NURTURING ENGLISH LANGUAGE CONFIDENCE: EXAMINING WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE (WTC) AMONG NONLANGUAGE MAJORS

Bacolod, Mary Antonette[1], Flores, Berhana[2], Aidil-Karanain, Fhadzralyn[3], Jeremiah Calisang

Western Mindanao State University, Normal Rd., Baliwasan, Zamboanga City, 7000 Philippines[1,2,3,4]

For Correspondence: maryantonetteolivarbacolod@gmail.com[*]

ABSTRACT. *Language as a means of communication follows a variety of functions to perform. Its fundamental goal is to develop interaction and communication in each social context, and the matter of nonlanguage learners' willingness to communicate in L2 predicts their participation in in-class and in out-class activities. Hence, this existing study employing quantitative-descriptive-correlational design, aimed to examine their level of willingness to communicate and communication confidence in L2. One hundred seventy-seven nonlanguage majors were sampled, and through an adapted polished questionnaire on WTC, a 'high' level of willingness to communicate was exhibited by the respondents. Moreover, when it comes to communication confidence, respondents attained a 'confident' level in using L2. Along with the preceding lines, there were gender differences established across the investigated variables in WTC, claiming that out of two dimensions (in-class or out-class activities), males are more willing to communicate than females. The findings also revealed evidence of a positive and substantial association between WTC and communication confidence where details of the results are presented.*

Keywords: Willingness to communicate, Second language acquisition, Communication confidence, Nonlanguage majors, Gender

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the main trends in second language teaching have changed dramatically over time, the dominant approach around the world is communicative language teaching [1]. It is involved in communication, allowing language learners to develop their communication skills [2]. However, even though the improvement of the learner's communication skills is the primary objective of communicative language education, effective communication requires more than just a significant level of communication competence.

From this point, it was noted that it is not uncommon to come across individuals who hold a high amount of communicative competence and yet avoid L2 communication situations [3]. Considering this, one can speculate that there are other psychological, verbal, and contextual components that influence the initiation and success of an individual in terms of communication. With the 'linguistic shift' in modern social theory, there has been an expanding interest in investigating non-pedagogical or pedagogical activities to learners as they create social relations.

In accordance with this view, a construct called willingness to communicate (WTC), globally characterized as *"readiness to participate in conversation with a particular individual or people at a specific time using L2"* [4], has emerged to be an effective factor in the communication preferences and tendencies of L2 individuals [5] This definition presents a dual structure of the L2 WTC [6]. Thus, the current investigation can be generally subdivided into two areas, examining the antecedent history of L2 WTC as a state or trait correspondingly.

Since WTC found its way into L2 research as an independent background variable, few studies [7, 8] have considered L2 WTC as an unstable state have focused primarily on L2 WTC and contextual factors including the types of activities, classroom climate, subject areas, class size, and style of teaching. In another direction, there are other studies [7, 9 - 11] that tend to treat L2 WTC as a consistent individual trait, examining some antecedents such as anxiety, cultural context, age, gender, personality, and motivation. Consequently, at this trait level, the understanding is relatively inadequate. Certain trait levels, such as gender, which has been identified in most recent studies as an important affecting factor in differentiating rate and outcomes in second language learning among various language students, have never been thoroughly examined regarding the L2 WTC [11]. In addition, studies predicting L2 WTC were usually performed only in secondary schools, and students at higher educational institutions wherein diversity was far more frequently observed, remain relatively unexplored.

Although WTC in L2 has typically been examined traditionally as a collective variable, a distinction has been drawn among various dimensions well inside the WTC structure. The overall WTC is mainly composed of form-focused and meaning-focused tasks [12, 13]. These aspects conceptualize WTC in various communication tasks. The WTC in terms of meaning-focused tasks is the students' willingness to speak outside of other teachers and within a large audience. In comparison, WTC in terms of form-focused tasks is the students' willingness to express and speak English inside the class or in a confined audience. Considering the said different communication behaviors, it can be assumed that WTC may be different for learners. Therefore, further research is needed to examine learners' WTC regarding meaning-focused tasks and form-focused tasks.

Furthermore, some experts in accordance with WTC, contend that the WTC of the students in L2 is mostly anticipated with communication confidence as well [14–16]. For example, according to Ortega [17], multiple studies have demonstrated a link connecting WTC in L2 and communicative confidence, ranging from 0.60 to 0.80, showing a strong positive relationship among two variables. Thus, it is possible to assert that communication is in high demand, and in such circumstances where class activities often demand interactive communication, it will also test the learners' perceived communication competence.

