Anxiety and Willingness to Communicate in Language Learning: A Case Study

Mohammad Mahmudul Haque*
BRAC University

Abstract

This case study attempts to find out the role of individual differences (IDs) in language learning of an advanced Bangladeshi EFL learner who aims to study at a graduate level program in Education at a North American university. A two-phase structured questionnaire interview has been conducted in which phase one comprises 40 open-ended questions with a general structure that attempts to find out the various personal characteristics of the interviewee, namely 'personal profile,' 'learning history,' linguistic background, etc. In phase two, there are two sub-phases, and the questionnaire in the first sub-phase focuses on four IDs namely 'personality,' 'learning style,' 'anxiety,' and 'willingness to communicate,' with a general research question concerning the effects of these IDs on the interviewee. In the second sub-phase, the researcher narrows down the focus of the research question to the two most important IDs influencing the interviewee's learning of English, namely 'anxiety' and 'willingness to communicate.' For the second sub-phase of phase two, the researcher uses four quantitative measurement scales, two measuring the interviewee's anxiety (adapted from Horwitz and Horwitz, 1986) and the other two measuring her willingness to communicate (adapted from Macintyre, 2001) both inside and outside of classrooms. The results show that the interviewee feels very anxious and addled in the classroom whereas she feels quite the opposite outside the classroom. Naturally, her willingness to communicate in the classroom is very low as

* Mohammad Mahmudul Haque is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of English and Humanities at BRAC University since 2007. As a Fulbright Scholar, he taught at Syracuse University, NY from 2008-2009, and completed an MA in TESOL from American University, Washington DC in 2013. His research interests include ESL methodology, language teaching materials, translation studies and testing and evaluations.

she does not enjoy the teacher-centered deductive presentations of grammar rules. Also, the interviewee's personality has a decisive effect on her language learning. Being an extrovert outside class and quiet in the class, she does not enjoy her academic success per se. Finally, there is a comparison between the researcher and the interviewee's language learning experience revealing a number of similarities and differences between them.

Introduction

This case study attempts to find out the role of individual differences (IDs) in language learning of an advanced Bangladeshi EFL learner who aims to study at a graduate level program in Education at a North American university. The learner will be addressed as Masha (a pseudonym) who is an exchange visitor on a J-visa living in downtown Washington DC with her husband. A two-phase interview was conducted in which phase one comprises a generally structured open-ended questionnaire with 40 questions that attempts to find out "enduring personal characteristics that are assumed to apply to everybody and which people differ by degree" (Dornyei, 2005, p. 644) in relation to the roles they played in Masha's learning of English as a foreign language. Phase two narrows the general focus to more specific ones analyzing the qualitative responses of the phase one interview. In other words, for the phase two interview, only those IDs were chosen which were "consistently shown to correlate strongly with L2 achievement – to a degree that no other SLA variables match" (ibid, 643). For phase two, the researcher used four quantitative measurement scales, two measuring the interviewee's anxiety (adapted from Horwitz and Horwitz, 1986) and the other two measuring her willingness to communicate (adapted from MacIntyre, 2001) both inside and outside of classrooms.

Phase one of the interview took place at 4pm on April 8, 2013 at a local restaurant in Washington DC. The researcher came to know about Masha through a friend of his and contacted her via email first to express his interest in interviewing her. He also added that the interview would not be timed so she could take her time in answering the questions but that it would be audio recorded. As Masha agreed, the date was set for the interview. The interview lasted 1.5 hours and was audio recorded in its entirety. The second phase of the interview (also face-to-face) took place on April 14, but was not audio-recorded since that was an attitude questionnaire in which Masha had to choose from a range of responses.

L2 learning history and the linguistic environment

The interviewee is a 25-year old female from Bangladesh, a country that falls under the outer circle in the three concentric circles as defined by Kachru (1985) in which "English is not the native tongue, but is important for historical reasons and plays a part in the nation's institutions, either as official language or otherwise." She completed her B. A. in English Language and Literature from a private university

in Dhaka, Bangladesh. On completion of her B. A. degree, she came to the United States in August 2011 as a J-2 dependent (a non-immigrant visa) with her husband. She works for a coffee shop in downtown DC where she has to interact with a lot of native and non-native speakers of English every day.

In part I of the interview (Personal Profile, Learning History, and Linguistic Background), she identified herself as an advanced user of English as aptly reflected in her IBT TOEFL score (105 out of 120). She spoke Bangla as her native language and also as a medium of learning for the entire pre-tertiary education for 12 years. In other words, the medium of instruction for all the content areas in her school was Bangla, and she had studied English as a subject like other content area courses (e.g., History and Geography) from the very start of her school at the age of five. She was first exposed to an English-speaking learning environment when she enrolled in the B.A. in English Language and Literature program at a university in Dhaka. Till then, she had hardly had any opportunity to practice her English (speaking) beyond classrooms. Moreover, even within the classroom, there was extensive use of L1, which again limited the scope for speaking practice.

