students because the researcher added 20% of the number of the participants in order to compensate for dropouts or incomplete returns. This study used purposive sampling to recruit the participants for quantitative part and systematic random sampling for qualitative part.

2.3 Data Collection

This present study used mixed method. Purposive sampling was employed during quantitative research. The criteria for selecting participants in qualitative part of this study were set before the qualitative study took part. The criteria included that participants must have completed at least two of the compulsory English courses in their study in order to exclude the participant's proficiency level as an impeding factor to L2WTC, and that the mean score of L2WTC obtained from the completed questionnaire of the participant must be low to medium, SPCC score must correlate negatively with the level of L2WTC, and the level of CA must be relatively high. The quantitative data was collected prior to qualitative data.

2.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistic was used for analyzing demographic data, including degree of L2WTC, psychosocial factors, and psychocultural factors, based on percentage and frequent distribution. One-way ANOVA was conducted to find out the variables which significantly influenced L2WTC. Multiple regression was used to investigate the accountability of the variables on L2WTC of the participants. For qualitative part, focus group interview was employed to provide in-depth information on pre-selected discussion topics. The qualitative data from the focused group interview was transcribed, coded, and grouped by using content analysis and thematization to conclude the final patterns of data. Group observation was employed for collecting qualitative data on the observable behavioral intentions which can represent L2WTC (i.e. hand-raising, leading the discussion) and the frequency of variables under discussion during the focus group interview for this present study. The results were interpreted by using descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation.

2.5 Validity and Reliability

The validity of the research tools were verified by the method of index of item-objective congruence (IOC) to calculate the average scored given by the experts. If any item received less than 0.67 validity, the item was revised according to the suggestions from the experts until they finally received all approvals. The instrument was piloted prior to collecting quantitative and qualitative data. For reliability, Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the Corrected Item-total Correlation (CITC) was computed on quantitative data and reported at 0.788. The researcher asked her peers who were pursuing Master Degree program in the same university to join the qualitative part for proving reliability of data.

3. Results

This section reports the findings of the present study on the research questions. Based on the quantitative data, which the L2WTC level was determined based on four context-type sub-scores including public, meeting, group, and dyad based on (McCroskey & Richmond 2013)'s Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science, it was found that the L2WTC among the participants of this present study was moderate ($\bar{x}$ = 3.21).

3.1 RQ1: What are the psychosocial factors and psychocultural factors that influence on willingness to communicate in English of Thai students in immersion program?

Table 1: The Level of L2WTC of Thai Undergraduate Students in the Immersion Program by context-type sub-scores

L2WTC based on Context-type sub-scores	Minimum	Maximum	$\bar{x}$
Public	2.33	4.62	3.37 (moderate)
Meeting	2.08	4.54	3.14 (moderate)
Group	2.15	4.69	3.13 (moderate)
Dyad	2.08	4.38	3.19 (moderate)

Table 1 presents the L2WTC level of the participants. The highest level of L2WTC among the participants was in public speaking ($\bar{x}$ = 3.37), the second and third highest level are in dyad ($\bar{x}$ = 3.19) and meeting context types ($\bar{x}$ =3.14), respectively, and the lowest level of L2WTC was found in group speaking ($\bar{x}$ = 3.13).

Table 2: Summary of Questionnaire Results

Variables	$\bar{x}$	Levels
Communication Apprehension (CA)	3.08	Moderate
Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC)	3.83	High
Motivation (Instrumental Motivation)	3.70	High
Motivation (Integretive Motivation)	3.28	Moderate
Personality (Introversion)	3.00	Moderate
Personality (Extraversion)	3.20	Moderate
International Posture	3.13	Moderate
Fear of Losing Face (FLF)	2.77	Moderate
Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ)	2.82	Moderate
Unity	2.97	Moderate
Teacher Status (TS)	2.99	Moderate

Table 2 presents a summary of descriptive statistics. It reveals that only SPCC ($\bar{x}$ = 3.83) and instrumental motivation ($\bar{x}$ = 3.70) were variables that highly contributed to L2WTC, while the rest of variables had moderate level of contribution.

Table 3: Summary of one-way analysis of factors influencing L2WTC in conversation situations

Variables	Context	Source	Df	SS	MS	F	p
Motivation (Instrumental Motivation)	Public	Between group	119	203.379	1.709	2.328	.000
		Within group	220	161.515	.734		
		Total	339	364.894			
Unity	Public	Between group	119	236.901	1.991	1.893	.000
		Within group	220	231.405	1.052		
		Total	339	468.306			
Communication Apprehension (CA)	Group	Between group	119	196.064	1.648	2.052	.000
		Within group	220	176.674	.803		
		Total	339	372.738			
Personality (Introversion)	Group	Between group	119	168.249	1.414	1.757	.000
		Within group	220	176.998	.805		
		Total	339	345.247			
Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ)	Group	Between group	119	198.791	1.671	2.144	.000
		Within group	220	171.382	.779		
		Total	339	370.184			
Teacher Status (TS)	Group	Between group	119	198.065	1.664	1.753	.000
		Within group	220	208.932	.950		
		Total	339	406.997			
Fear of losing face (FLF)	Dyad	Between group	119	286.427	2.407	3.154	.000
		Within group	220	167.867	.763		
		Total	339	454.294			

Table 3 shows the significantly influencing variables to L2WTC at p less than 0.001. In public context, the significantly influencing variables to L2WTC were instrumental motivation and unity. In group context, the significantly influencing variables to L2WTC were CA, introversion, KKJ, and TS. In dyad context, the significantly influencing variable to L2WTC was FLF. There was none of variables significantly influencing L2WTC reported in meeting context.

3.2 RQ2: What is the contribution of overall and each individual psychosocial and psychocultural factor to willingness to communicate in English of Thai students in immersion program?