Hence, with the two dimensions that conceptualize WTC, and with the effect of gender which has been neglected even though it is considered a crucial variable, the existing study attempted to evaluate the relationship of gender to the WTC

in terms of meaning-focused and form-focused tasks among nonlanguage students in a higher education institution.

Research Questions

The recent study sought to determine the willingness to communicate among tertiary students specifically nonlanguage majors in the matter of gender and their level of communication confidence. The entirety of the investigation was led through the succeeding queries:

1. What is the overall WTC among nonlanguage majors?
2. What is the difference between gender and WTC among nonlanguage majors in terms of:
a. meaning-focused activities (outside class); and
b. form-focused activities (during speaking class)
3. What is the level of communication confidence among nonlanguage majors?
4. Is there a significant relationship between nonlanguage majors' willingness to communicate and their communication confidence in English?

II. METHODODOLOGY

Research Design

The existing investigation employed a descriptive-quantitative-correlational research design. Creswell [18] asserts that quantitative design is fit to use when the primary objective of the study involves information that can be quantified and yield statistical evidence, as the case of this investigation which sought to accurately measure the latent variable willingness to communicate (WTC) and level of communication competence among nonlanguage majors. Likewise, the study was recognized as descriptive since it performed the characterization of the respondents' willingness to communicate and their level of communication competence through data collection, tabulation and data analysis using the statistical descriptions limited to the arithmetic mean and standard deviation. Additionally, the study gathered information within a reasonably short time frame, resulting in a cross-sectional inquiry [19] that was achieved through the utilization of a web-based survey method which is an effective approach for studies with a large sample size.

Respondents

To be able to determine whether the respondents were fit to carry out the objectives of the study, an inclusion criterion was set by the researcher to settle the eligibility of the respondents. Accordingly, the respondents of the study should be (1) nonlanguage majors; (2) a student studying under the College of Teacher Education Program, and (3) an undergraduate (1st year to 3rd year) student at Western Mindanao State University.

Furthermore, out of 179 respondents, a total of 177 respondents constituted the sample and agreed to take part in the survey. Regarding the gender distribution, the majority (133 or 75.1%) were females, leaving males with a total of 44 or 24.9%. The data imply that most of the sample size was females, suggesting that the teacher-education course attracts fewer males than females. In addition, in terms of age, the range is 13 to 38, with a mean age equal to 19.55 (standard deviation [SD]: 2.10).

Research Instrument

Polished L2 WTC Questionnaire. This refined L2 WTC questionnaire has been developed to investigate interrelatedness among L2 WTC and motivation, beliefs, context, and confidence. Adapted from Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak [20], eight preexisting scales were classified, associated, and modified to create a 39-item polished questionnaire that includes measured data of WTC inside the class [12], WTC in an outside class [4], and communication confidence, including perceived communication confidence and anxiety [21].

Accordingly, WTC in form-focused tasks (evaluated by items in part one), is defined as the willingness to interact in a confined audience in which higher-order cognitive activities frequently take place, for instance, *"I am willing to ask my peer in about ideas/arguments related to the topic".* In contrast, WTC in meaning-focused tasks (evaluated through items in part two) is defined as the willingness to interact with other teachers and in a larger number of people, where personal and social interactions were emphasized, for instance, *"I am willing to use CMC to address a group of my acquaintances".* Furthermore, communication confidence (as measured by items in part three) includes the coalescence of perceived communication competence and anxiety, including *"I am willing to participate in a role-play or dialogue".* Finally, research participants assessed the questionnaire on a 6-point Likert scale varying between 1 (not at all true about me) to 6 (extremely true about me).

The internal consistency reliability as evaluated along alpha coefficient reliability or Cronbach's alpha (α), was utilized to examine the instrument's dependability. Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak [20] proved that the instrument is reliable and valid.

Data Gathering Procedure

Respondents were first identified and determined. The communication between the respondents and the researcher was carried out online, and a digitized instrument was provided so they could have accessed any time and the results will immediately be collected by the researcher.

The respondents were asked to access the link of the digitized instrument comprising the nature and aims of the research study and emphasizing consent, the concept that the study is voluntary and optional, and in no way would nonparticipation affect them negatively. Similarly, they were instructed that there would be no reward or recognition of any form given to those who would participate. The survey form only took 5-10 minutes to complete.

Data Analysis Technique

To statistically measure responses to the survey questionnaire of the existing study, the findings were statistically examined throughout the utilization of SPSS version 26. In determining respondents' overall WTC and the difference of gender in willingness to communicate and level of communication confidence, descriptive statistics were utilized to present the data frequency, the arithmetic mean (M), and the standard deviation (SD).

Furthermore, since the dimensions of WTC (meaning-focused and form-focused) and gender (male and female) variables are dichotomous, independent sample T-test was utilized to determine whether the differences in the responses of the respondents are significant.

Data Coding Procedure

To assist data analysis, the responses were coded as follows: for the variable gender, 1 is for the male and 2 is for the female. Moreover, for the responses provided in the survey tool WTC (consisting of three parts: MF for meaning-focused activities; FF for form-focused activities; and CC for communication confidence), all the statements were untoned, and no negative statements were present. The coding of the responses in this questionnaire are the following: 1 for not at all true about me, 2 for very slightly true about me, 3 for slightly true of me, 4 for moderately true of me, 5 for very much true of me, and 6 for extremely true about me.

Moreover, to determine the WTC of the respondents in English, interpretation based on the computed intervals of the codes was given to the mean results, and these are as follows: 1.00 to 1.82 for Extremely Low, 1.83 to 2.65 for Very Low, 2.66 to 3.47 for Low, 3.48 to 4.31 for High, 4.32 to 5.14 for Very High, and 5.15 to 6.00 for Extremely High. On the other hand, mean scores for answers taken from CC were given meaning as follows: 1.00 to 1.82 for Not at all confident, 1.83 to 2.65 for Slightly Confident, 2.66 to 3.47 for Somewhat Confident, 3.48 to 4.31 for Confident, 4.32 to 5.14 for Very Confident, and 5.15 to 6.00 for Extremely Confident.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Willingness to communicate in L2

The respondents' WTC toward English was statistically quantified by the score of 39 items with the utilization of a six-point Likert scale. The existing data were examined and interpreted using descriptive statistics (mean [M], standard deviation [SD]) and interpreted (Scale: 1.00 to 1.82 – extremely low, 1.83 to 2.65 – very low, 2.66 to 3.47 – low, 3.48 to 4.31 – high, 4.32 to 5.14 – very high, and 5.15 to 6.00 – extremely high). The analysis and interpretation are shown in Table 1.0.

Table 1.0
Nonlanguage majors' WTC toward English

Dimensions	M	SD	Interp.
Meaning-focused	3.61	1.01	High
Form-focused	4.00,	.94	High
Overall WTC	3.82	.88	High

Scale: 1.00 to 1.82 – extremely low, 1.83 to 2.65 – very low, 2.66 to 3.47 – low, 3.48 to 4.31 – high, 4.32 to 5.14 – very high, and 5.15 to 6.00 – extremely high; N-177

Table 1.0 provides the descriptive analysis of the data. It can be deduced from the statistical analysis that throughout two dimensions, the research participants, predominantly rated *'high'* in distinguishing the use of English towards communicating in form-focused and in meaning-focused tasks, which resonates indicated data of Bukhari and Cheng [22] who conducted WTC in the ESL setting and claimed that L2 WTC of learners was found to be at a high level. This implies that the respondents favor the utilization of the English language may it be outside or in their respective class.

Furthermore, it is noticeable that the provided analysis entails that the respondents display a highly distinguished use of English, but out of two dimensions, the form-focused dimension has the highest-rated mean (M-4.00, SD-0.94), and the meaning-focused dimension has the lowest-rated mean (M-3.61, SD-1.01). This proves that the respondents' level of WTC can be attributed to the claim of Cameron [23] that it

may somehow be due to the substantial influence by means of the L2 learning factors on an individual's WTC, which further implies that their willingness to interact may differ in every given circumstances or opportunities given in all areas and may differ on their background knowledge and their confidence.

Research Participants' Responses to items in MF

To assess the responses of the participants in the item in meaning-focused activities, the responses for the 12 items of the unit were coded and descriptively examined and analyzed. The analysis is shown in Table 1.1, which includes the statements of the survey question, the arithmetic mean, the standard deviation, and the interpretation of the feedback.