With regards to the contribution of overall and each individual psychosocial and psychocultural factors to L2WTC of Thai students in immersion program, the results were organized by questionnaire, focused group interview, and observation report, as follows:

3.2.1 Questionnaire

Table 4 Correlations of Psychosocial and Psychocultural factors to L2WTC

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. CA	-											
2. SPCC	.062	1										
3. Introvert	.446[a]	-.320[a]	1									
4. Extrovert	.113[b]	.607[a]	-.476[a]	1								
5. INST	.115[b]	-.166[a]	.195[a]	-.142[a]	1							
6. INTE	.163[a]	.380[a]	-.069	.435[a]	.097	1						
7. IP	.106	.266[a]	-.036	.345[a]	.182[a]	.403[a]	1					
8. KKJ	.309[a]	-.224[a]	.527[a]	-.300[a]	.226[a]	-.007	.020	1				
9. FLF	.355[a]	-.132[b]	.523[a]	-.192[a]	.186[a]	.104	.063	.562[a]	1			
10. Unity	.267[a]	-.194[a]	.483[a]	-.244[a]	.248[a]	-.073	-.017	.501[a]	.456[a]	1		
11. TS	.251[a]	-.210[a]	.376[a]	-.224[a]	.341[a]	.027	-.002	.430[a]	.368[a]	.415[a]	1	
12. L2WTC	.608[a]	.328[a]	.474[a]	.222[a]	.385[a]	.477[a]	.412[a]	.556[a]	.632[a]	.530[a]	.500[a]	1

CA: communication apprehension; SPCC: self-perceived communication competence; INST: instrumental motivation; INTE: integrative motivation; IP: international posture; KKJ: Kwam Kreng Jai; FLF: fear of losing face; TS: teacher status; L2WTC: willingness to communicate in English

[a]$p < .05$.
[b]$p < .01$.

Table 4 presents a correlation analysis which was conducted to understand the linear relationship among the variables. The results show that L2WTC is positively correlated to all of the variables, and exceptionally has significantly high correlation with FLF (.632**). Other variables are mostly positively correlated to another variable, except a few that negatively correlates such as SPCC and introvert (-.320**), extrovert and introvert (-.476**), integrative motivation and introvert (-.069), and et cetera. Nevertheless, the linear relationships among these variables are not particularly strong.

Table 5 Regression Analysis Summary for Psychosocial and Psychocultural factors to L2WTC

Variables	B	SE B	β	t	p
Self-Perceived Communication Competence	.155	.001	.350	112.201	.000
Fear of Losing Face	0.77	0.01	.228	71.430	.000
Teacher Status	.078	.001	.188	64.804	.000
Personality (Introversion)	.078	.002	.188	50.102	.000
Communication Apprehension	.156	.003	.185	64.144	.000
Kwam Kreng Jai	.076	.001	.182	55.595	.000
Motivation (Instrumental)	.078	.001	.173	64.179	.000
Personality (Extroversion)	.076	.002	.172	45.797	.000
Unity	.075	.001	.167	64.174	.000
Motivation (Integrative)	.075	.001	.167	57.024	.000
International Posture	.077	.002	.133	47.989	.000

Table 5 presents multiple regression analysis, which was conducted to ascertain the contribution of each variable to L2WTC. The finding reveals the R square value of 78%. The result shows that the highest predictor of psychosocial variables was SPCC (β = .350), following by introversion (β = .188). On the other hand, the highest predictor of psychocultural variables was FLF (β = .228), following by TS (β = .188).

3.3.2 Focus Group Interview

The number of five immersion students was interviewed in this part of qualitative study. The interview data reveals the results, which support the quantitative data analysis. The data were as followed:

3.3.2.1 Psychosocial Variables

1. Communication Apprehension (CA)

In addition to the quantitative data, the interview results revealed how the environment and reaction from other interlocutors would cause some immersion students higher CA level to some extent. A participant who graduated from international school in Thailand talked about CA, which related to him speaking in English. The participant said he would be influenced by CA in some cases when it involved with Thai culture. He said,

> "I feel confident every time I speak English, but there are some cases that I am like… don't want to… because other people might think like… oh… you can speak Thai, why you want to speak English, especially in Thai culture. But I grew up in international high school, so every time I did, every time I speak, I will try to deliver in English, mostly.." (SS3)

Another participant, who also had studying background from international school, commented on the specific circumstance when she would feel less comfortable in using English with Thai people. She said,

"Sometimes when I speak English with… let's say… foreigners, I feel more comfortable because I think foreigners are more open-minded than Thai people, but sometimes I like … talk to let's say like… seniors. I feel like less comfortable because I think my grammar would be wrong." (SS4)

The source of CA may not derive from the need to speak in English, but from the intensity from the situation, for example, a participant talked about the situation when she was required to give a presentation in front of her classmates, which it can naturally cause the level of CA to rise up to some extent. She said,

"I think presenting for me, personally, is already pressuring on its own. It doesn't matter what language it is in, whatever, if it's presentation and you're in front of the whole class, they have expectations, and the lecturer is grading you have… especially if it's like a lot of grading, it's like a lot of the great ways on the presentation, that's even more pressuring. It's not about the language setting, I think it's more about how prepared you are for that presentation." (SS1)

The interview data indicates that CA of the immersion students can be caused from several possibilities whether it is cultural related or based on the reaction of their interlocutor. The occasion when CA was certainly guaranteed was relative to formal speaking situation, or precisely when the participants know that they would become the center of attention.

2. Self-Perceived Communication Competence (SPCC)

The quantitative results revealed that the level of SPCC was high among the participants of this study. Multiple regression revealed that SPCC contributed to L2WTC at β = .350 as the highest influencing variable. In addition to quantitative data, the interview data revealed that SPCC can influence the immersion students' L2WTC. One participant who had been studying in overseas since she was young commented on her feeling when she had to use English to communicate. She confidently answered,

"I have no problem communicating English, which I prefer. So if I'm talking to Thai friends in class, or whatever then, I think most of the people in our major would know that... like my group of friends prefers to speak English anyway." (SS5)

The excerpt above shows that the participant had high SPCC towards oral communication skill. However, there were those among the immersion students who perceived their SPCC as low to moderate among the others. A participant from Thai school background who had never been studying abroad said that she would feel uncomfortable to speak in L2 in some situations. She said,

"For me, I'll do it (speak in English) when I have to… in the PC3 (pre-college program) that I have to practice my discussion to pass to PC4. Yeah. And that's it. In college life, erm… for EC3 (Compulsory English speaking course) only. Because I… honestly, I don't like to speak English because I'm not that good.." (SS2)

In addition to either high or low level of SPCC, a participant would feel more or less likely to join L2 conversation based on how they perceived the SPCC of their interlocutor. The same highly proficient participant talked about when she would decide to speak in Thai despite preferring English as her major language. She said,

"I actually always speak English with my group of friends and people who are close that they already know that I prefer to speak English, but when I meet a friend of a friend, who I'm not really close with just having class with, then I would actually speaking Thai because I think some of them prefer speak Thai, so yeah… it depends on people who I'm with." (SS5)

In contrast, for the case that the student perceived SPCC of their interlocutor at low level, the student would react in the opposite way.