Table 1.1
Descriptive analysis of items in meaning-focused activities

No.	Statements	M	SD	Interp.
1	I am willing to use computer mediated communication (CMC) to address an acquaintance of mine.	4.02	1.248	High
2	I am willing to use CMC to address a group of my acquaintances.	3.86	1.260	High
3	I am willing to use CMC to address a group of my acquaintances as well as strangers.	3.49	1.306	High
4	I am willing to use CMC to address whoever is interested in what I want to communicate.	3.64	1.286	High
5	I am willing to initiate communication with a foreigner met in the street.	2.79	1.517	Low
6	I am willing to speak to a foreigner who needs assistance (e.g., to help find directions).	4.33	1.299	Very high
7	I am willing to initiate communication with a group of foreigners met in the street.	2.98	1.541	Low
8	I am willing to speak to a group of foreigners who need assistance.	4.02	1.473	High
9	I am willing to speak to a foreign teacher in a private situation (e.g., in a cafeteria).	3.24	1.451	Low
10	I am willing to use English to speak to/text my Polish friend out of class (during breaks).	3.58	1.468	High
11	I am willing to use English to speak to/text my Polish peers out of class.	3.61	1.466	High
12	I am willing to speak to exchange students enrolled in my program.	3.74	1.477	High

Scale: 1.00 to 1.82 – extremely low, 1.83 to 2.65 – very low, 2.66 to 3.47 – low, 3.48 to 4.31 – high, 4.32 to 5.14 – very high, and 5.15 to 6.00 – extremely high; N-177

This dimension elicited how willing the respondents were to communicate English outside the classroom. Table 1.1 reveals that most of the items garnered *'high'* level of willingness to interact using English, from willingly using computer-mediated communication to having the willingness to speak to polished peers out of class. This entails that nonlanguage majors think of English language something that would greatly help them improve and communicate better apart from utilizing it inside the classroom.

Intriguingly, among the items, only the sixth item yielded a *'very high'* response in terms of willingness to speak to foreigners who need assistance. However, items five, seven, and nine, in terms of initiating communication to foreigners in a group or in a private situation, only yielded a *'low'* response. These findings proved that some nonlanguage majors were not ready to communicate owing on a variety of circumstances such as having a conversation between native speakers.

Research Participants' Responses to items in FF

To assess the responses of the participants in the items in form-focused activities, the responses for the 14 items of the unit were coded and descriptively examined and analyzed. The analysis is shown in Table 1.2, which includes the statements of the survey questions, the arithmetic mean, the standard deviation, and the interpretation of the feedback.

Table 1.2
Descriptive analysis of items in form-focused activities (FF)

No.	Statements	M	SD	Interp.
1	I am willing to present my arguments to the rest of the class.	3.29	1.293	Low
2	I am willing to give a presentation in front of the class.	4.01	1.327	High
3	I am willing to do a role-play in a small group.	4.09	1.451	High
4	I am willing to do a role-play in a pair.	3.67	1.452	High
5	I am willing to take part in a discussion in a small group.	4.66	1.163	Very high
6	I am willing to take part in a discussion in a pair.	4.69	1.251	Very high
7	I am willing to ask the teacher in English to repeat he/she said.	3.79	1.481	High
8	I am willing to ask the teacher in English about words or structures he/she just said.	3.60	1.447	High
9	I am willing to ask my peer in English about forms/words related to the topic.	3.98	1.348	High
10	I am willing to ask my peer in English about ideas/arguments related to the topic.	4.00	1.310	High
11	I am willing to ask my group mates in English about forms/words related to the topic.	3.99	1.279	High
12	I am willing to ask my group mates in English about ideas/arguments related to the topic.	4.06	1.302	High
13	I am willing to correct a mistake that I notice in what others are saying.	3.90	1.421	High
14	I am willing to modify what I have said in response to an indication of an error.	4.33	1.260	Very high

Scale: 1.00 to 1.82 – extremely low, 1.83 to 2.65 – very low, 2.66 to 3.47 – low, 3.48 to 4.31 – high, 4.32 to 5.14 – very high, and 5.15 to 6.00 – extremely high; N-177

The table above shows how willing the respondents were to communicate English during the speaking class. Table 1.2 reveals that most of the items garnered *'high'* level of willingness to interact utilizing English, from willingly presenting in front of the class to willingly correcting mistakes from others in class. Three items (5, 6, & 7) accumulated a *'very high'* level of WTC, while the first item yielded *'low'* in the level of WTC concerning willingness to present arguments in front of the class. Hence, this demonstrates that learners who seldom get the chance to utilize the language for the purpose of communication, and with limiting their opportunities for initiating a conversation or a discussion, have a lower inclination to communicate in class.

Level of WTC in terms of Gender

As presented in table 2.0 below, the analysis suggests that females utilize English less willingly than males. With the 'high' level of interpretation, both genders are willing to communicate, however, boys demonstrate a more positive desire to communicate outside the class than girls. The outcome also negates the data of Tannen [24] that females are more communicative and are more interested in forming relationships than males.

Table 2.0
Differences of gender in terms of WTC in MF activities

Dimensions	Gender	M	SD	Interp.
Meaning-focused activities	Male	4.28	.77	High
	Female	3.91	.97	High

N-177

Regarding table 2.1, as illustrated below, the data shows that male students' level of willingness to interact inside the class has a *'high'* level compared to female students who accumulated a *'low'* level of willingness to speak. It implies that males are more willing to utilize and speak the English language in-class than females. This specific finding is not in consonance with the claim that teenage girls are more willing to engage in a conversation than teenage boys [24].

Table 2.1
Differences of gender in terms of WTC in FF activities

Dimensions	Gender	M	SD	Interp.
Form-focused activities	Male	4.01	.83	High
	Female	3.47	.03	Low

N-177

Hence, the yielded results imply that in examining the two dimensions (meaning-focused and form-focused activities) that conceptualize WTC in various communications, the present group of respondents in the study, undeniably proved that WTC has a huge discrepancy in relation to their differences in gender.

Level of Communication Confidence

The research participants' level of communication confidence in L2 was assessed through a score of 13 items utilizing a six-point Likert scale. The responses were computed through arithmetic mean and standard deviation, and interpretation was given with the use of the following scale: 1.00 to 1.82 (Not at all confident), 1.83 to 2.65 (Slightly confident), 2.66 to 3.47 (Somewhat confident), 3.48 to 4.31 (Confident), 4.32 to 5.14 (Very confident), and 5.15 to 6.00 (Extremely confident). The statistical analysis (mean [M], and standard deviation [SD]) and interpretation of the data are presented below.

Table 3.0
Nonlanguage majors' communication confidence toward English

	Gender	M	SD	Interp.
Communication Confidence	Male	3.89	0.98	Confident
	Female	3.41	1.06	Confident

N-177

The table shows that the respondents, in general, reported their level of CC as *'confident'*. This result reflects the findings of earlier conducted statistical analysis in identifying the overall WTC (see table 1.0) of nonlanguage majors where Clement and Kruidenier [25] claimed that second language acquisition and communication confidence are interconnected and are directly relevant as they affect and influence each other in a manner where if one factor drops or increases, the rest will follow and respond.

Interestingly, although females garnered a *'low'* level of willingness to speak on one of the dimensions, scholars made conclusions that other sorts of lacking self-confidence might be based on how inspired students are in engaging in an English discussion, or their attitude with regards global community were Yashima [26] claimed that having good attitude towards it had a higher level of confidence than students who were not motivated at all.

The findings suggest that some students were not prepared to communicate in a variety of situations and will later find themselves in an infinite phase of wanting to connect with native speakers to construct L2 confidence but being unwilling to initiate contact due to their lack of confidence in a given specific social context.

Research Participants' Responses to items in CC

The table below shows the arithmetic mean of the responses in every item to assess the communication confidence of nonlanguage majors. The table below present statements, mean scores, standard deviations, and interpretations of data.

Table 3.1
Descriptive analysis of items in CC

No.	Statements	M	SD	Interp.
1	I am willing to give an oral presentation to the rest of the class.	3.90	1.421	Confident
2	I am willing to take part in a role-play or dialogue.	4.00	1.430	Confident
3	I am willing to contribute to a class debate.	3.55	1.500	Confident
4	I am willing to respond when the teacher asks me a question in English.	4.27	1.250	Confident
5	I am willing to speak without preparation in class.	3.24	1.477	Somewhat confident
6	I am willing to speak informally to my English teacher during classroom activities.	2.50	1.435	Slightly confident
7	I am willing to give my peer sitting next to me directions to my favourite restaurant in English.	3.12	1.403	Somewhat confident
8	I am willing to do a role-play in English at my desk, with my peer.	3.49	1.466	Confident
9	I am willing to tell my group mates in English about things I do in my free time.	3.47	1.496	Confident
10	I am willing to give a short impromptu speech to my class.	3.14	1.510	Somewhat confident
11	I am willing to correct a mistake that I notice in what others are saying.	3.67	1.460	Confident
12	I am willing to modify what I have said in response to an indication of an error.	4.02	1.357	Confident
13	I am willing to lead the discussion.	3.49	1.478	Confident