"It depends on who I'm talking with. If I'm with my friends from Thai school, I'll prefer talking like… all in Thai because they wouldn't understand if I'm talking in English." (SS4)

The interview data indicates that the participants who had high SPCC would not feel uncomfortable to use L2, but they would switch to using L1 depending on their interlocutor, whether the interlocutor was able to use L2 or which language the interlocutor would prefer. On the other hand, the participant who had low to moderate level of SPCC, would consider factors such as their L2 ability and their knowledge on topic being discussed before they made a decision whether they would engage in an L2 conversation.

3. Motivation

In addition to quantitative data, the interview data revealed that instrumental motivation would involve with the tendency that the participants would react differently on the communication opportunities. A participant who labeled herself as the person who preferred using English as a medium for communication commented on how she perceived the importance of English based on her opinion and not from integrative factors. She said,

"Not only in class, but afterwards when applying for jobs or continuing studies for master degree abroad, then we actually need the communication in English, not just the knowledge in English in class, or… yeah… being in international program will help you better at communicating in English if you actually put yourself out there." (SS5)

In contrast to instrumental motivation, integrative motivation relied on the incentives to speak in English. A participant states that the frequency of her participation would base on her desire to get a better grading for a particular subject. She said,

"I would participate because ten percent means A, you know, B to an A, or C to a B. So, it's actually kind of large percentage. So if I know I'm not gonna do well in midterm and the finals, I'm probably going to participate in every class." (SS1)

Another student also considered the total grade of the course when she decided to participate in classroom's discussion. She said,

"Um. In incentive, for example, like… the score, the participation score, if it gets to have this score, if we put our hand up, so we get the percent out of total grade, so that would be… that would influence on us participate in class." (SS3)

The interview data indicated that the immersion students who had instrumental motivation are likely to participate in L2 communication more than those who had integrative motivation which the tendency to participate would rely on incentives alone.

4. Personality

According to (MacIntyre & Thivierge 1995), introverts were more anxious, reluctant, and had fear of negative evaluation to speak in front of audiences than extroverts did. In addition to quantitative data, the interview data revealed that introverts would assess the situation to participate more than extroverts. One of the participants who labeled herself as an introvert talked about how her decision to speak was influenced by her personality. She said,

> "For me, I'm quite… an introvert person, so <u>I don't really like to initiate the conversation, even in Thai or English.</u> I also like to make new friends, but I don't know how to like… make the conversation first." (SS4)

Another student who also saw herself as an introvert supported the point that her decision to engage in English conversation was influenced from introversion. She said,

> "<u>I think of my personality as the introvert person. So, I'm usually not be the person who start the conversation</u>, so ah…yeah… <u>it might block the opportunity to improve my skill</u>, but now I try to be more extrovert person to add more chance for me to speak English." (SS2)

For the case that the students perceived their personality as extroverts, the participants had no sign of anxiety or hesitation to be the first person to initiate the conversation. One of the students confidently answered regarding his willingness to participate in conversation and interact with others. He said,

> "I am an extrovert, and <u>I kind of like to initiate the conversation because I would like to practice English more</u>, even though I kind of like… don't have any vocabulary." (SS3)

Another participant who also saw herself as an extrovert commented on the similar point that she enjoyed talking and meeting new people while she was using English. She said,

> "For me, I think <u>I'm also an extrovert person, so I like to talk a lot.</u> I like to talk to different people and I like to make new friends, so for me, most of the time I speak half Thai-English. <u>More English with my friends, and not only like talking… when we texting, we use English, too</u>." (SS5)

Another participant who also saw herself as an extrovert talked about some situations when she found her personality as being influenced from Thai collectivist culture. She said,

> "I would consider myself extroverted, but <u>there're times when I wouldn't interact as much</u> because even though I'm in like er… this sort of Thai society, like… collectivist that people tend to stay in groups, <u>I lean towards the individualistic type more.</u> So, erm, it depends on the situation who I'm with." (SS1)

The interview data indicated that the immersion students who saw themselves as introverts would not intend to be the very first person to speak up in communication situation. Due to their nature which tended to think and assess the situation thoroughly, it explained why introversion trait was found significantly influencing to L2WTC in group conversation at p less than 0.0005 along with CA, KKJ, and TS, while extroversion did not. However, those who saw themselves as extroverts would have higher possibilities to engage in L2 conversation, as they were more confident to be at the center of attention, but there could also be a time an extrovert was hesitated to speak in L2 conversation if the environment was not in his/her favor.

5. International Posture (IP)

In addition to quantitative results, the interview data revealed that the immersion students generally showed signs of having interests in international affairs, careers, and travelling as similar to previous studies. However, IP did not necessarily lead to L2WTC in the immersion program but to the use of English in more general sense. One of the participants said,

> "It's like a global language for everyone, especially when you're doing the business, you have to communicate in English, and also when you apply for a job, the language skill is what the employer looking for. So, if you have like... the competitive advantage for this skill, you can… you have higher opportunity for the job that you want to apply." (SS4)

Another participant perceived English as a language for communication purpose, similar to other languages, which are also as important. He said,

> "I think English… not only English, but any languages.. it's like… the matter of languages is to understand the context or the content of the discussion, right? And if you don't speak English, but you still understand, I think English might not be like…so important. But as people in today's world, they start to use English as like… a second language or common language, so I think this is important to follow the trend." (SS3)

Another participant thought of English as a universal language to be used as a medium to communicate with people whose first languages were different. She said,

> "I think it depends on background 'cause for some people... their second language might not be English, but the other languages. Sometimes English… for example, there're people..you know like… erm… with second language like French or German, so sometimes it's actually difficult to communicate with English, but I think at the moment, in a lot of countries, English is available, so at the moment, it's important. The majority of the countries are using English." (SS1)

The interview data indicated that the immersion students had IP in which they set their value on L2 learning and travelling, and regarded the importance of L2 for their future career. But they also did not perceived IP as the sole reason that pushed them to the point at which they would have L2WTC to voluntarily engage in L2 conversation.

3.3.2.2 Psychocultural Variables

1. Fear of Losing Face (FLF)

According to (Pattapong 2010), fear of negative evaluation refers to 'participants' response, which disclosed their concerns about others' negative evaluation towards themselves'. In addition to quantitative data, the interview data revealed that FLF can influence the participants to feel more or less comfortable to engage in L2 conversation. One of the participants mentioned an occasion he would feel uncomfortable to engage in classroom discussion due to FLF. He said,

> "Because of the nature of the Thai culture, we are shy to make mistake. Yeah. So I think if I don't really understand about the specific question, I'd rather feel uncomfortable to answer that question." (SS3)

Another participant also commented on the very similar topic and her answer suggested that FLF can be arised from lacking of knowledge on the topic under discussion. She might as well avoid the situation, which she regarded as having a possibility to make her feel uncomfortable. She said,

> "I think I would speak up if I know the topic, and if I… in case I don't really understand as well as most of my classmates, I think I would rather keep quiet. Because I don't understand, so I have no idea what the answer, so I just don't answer at all." (SS4)

Another participant commented on the nature of Thai culture on how it affected the decision to remain silent in classroom. She said,

> "I think it's nature of Thai culture because people are more shy and don't really speak up, but most of the students will go ask after class, but not really in class." (SS5)

The interview data indicated that FLF had its roots in Thai culture that involved with shyness, and this made the immersion students hesitate to engage in L2WTC if they are uncomfortable with some topics being discussed or the possibility of being judged from others.

2. Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ)

According to (Komin 1990), Kreng-Jai referred to "to be considerate, to feel reluctant to impose upon another person, to take another person's feeling (an ego) into account, or to take every measure not to cause discomfort or inconvenience for another person." In addition to quantitative data, a participant mentioned how she would feel kreng-jai towards other students if she wanted to ask the lecturer to explain on something. She said,

> "Most of the time when I really need further explanation, I'll do it after class. So it doesn't interrupt with other students." (SS5)

Another student mentioned the presence of foreign students in group work would make her feel kreng jai to use Thai to speak with other Thai group members.

> "If there's my close friends in the group and if there's some exchanged students in the group too, I'll try to speak English, so they will understand what we're talking about." (SS2)

The same student, who had secondary school background from Thai school, also mentioned her feeling towards using English with older people in negative light.

> "For the negative side (of the immersion program), sometimes our expression means like we are rude to the elderly." (SS2)

The interview data indicated that KKJ can be found in immersion students in communication situations involving their peers and teachers. KKJ can make the immersion students hesitate to engage in a conversation if they felt that others would be impacted by their action, whether it is the conversation in classroom or within group work. And for the participant who was not used to using English, KKJ would influence on L2WTC in the sense that the participant felt she was being rude towards older person when she was using English.

3. Unity

In addition to quantitative data, the interview data revealed that unity did not highly influence the immersion students' L2WTC. However, it would influence on how the student decide which language they should speak based on conformity. A participant mentioned how she would assess others' response and ability to use English before she decided to use the language to converse with them. She said,

> "I think it is like… if there's like five people and they're all people I don't know. If their English isn't good, then maybe I'll use Thai with them. But if it's like everyone's okay with English, then I'll use English." (SS4)

Another participant also supported the point that she would observe the interlocutor's response and the language he/she preferred before she made a decision to use English with them. She said,

> "I think it depends on the question. if they ask me in English, I will answer it in English, but if they ask me in Thai, I'll response in Thai." (SS2)

The interview data indicated that unity would be more or less likely depend on the interlocutor. The students would observe their interlocutors first and then spoke in the language, which the rest of their interlocutors were comfortable with.

9. Teacher Status (TS)

(Pattapong 2010) found that both low and high L2WTC participants chose to talk with their peers rather than with teachers due to the social distance of student-teacher relationship in classroom. In addition to quantitative data, one of the participants stated that she sometimes felt uncomfortable to speak with some lecturers due to their attitude and negative responses. She said,

> "If it's a lecturer who is very strict, and it's saying like, you know, if you get it wrong, you're going to be… you're going to feel like you're put on trials. I probably not answer if it's uncomfortable." (SS1)

Another participant also had experience the kind of similar negative responses from a teacher, and it was the reason why he decided not to continue the conversation with the lecturer. He said,

> "When I ask ajarn (lecturer), can you repeat the question again? and he's kind of like… like it was like his time, and he has his time limit on the content of the class, and what I get was 'don't you understand English?' I was like... okay, I'll ask him later." (SS3)

Another participant pointed out the occasion when she wanted to remain silent towards her teacher due to the topic under discussion because she cannot predict the outcome of her participation. She said,

> "If you don't understand the topic, you don't really want to speak out because you don't really know you are right or wrong, and most of the time with the teachers." (SS4)

The interview data revealed that teacher status would interfere the decision of immersion students to engage in L2WTC based on the positive or negative responses they received from lecturers. The participants perceived the standpoint of each teacher differently, leading to them being likely or less likely to engage in L2 communication in classroom.

3.3.3 Observation

Observation was conducted during the focused group interview. The results were interpreted by descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation.

Table 6 Observation Schedule

Observation Schedule	Statements	SS1	SS2	SS3	SS4	SS5	$\bar{x}$	*S.D.*
Behavioral Intention	1) Raising their hand	9	0	2	1	4	3.20	3.56
	2) Voluntarily share their opinion during the discussion	1	3	2	3	1	2.00	1.00
	3) Be the first person to answer discussion question	29	0	2	4	0	7.00	12.41
Other Behavioral Performances	4) Nodding	1	1	3	1	1	1.40	0.89
	5) Eye contact	6	1	7	13	6	6.60	4.28
	6) Hand gesture	7	5	6	8	9	7.00	1.58

Table 6 shows data recorded from observation schedule of the interviewees. The observation schedule revealed that those who were likely to participate in conversation would had more frequent noticeable behavioral performances. The data showed that being the first person to answer discussion question and having hand gesture had the highest mean score ($\bar{x}$ =7.00), whereas nodding had the lowest mean score ($\bar{x}$ =1.40). However, the results also indicated that there was no clear distinction in terms of behavioral performances between the introvert and extrovert interviewees that could predict L2WTC.

4. Discussion

The previous section highlights key findings of this study. Following (MacIntyre et al. 1998)'s Heuristic Model in relation to (Pattapong 2010)'s as conceptual frameworks, three major conclusions of the L2WTC researches in Thai context were derived by this present study including the interrelations among psychosocial and psychocultural variables in Thai L2WTC contexts, CA as the major influencing variable to L2WTC of the immersion students, and the relationship between Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ) and Unity.

4.1 The Interrelations Among Psychosocial and Psychocultural Variables in Thai L2WTC contexts

Initially, it was believed that the results of this study can single out the highly L2WTC influencing variables. However, with regards to the quantitative result of the variables in this present study, it showed that even though a few variables possessed high influencing power to L2WTC, it would be impossible to single out only a few variables as the correlation results showed that almost all variables were significantly related.

However, one-way ANOVA results made it possible to look at some variables which significantly influenced L2WTC at p less than .005 during communication contexts including instrumental motivation and unity in public, CA, introversion, KKJ, and TS in group

conversation, and FLF in dyad conversation. Multiple regression results also revealed the level of contribution to L2WTC which can be ranked from SPCC ($\beta = .167$), FLF ($\beta = .288$), TS and introversion ($\beta = .188$), CA ($\beta = .185$), KKJ ($\beta = .182$), instrumental motivation ($\beta = .173$), extroversion ($\beta = .172$), unity and integrative motivation ($\beta = .167$), and IP ($\beta = .133$). Therefore, it can inform about the L2WTC study in the immersion context. The reason why SPCC ($\beta = .167$) held the highest level of contribution to L2WTC was understandable due to the fact that the participants of this present study perceived their communication competence as very high ($\bar{x} = 3.83$).