Scale: 1.00 to 1.82 - Not at all confident, 1.83 to 2.65 - Slightly confident, 2.66 to 3.47 -Somewhat confident, 3.48 to 4.31- Confident, 4.32 to 5.14 – Very confident, and 5.15 to 6.00 - Extremely confident; N-177

Table 3.1 shows communication confidence of the respondents toward the utilization of the English language to the nonlanguage majors. The table reveals that most of the items garnered a *'confident'* level of CC, from willingly giving presentation orally to the rest of the class, to willingly leading the discussion. This means that nonlanguage majors think of the English language as an effective means of communication and discussion.

Furthermore, among the items, only the sixth item yielded a *'slightly confident'* response in terms of willingness to informally speak to teachers during classroom activities. On the other hand, items five, seven, and ten yielded a *'somewhat confident'* response. This implies that some nonlanguage majors are confident in willingly speaking without any preparation in class or giving an impromptu speech inside the class.

Correlation: WTC in English and the Level of Communication Confidence

Table 4.0
The relationship between WTC and Level of Communicative Competence

	p-value	r-value	Interp.
WTC			
	0.01*	0.827	**Significant**
Communication Confidence			

N-177

From the statistical analysis, it could be identified that there is a substantial association between CC and WTC of the respondents. In addition, it is noted that the variables have a fairly strong positive relationship (r-value = 0.827). This entails that the respondents with high CC are most likely to exhibit a *'fairly strong positive'* level toward willingness to communicate. Similarly, nonlanguage majors with low CC are likely to manifest a *'negative'* level of willingness to communicate. Hence, it could tell that the variable CC is positively associated with WTC, and vice versa.

These findings support prior research that has found that there is unambiguous correlation between students' confidence and their L2 speaking behavior, for example [4], [27]. Furthermore, the findings put forward that certain self-confidence is an important determinant in the motivation of the learners to interact and communicate utilizing L2 [4].

IV. CONCLUSION

The existing investigation has its focus upon nonlanguage majors' overall level of WTC in English and their competence in the purview of their communication confidence. Additionally, perceived differences of WTC in terms of gender in in-class or out-class activities. Likewise, a correlational relationship has been teased apart between the two foregoing variables. It has been ascertained by this academic work that the overall level of WTC exuded by the respondents deemed high, which means that both meaning-focused and form-focused activities are tilted toward a high level of WTC. The investigation also attempted to distinguish

if respondents would differ significantly when there WTC and communication confidence are compared across gender, and it was revealed that such a difference has an occurrence in the investigation. The result implies that males are much more willing or enthusiastic to communicate and interact in meaning-focused (out-class) including form-focused (in-class) tasks than females. In a similar vein, their level of communication confidence is statistically interpreted as high, correspondingly leading to a 'high' level of communication confidence in its entirety. Furthermore, a significant relationship has been determined between the respondents' level of WTC in L2 and communication confidence, implying that once a 'high' level of WTC is exhibited, communication confidence can be anticipated.

The current research is suggestive of the great deal of room for improvement as this was not without limitations. The first limitation was that the investigation was implemented only with the involvement of higher education level, nonlanguage majors. Thus, any further extrapolation from this investigation should be done with caution by taking into consideration the environment and the respondents of the study. Another limitation was the scope which was centered on the verbal method of L2 WTC and L2 competence. Nonetheless, as MacIntyre and other colleagues argue, L2 WTC includes not just speaking, it is about various modes of communication as well. Hence, further study might direct L2 WTC not only through the process of speaking, but as well as through other methods notably comprehension, reading, and writing to be able to acquire a much comprehensible overview of L2 WTC. Finally, for future study on L2 WTC, utilizing a mixed-method research design might be performed to acquire a clear grasp of situational and continuous character of L2 in addition to valuable insights regarding involvement in second language teaching.