4.2 CA as the major influencing variable to L2WTC of the immersion students

According to the result of this present study, two major CA scores lied on the other ends of the reversed score items from quantitative data ('I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions' / $\bar{x} = 3.48$) and ('I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions' / $\bar{x} = 2.77$). Such results revealed that the level of CA among the participant was moderate. One-way ANOVA results also revealed that CA can significantly influence L2WTC at p less than 0.001 in group discussion. Initially, CA was linked to SPCC as the two major variables that can predict L2WTC. That is, if one had low level of CA and high level of SPCC, it was likely that the person would have high L2WTC and the intention to engage in the L2 communication situation, and vice versa. However, as the results of SPCC in this present study, which was usually served as an important affective filter to L2WTC, leaned towards the high, positive side when CA was moderate, the result suggested that, the level of CA did not solely rely on level of SPCC anymore in case of the immersion students. This statement can be supported by correlation result between CA and SPCC which was not significant and was the lowest among the linear relationships ($r = .062$)

However, the results of recruiting high proficient participants also proved that once the L2WTC research excluded the low proficient level out of the context of study, the variables that actually account to L2WTC became more apparent. With the qualitative results of this present study, it was believed that the cause of CA might come from the communication situation involving peers and teachers in a variety of contexts. The next sub-section will discuss the situation where CA might be influenced from interacting with peers, following by CA which would derive from interacting with teachers.

4.2.1 CA from Interactions with Peers

According to (MacIntyre et. al. 1998), one of the numerous factors influencing the level of L2WTC comprised of 'familiarity between speakers, the number of people present, the formality of the situation, the degree of to which the speakers might be being evaluated, the topic of discussion, and situational elements'. It was possible that some of these conditions were met in group discussion situation, which was found in one-way ANOVA results that it was the communication situation where L2WTC was affected the most.

According to (MacIntyre et. al. 1998), it is not certain that proficient learners would use L2 to communicate although they become communicatively competent in the classroom. This present study found the results highlighting such remark as SPCC level among the immersion students could vary in a context of L2 communication, particularly during group conversation where L2 was required. As the highest level of SPCC in communication situation with a small group of friends ($\bar{x} = 4.20$) rather than with a big group of strangers ($\bar{x} = 3.16$), it was doubted what made L2WTC level vary could come from the interpersonal relationships among the interlocutors. Such remark can be relative to (MacIntyre et. al. 1998)'s L2WTC pyramid model

at Layer IV: Motivational Propensities, which the ground of interpersonal relationships among interlocutors (Box 5: Interpersonal motivation) or feeling of belongingness to a specific group, the communication context, climate, and the attitudes of the group that the speaker was a part of (Box 6: Intergroup Motivation), could explain the rationale behind the moderate L2WTC level of the immersion students despite having high SPCC level. A few excerpts from a qualitative part of this study can support how motivational propensities were relative to the change in SPCC level. The first excerpt was given by a participant who perceived communicating English as a very normal occasion in her daily life as well as for those who were in her circles. She said,

> 'I'm not good at Thai since the beginning because I went to school in Canada for four years. And then I came back to Thailand and erm… so I kinda lost all the… most of the knowledge about Thai language, and then I use most of my English, and then I came here, and then I made… some friends who also like… came from abroad or like… whole life in international school, so <u>my group of friends always prefer speaking English, even though we're Thai, we would talk in Thai a little bit and mix with English</u>.' (SS5)

The second excerpt was given by a participant who graduated from Thai school, and then enrolled in the immersion program. Compared to the former participant, there must be a specific, or a certain condition for this participant to use English. Such conditions might depend on the climate of the group she belonged to. She said,

> "<u>For me, I think I feel okay to speak English when I have to be in the group discussion or in the public speaking</u> like EC3 (a compulsory English course which mainly focuses on speaking and presentation skills) or something, but <u>if it's just a chit chat with my friend, I would prefer to speak Thai</u>." (SS2)

For the conversation with peers, it seemed that the influence from motivational propensities and outer factors such as contextual factors, topical knowledge, and level of interpersonal relationship among the interlocutors could lead to CA from interactions with peers. The qualitative part of this study suggested that higher level of CA was not necessarily caused from the participants' awareness of having to speak in L2, and this result replicated to (McCroskey, Gudykunst, & Nishida 1985) who found that CA level of their participants was not necessarily increase from L2 speaking. One of the factors contributing to this condition was the participants' high level of language proficiency. The results also replicated to (Hashimoto 2002) who conducted a study among ESL advanced language learners and found that frequent communication in L2 was not significantly predicted by SPCC. As it was found that the cause of CA did not only rise from interacting with peers, the next section will discuss on CA from interactions with teachers.

4.2.2 CA from Interactions with Teachers

Teacher status was the last psychocultural variable investigated in this present study, and it was also the psychocultural variable that contained the third highest contributing level to L2WTC of the immersion students ($\beta = .188$) along with introversion. The quantitative result reviewed that the immersion students perceived teacher status in public context-type as very important ($\bar{x} = 3.24$: 'I use Thai in conversations with my Thai teachers outside classroom because I think the language is more polite than English language.') compared to the group context-type which had the least mean score ($\bar{x} = 2.79$: 'If my teacher is nearby when I am doing group work with my friends, I would speak quietly or not at all.'). With regards to these results, it became clear that the concept of teacher status, which mainly involved teachers' strong presence and great social distance exercised between teacher and students, were extraordinary practiced in the context of this present study. One of the participants, who came from international background, mentioned how the 'presence' and 'social distance' of some lecturers can stop her from willingly engage in communication situation to remain silent. The participants said:

> "Sometimes <u>I don't feel comfortable asking certain lecturers</u>, but sometimes, some lecturers are cool with dumb questions. Some lecturers also make it specific that they don't like students to ask them 'Can you repeat this?' 'Can you say this again?' They would make it clear." (SS1)

Another participant also supported on the similar point that he would remain silent if he felt that he would get negative response from one teacher, while being more active if he would get positive response from the other. He said,

> "<u>It depends on who is the teacher</u>, so for example, I took management science this trimester, and the topic is very hard and he always asks the students that do you guys have any question? I want to ask him and he's like came to me and my friends and like… <u>his voice tone is pretty negative, so after that I don't ask at all</u>. So it depends on who is the teacher and compared to another subject in business negotiation, I always ask her." (SS3)

With regards to (Pattapong 2010), two cultural characteristics, which seemed to lead to teacher status included the hierarchical structure of Thai society and a grateful relationship. In Thailand, the hierarchical structure of classroom is usually conducted with the aspect of 'teacher-center', or the traditional teaching pedagogy which disregarded students as the priority and often ignores student needs. Teacher-center teaching practice not only was found in Thailand, but also found in L2WTC research in Japanese context. (Maftoon & Ziafar 2013) found that Japanese learners of English were influenced by teacher-center factors including anxiety towards initiating conversations, raising new topics, and challenging their teachers, and Japanese culture which values indirect speech, face saving, group conformity, reticence, and competition avoidance. Such educational mistreat may be blamed as an influence on students' silence in the immersion program in the current study. For students who graduated from regular Thai program from public or private schools in Thailand, it might be convincing that they likely adopt 'passive learning' behavior as a result from Thai traditional classroom environment. A participant who came from Thai secondary school mentioned about this topic regarding crossing some line of the teacher-student classroom relationship when she was asked about the positive and negative sides of studying in the immersion program. She said:

> "For the positive side (of immersion program), I think it is er… we have more opportunity to express our idea… because in Thai school… we are like in the Box. The teachers will teach what they have been teaching before and our idea is not really important for them, and for the negative side, <u>sometimes our expression means like we are rude to the elderly.</u>" (SS2)

With regards to the linguistic distance between L1 (Thai) and L2 (English), it involves not only the language structure, but also other elements including thoughts, culture, socialization, rank, order, or even politeness embedded in the use of L1. With the nature of L1, or Thai language, it is a social code of conduct for Thais to use interjections of 'ka' (used by female) and 'krub' (used by male) to represent the form of respect towards the other persons. These interjections are usually used with someone who is older, or someone who is socially distanced from themselves in terms of age and rank. Compared with the natural structure of English which does not contain such endings, which embedded the sense of formality, some immersion students or those who are greatly influenced from the linguistic distance might feel uneasy to use English which does not include the same kinds of very language sensitivity towards teachers who are considered as the authoritative figure in classroom.

TS also had relationships towards other psychosocial variables in this study. Although the result of this present study presented that FLF only impeded on the immersion students' L2WTC moderately, the item that had the highest mean score in meeting context-type which related to teacher presence ($\bar{x}$ = 2.89: 'I fear that my teacher would point out that I do not have enough knowledge on the topic under discussion.') and the lowest mean score item was in dyad context-type in relation to peer presence ($\bar{x}$ = 2.62: 'I fear that my friend would know that I do not have enough knowledge on the topic under discussion.'). These results were replicated to (Pattapong 2010), who found that the participants of her study chose to stay quiet in both interactions with teachers and with peers to avoid the risk of losing face. A participant talked about on how teachers seemed to be those who influenced her decision to engage or remain silent in a communication situation. She said,

> 'For example, in like… I would say in a particular topic, in any subjects, like <u>if you don't understand the topic, you don't really want to speak out because you don't really know you are right or wrong, and most of the time with the teachers.</u>' (SS4)

As previous studies including (Komin 1990) and (Chaidaroon 2003) quoted that Thais would take their spoken contents as the representation of their 'face', and losing 'face' was critically concerned, it led them to behave in the way of remaining silent to people whom they were not closed with and it was regarded as the concept of 'face protection.' In some sense, this would mean that CA rose higher during the communication situation when it relates to TS or FL. The next section will discuss the connection between Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ) and Unity, which mainly deal with the situation involving those with distanced interpersonal relationship between the interlocutors.

4.3 Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ) and Unity

Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ), or the cultural element that would influence ones' intention to avoid causing others discomfort or inconvenience, was a variable that was found in learners with high and low L2WTC (Pattapong 2010). In general, it seemed that the context of KKJ in this present study might not differ from those of the non-immersion context, as the findings of KKJ in terms of quantitative study of this present study found that KKJ impeded the L2WTC

of the immersion students the most in terms of public context-type ($\bar{x}$ = 2.94: I hesitate to request for products or services from strangers.') and the least in group context-type ($\bar{x}$ = 2.71: 'I hesitate to request for cooperation from my group members.'). However, from these results, it suggested that the number of people presented in the scene, the intrapersonal level among the interlocutors, and the formality of the event could alter the immersion students' decision to engage in L2 conversation, as stated by (Chaidaroon 2003) that KKJ represented 'a person's gaining of social respect and recognition in a Thai community', and 'a reciprocal process to create, maintain, honor, and/or protecting the face of another interlocutor, while expecting that the interlocutor would respond with the similar KKJ in return.'. The qualitative result of this present study suggested how KKJ would intervene with L2WTC if the participant perceived that their interlocutor would feel uncomfortable with the use of L2, and this part would connect to unity, or the need to comply with what others do. One of the participants mentioned how she would assess the language that her interlocutor might prefer before making a decision whether she would speak in Thai or in English. She said,

> "It depends on who I'm talking with. <u>If I'm with my friends from Thai school, I'll prefer talking like… all in Thai because they wouldn't understand if I'm talking in English,</u> and it's much better to talk in Thai with particularly group of people you're dealing with." (SS4)

Another participant also added the point how KKJ might influence her decision to choose which language to speak with her interlocutors. She said,

> "I actually always speak English with my group of friends and people who are close that they already know that I prefer to speak English, but <u>when I meet a friend of a friend, who I'm not really close with just having class with, then I would actually speaking Thai because I think some of them prefer speak Thai,</u> so yeah… it depends on people who I'm with." (SS5)

Due to the fact that KKJ concerns the social respect and recognition from other people, while unity regards the conformity in society as more usual practice in Thai culture, in a possible scenario, it could be that a person might develop KKJ towards the other person if he/she uses the language that did not comply to what the other person was comfortable with. This means that one's decision to engage in communication situation depended on the role of their interlocutors.

Similar concept of the influence of group cohesiveness and classroom communication behaviors on L2WTC was found by (Thong-Iam 2010). Nevertheless, in this study, the context of unity did not only rely on classroom communication, but had extended further outside classroom environment. The result of this present study revealed that unity had the lowest mean score for questionnaire items out of the four psychocultural variables, which the highest mean score was for the item assessing dyad context-type ($\bar{x}$ = 2.89: 'I hesitate to use English with my friend if he/she usually replies to me in Thai.'), while the lowest mean score was for the public context-type ($\bar{x}$ = 2.62: 'I hesitate to initiate the talk in group discussion when my peers are quiet.'). Even though such result might not contradict to (Pattapong 2010)'s definition on the concept of unity responses as supported by the qualitative data, it would be plausible to suggest that the definition of 'unity' need to be revised to be applicable for the explanation of immersion context.