V. REFERENCES

[1] M. Yu, "Willingness to communicate of foreign language learners in a Chinese setting," *The Florida State University ProQuest Dissertations Publishing,* 2002.

[2] S .J. Savignon, "Communicative language teaching: strategies and goals," *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning,* pp. 635-652, 2005.

[3] Z. Dörnyei, "The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition," *Routledge,* 2005.

[4] P. D. MacIntyre, R. Clément, Z. Dörnyei, and K.A. Noels, K. A, "Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation," *The Modern Language Journal,* vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 545-562, 1998.

[5] T. Yashima, "Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context," *The Modern Language Journal,* vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 54–66, 2002.

[6] J. Zhang, N. Beckmann, and J. F. Beckmann, "To talk or not to talk: A review of situational antecedents of willingness to communicate in the second language classroom," *System,* vol. 72, pp. 226-239, 2018.

[7] M. Kruk, "Dynamicity of perceived willingness to communicate, motivation, boredom, and anxiety in

Second Life: The case of two advanced learners of English," *Computer Assisted Language Learning,* vol. 35, no. 1-2, pp. 190-216, 2022.

[8] M. Pawlak, and A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak, "Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate," *System,* vol. 50, pp. 1-9, 2015

[9] M. Asmali, U. Bilki and C.A. Duban, "A comparison of the Turkish and Romanian students' willingness to communicate and its affecting factors in English," *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies,* vol. 11, pp. 59-74, 2015.

[10] T. Ito, "Effects of general trust as a personality trait on willingness to communicate in a second language," *Personality and Individual Differences,* vol. 185, 2002.

[11] P. D. MacIntyre, S. C. Baker, R. Clément, and L. A. Donovan, "Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students," *Language Learning,* vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 537-564, 2002.

[12] J. E. Peng, and L. Woodrow, "Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context," *Language Learning,* vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 834-876, 2010.

[13] C. Weaver, "Using the Rasch model to develop a measure of second language learners' willingness to communicate within a language classroom," *Journal of Applied Measurement*, vol. 6, no.4, pp. 396-415, 2005.

[14] E. Fadilah, "Perception, motivation, and communicative self-confidence of Indonesian students on willingness to communicate in L2 using Facebook," *JEELS,* vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 23–48, 2018a.

[15] E. Fadilah, "Willingness to communicate from Indonesian learners' perspective : A dynamic complex system theory," *Journal of ELT Research,* vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 168–185, 2018b.

[16] N. Fallah, "Willingness to communicate in English, communication self-confidence, motivation, shyness, and teacher immediacy among Iranian English-major undergraduates: A structural equation modeling approach," *Learning and Individual Differences,* vol. 30, pp. 140–147, 2014.

[17] L. Ortega, "Understanding second language acquisition," *New York: Routledge*, 2007.

[18] J. Creswell, "Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. (2nd ed.)," *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc,* 2003.

[19] A. L. Perez, and E. Alieto, "'Change of Tongue' from English to a local language: A correlation of Mother Tongue proficiency and Mathematics achievement," *The Asian ESP Journal,* vol. 14, no. 7.2, pp.136-250, 2018.

[20] M. Pawlak, A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak, and J. Bielak, "Investigating the nature of classroom willingness to communicate (WTC): A micro perspective," *Language Teaching Research,* vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 654–671, 2016.

[21] E. K. Horwitz, M. B. Horwitz, and J. Cope, "Foreign Language Anxiety," *The Modern Language Journal,* vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 125–132, 1986.

[22] S. F. Bukhari, and X. Cheng, "To do or not to do: willingness to communicate in the ESL context: Pakistani students are highly willing to communicate in English in Canada," *English Today,* vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 36-42, 2016.

[23] D. Cameron, "Willingness to communicate in english as a second language as a stable trait or context-influenced variable," *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,* vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 177-196, 2013.

[24] D. Tannen, "Gender differences in conversational coherence: Physical alignment and topical cohesion. In B. Dorval (Ed.)," *Conversational organization and its development,* pp. 167-206, 1990.

[25] R. Clement, and B. G. Kruidenier, "Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model," *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 21-37, 1985.

[26] C. L. Lai, "Effects of the group regulation promotion approach on students' individual and collaborative learning performance, perceptions of regulation and regulation behaviours in project-based tasks," *British Journal of Educational Technology,* vol. 52, pp. 2278-2298, 2021.