5. Conclusions

This study can explain the L2WTC contexts of Thai students in immersion programs on factors contributing to L2WTC among immersion students. Teachers, course designers, and scholars may take into account the findings of this study to design effective learning environment for Thai immersion students to assert their ideas, or speak out where participation of English is required.

6. Acknowledgements

7. Appendices

Appendix A: questionnaire

Thesis Title: Factors Contributing to Willingness to Communicate in English of Thai Undergraduate Students in the Immersion Program

This questionnaire is a part of a thesis. The purposes of this questionnaire are to investigate the psychosocial and psychocultural variables influencing willingness to communicate in English (L2WTC) and to determine the influence of the psychosocial and psychocultural variables towards L2WTC of Thai undergraduate students in immersion program. The researcher promises to keep your information confidential and guarantees that your answers to the questionnaires will not affect you in any ways.

The report of the findings will be presented in overall results. Please answer every question attentively. Your answers are very valuable to the research. Providing truthful information will be make the research more accurate. Thank you for your cooperation and your time. This questionnaire is divided into two parts including the participants' background information and factors contributing to willingness to communicate in English.

Part 1: The Participants' Background Information

Instructions: Please tick the given boxes that represent your demographic information.

1.1 Gender ☐ Male   ☐ Female   ☐ Don't want to identify

1.2 Age ☐ Below 18 years old
☐ 18 - 20 years old
☐ above 20 years old

1.3 What is your current year in college?
☐ first year students   ☐ second year student   ☐ others (plese specify) _____
☐ third year student   ☐ fourth year student

1.4 What is your major?
☐ Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)   ☐ Bachelor of Communication Arts (B.Com.Arts.)
☐ Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.)
☐ Bachelor of Engineering (B.Eng.) Computer Engineering
☐ Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.) International Hospitality Management
☐ Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)

1.5 Did you complete your secondary education in international schools, international programs, or have experience in studying overseas?

☐ Yes, I studied in

☐ International school   ☐ International program   ☐ Overseas

☐ No, I graduated from Thai secondary school.

1.6 (*Skip this question if your answer on question number 1.5 is 'No'*)

How long did you study in international school, international program, or have experience in studying overseas?

☐ Less than one year   ☐ A few years

☐ More than 3 years (Please specify) _____ years.

1.7 Please tick the compulsory English courses that you have already taken at theuniversity.

☐ ERS   ☐ EC I   ☐ EC II   ☐ EC III   ☐ EC IV

☐ Advanced English communication I   ☐ Advanced English communication II

1.8 Please write your contact information: (Optional)

Email: _____

Phone Number: _____

Line ID: _____

Part 2: Factors Contributing to Willingness to Communicate in English

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking '✔' into the box that closely represents yourself.

5 means this statement represents yourself the highest.
4 means this statement highly represents yourself.
3 means this statement moderately represents yourself.
2 means this statement lowly represents yourself.
1 means this statement represents yourself the lowest.

Statements	5	4	3	2	1
1. I dislike participating in group discussions.					
2. I can present a speech to my classmates despite being given a short amount of time.					
3. I hesitate to ask questions and comments to my classmates after they gave a presentation in front of the classroom.					
4. I use English as a means to understand different cultures embedded in the language.					
5. I am very calm and relaxed when the instructor asks me to express my opinions in classroom.					
6. I am very confident to speak in English with a stranger.					
7. I fear that my teacher would mention that my answers are incorrect in front of my classmates.					
8. I am sometimes shy to talk in front of many classmates whom I do not know well.					
9. I am afraid to speak up in group conversations.					
10. I am very confident to speak with friends in English.					
11. I avoid giving my answers to class if I do not have enough knowledge on the topic under discussion.					
12. I use English because it is widely spoken by people around the globe.					
13. I get nervous and worried if I have to talk with a friend whom I do not know well.					
14. I want to make friends with international students studying in the same class.					
15. I tend to participate in class discussion when someone has already started.					
16. I am very confident to speak in English at a large meeting of acquaintances.					
17. I prefer to work alone or only work in a group with a few people.					
18. I study English because I can broaden my outlook.	1				

Statements	5	4	3	2	1
19. I am fear that my Thai friends may have negative impression on me if I speak in classroom too much.					
20. I try to avoid talking with foreigners if I can.					
21. I prefer to actively listen rather than speak in classroom as it shows my way of classroom participation and respect to teachers.					
22. I tend to keep quiet when I am in a big group of people.					
23. I would feel somewhat uncomfortable to work with an international student for group work.					
24. I study English because I may need to use it later for jobs or studies.					
25. I hesitate to speak in class when my peers are quiet.					
26. I choose to talk only with a certain person whom I feel comfortable with.					
27. I would talk to an international student before he/she talks to me.					

Comments and Suggestions:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

By submitting this questionnaire I agree that my answers, which I have given voluntarily, can be used anonymously for research purposes.

Appendix B: Interview questions

Components	Items
1. Social and individual context *refers to participants' attitudes towards learning English derived from their English learning experience, personality, and interest.'*	1. Would you share your experience in immersion program?
	1.1 What would be the reasons that you choose to study in the immersion program?
	1.2 What would be your opinion regarding using English as a medium for communication in immersion environment?
	2. How often would you engage in a classroom discussion?
	3. How would your personality influence you on the frequency of communication in English with other?
	4. How important do you think English is as a means of communications with people from different first language?
2. Classroom context *refers to how the participants felt when they spoke English in class in different situations and with different interlocutors.*	5. What would be your opinion regarding using English as a medium for communication with your teacher in a classroom context?
	5.1 Would you feel comfortable if your teacher ask you some content-specific questions?
	5.2 Would you ask your teacher to explain more on certain parts of the lesson that are quite unclear?
	5.3 How did you feel when your teacher corrected your English?
	6. How did you feel when you had to use English with your Thai friends in class?
	6.1 Would you keep quiet if your friend is more fluent in English as compared to you? Why?
	6.2 Have you ever kept quiet because you were afraid of your friend laughing at your accent? Why?
	5.1 How do you feel when you are being observed by your classmates while you are presenting in English?
	7. Do you choose to speak English with some particular people only?

Components	Items
	8. Who do you speak English with most, between your teacher and your friends?
	9. In what situation would you speak most, between speaking in pairs or speaking in groups?
3. Psychological context addressed issues about psychological factors and willingness to communicate.	10. What would be the reason, if any, for you to hesitate or engage in English conversation?
	11. On a scale of one to ten, where ten is the highest competence, how would you rate your ability to use English for communication purposes -reading, -writing, -listening, -speaking? (Ask them to evaluate skills separately.)
	12. How would you describe your feelings when you speak in English?
	12.1 Were you confident?
	12.2 Were you afraid of making mistakes?
	12.3 Were you embarrassed when you made mistakes?
	12.4 Were you afraid that your friends would have negative impression on you?

(OPENED QUESTIONS)

Components	Items
4. Psychocultural context *refers to factors which are in between cultural orienation and social norms, and is an abstract concept which resides in the mind and perception towards social beliefs of a person.*	13. What are your positive and negative impressions of studying in the immersion environment?
	14. Do Thai students volunteer to participate in classroom discussion using English? What would be the reasons of doing so?
	15. Do Thai students speak in classroom as much as foreign students do in classroom? What would be the reasons of doing so?

Appendix C: scenarios for group discussion

Components	Items
1. Social and individual context *refers to participants' attitudes towards learning English derived from their English learning experience, personality, and interest.'*	1. The class is about to end. Your foreign teacher asks if anyone has any question or comment. You have a question but it is the topic that your teacher has just explained in detail. Will you ask your teacher about it?
	2. In the beginning of every trimester, your teacher informs you about the criteria that participating in classroom discussion will account for 10% of your overall grade. To show that you really participate in his class, will you speak up in discussion every class? What factors will influence your participation?
2. Classroom context *refers to how the participants felt when they spoke English in class in different situations and with different interlocutors.*	3. Your teacher assigns you to form group of 5 and work with your friends whom you are quite close with. What might deter you from engaging in a conversation in English with them?
	4. Your teacher assigns you to form group of 5 with classmates you have never talked with before. What might deter you from engaging in a conversation in English with them?
	5. You know every classmate in your class but not on a personal level. One day, you went to class early and there was no one except a couple of foreigners who were also your classmates there. Your teacher had not arrived yet, so those two foreign students were talking with each other. They knew that you arrived so they said hello to you. What might deter you from taking this opportunity to engage in a conversation with them?
	6. There are 30 students in your class. The class has just started for a few minutes. Your foreign teacher asks for a volunteer to answer to his question about the topic from last class, but your classmates keep quiet. Will you take this opportunity to speak in the classroom?

Note: Scenarios for psychological and psychocultural contexts were not included on purpose because mentioning them in the scenarios may become too suggestive for the participants. If there is any influence from one of the contexts, it may come up during the discussion among the participants.

Appendix D: observation schedule

Observation Schedule for focus group interview		The Frequency of Participants' Behavioral Intention							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Behavioral Intention	1) Raising their hand								
	2) Voluntarily share their opinion during the discussion								
	3) Be the first person to answer the discussion question								
Other Behavioral performances									
		The Frequency of Discussed Keywords by the Participants							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Psychosocial Factors									

Communication Apprehension (CA)								
Self-Perceive Communicative Competence (SPCC)								
Motivation								
Personality: introversion / extraversion								
International Posture								
Psychocultural Factors								
Fear of Losing Face								
Kreng-Jai								
Unity								
Teacher Status								
Other Factors								

8. References

Chaidaroon, S. (2003). When shyness is not incompetence: A case of Thai communication competence. *Intercultural Communication Studies,* 12-4, Asian Approaches to Human Communication.

Dornyei, Z. (2010). Chapter 7 Other Learner Characteristics. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*, 207-210. Routledge.

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictor of reported L2 use: the Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies,* 20(2), 29-70.

Komin, S. (1990). *The psychology of Thai people.* Research Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok.

Krejcie, R. & Morgan, W. (1970) Determine Sample Size for Research Activities. Small-Sample Techniques. *The NEA Research Bulletin*, Vol. 38, 99. December 1960.

Lahuerta, C. (2014). Factors affecting willingness to communicate in a Spanish university context. *International Journal of English Studies,* 14 (2), 39-55.

Lazaraton, A. (2013). Second Language Speaking. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & A. Snow (eds.), *Teaching English as a Second of Foreign Language* (4th ed.), 106-120. Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning / Cengage Learning.

Maftoon, P. & Ziafar, M. (2013). Effective Factors in Interactions within Japanese EFL Classrooms. *The Clearing House,* 86, 74–79. Taylor and Francis group. Routledge.

MacIntyre, D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 15, 3-26.

MacIntyre, D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z. & Noels, K. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 545-562.

MacIntyre, D. & Thivierge, A. (1995). The Effects of Speaker Personality on Anticipated Reactions to Public Speaking. In McCroskey, J.C. and Howard, M.A. (Eds). *Communication Research Reports,* vol. 12 no. 2.

McCroskey, C., & Baer, E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: the construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO. November.

McCroskey, C., Gudykunst, B., & Nishida, T. (1985). Communication apprehension among Japanese students in native and second language. *Communication Research Reports,* 2, 11-15.

McCroskey, C. & McCroskey, L. (1988). Self-report as an approach to measuring communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 5*, 108-113.

McCroskey, C. & Richmond, P. (2013). Willingness to communicate (WTC). Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from www.midss.ie

Pattapong, K. (2010). *Willingness to communicate in a second language: a qualitative study of issues affecting Thai EFL learners from students' and teachers' points of view.* Ph.D thesis. Faculty of Education and Social work, University of Sydney.

Ponata, W. (2015). *A study of upper secondary school English as a foreign language (EFL) Thai students' anxiety in English language classroom.* A Master Degree Thesis, Mahidol University.

Suksawas, W. (2001). *A sociocultural study of EFL learners' willingness to communicate.* Ph.D thesis of Education thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong. Retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3427

Thong-Iam, N. (2010). Willingness to communicate and English classroom communication behaviors, Vol.1, issue 1, 2. Chulalongkorn University.

Wen, P., & Clement, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum,* 16, 18-38.

Zhou, Y., Knoke, D. & Sakamoto, I. (2005). Rethinking silence in the classroom/ Chinese students' experiences of sharing indigenous knowledge. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* Vol. 9, No. 3, 287–311. Routledge. July–September. 2005.

9. Correspondence details

Nitchamon Suvongse
Faculty of Liberal Arts
1554/4 Soi. Thammararoj
Pracharaj Road, Bang-Sue
Bangkok, Thailand, 10800

Nitchamon.s@gmail.com

Natthapong Chanyoo, PhD
The Graduate Program in Applied Linguistics,
Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University
Nakhon Pathom, Thailand 73170

Natthapong.cha@mahidol.edu

10. Research Grant