Shedding light on her academic learning environment for English, she mentioned that she had four one-hour English classes in the primary level and five 1.5-hour English classes at the secondary level. The English classes were mostly limited to reading, writing, and grammar throughout as there was no systematic teaching of listening and speaking. Masha identified the reason for this discriminatory focus as the result of the exam-oriented education system. Since the tests/exams were limited to only reading and writing, teaching was largely geared towards achieving these skills and thereby preparing the learners solely for the test. Listening and speaking were expected to be learned as a by-product of classroom discussion.

The textbooks were largely reading-based followed by comprehension questions. Usually the writing tasks used to be integrated into the readings as extension activities. A typical example of her secondary English textbook activity would be a reading comprehension, say, on family planning followed by comprehension questions and controlled writing activities like filling in the blanks with missing information. She was then instructed to write a paragraph on selected issues of the reading passage in question. Also, there were literary texts (mostly short stories and poems) to stimulate "creative thinking." She added that there was not much variation in the class work and homework since both emphasized mostly similar reading and writing activities. In her words, "the homework was mere extensions of the class work."

However, despite her limited exposure to English in the academia, she used to watch English cartoons since Grade 1 on various satellite channels in Dhaka. As she reached her sixth grade, she started watching Disney movies regularly. She said that natural exposure to English through visual media was extremely helpful in getting her ears attuned to understanding both British and American English. She

said that at the beginning, "it was just a lot of listening, with almost zero speaking" which, according to her, helped to make a solid linguistic as well as pragmatic foundation for her future learning of English.

Relevant personal characteristics influencing languag learning

As Ellis (2008) pointed out, the factors in the study of individual differences "overlap in vague and indeterminate ways,"and it is sometimes impossible to figure out the exact roles of a given factor in relation to the other factors (p. 644). As an attempt to systematize the study of the IDs, Ellis (2008) divided them in terms of 'abilities' (cognitive capabilities for language learning), 'propensities' (cognitive and affective qualities related to language learning), 'learner cognitions about L2 learning,' and 'learner actions.' However, Dornyei (cited in Ellis, 2008) pointed out that it may not always be easy to decide if an ID constitutes 'ability' or a 'propensity.' That is why it may be more sensible, as Ellis (2008) commented, to treat them separately. Following is an individual discussion of the four ID factors, namely learning style, personality, anxiety, and willingness to communicate.

Learning Style

According to Keefe (1979a), learning styles refer to the characteristics that indicate "how learners perceive, interact with and respond to the learning environment" (p. 4). He also describes it as a "consistent way of functioning" which reflects the "underlying causes of behavior" (p. 4). As for measuring the learning style, there are research instruments that have been borrowed from general psychology, for example, Dunn et al.'s (1991) Productivity Environmental Preference Survey, while others have been specifically designed to investigate language learners, for example, Reid's (1987) Perceptual Learning Style Questionnaire (Ellis 2012, pp. 667-668).

Dunn et al.'s (1991) Productivity Environmental Preferences Survey measures learning styles in "four areas: a) preferences for environmental stimuli, b) quality of emotional stimuli, c) orientation towards sociological stimuli, and d) preferences related to physical stimuli" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 668). It is designed to showcase preferences pertaining to both personality and learning style. Bailey, Onwuegbuzie, and Daley (2000) employed this questionnaire among 100 French and Spanish first and second semester students studying at a US university. The study reveals that higher achievers prefer informal classroom design as opposed to "receiv[ing] information via kinesthetic mode" (p. 115).

On the other hand, Reid's (1987) perceptual learning styles questionnaire was created based on four perceptual learning styles (visual learning, auditory learning, kinesthetic learning, and tactile learning) and two social learning styles (group preferences, individual preferences). She administered the survey on learners of

different language backgrounds and found that learners had a general preference for kinesthetic and tactile learning with a negative attitude (both native and non-native learners) towards group work. However, a modified version of Reid's questionnaire, conducted by Wintergerst, DeCapua and Verna (2003), revealed a contradictory result (learners preferred group work over individual work). The researchers consider time gap and various social learning styles to be responsible for the contradictory results.

Ellis (2012, p. 671)) concludes that since learners' preference towards L2 learning approach varies to a great extent, it is almost impossible to choose the best one. He mentions 'flexibility' to be a plausible reason for learners' success, but it lacks real evidence. He adds that it is unlikely that progress will happen in this respect unless and until researchers know what it is that they want to measure.

Personality

Pervin and John (2001) define 'personality' as an expression of a consistency in the pattern of "feeling, thinking and behaving" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 672). Both teachers and learners consider it to be a very important aspect of language learning as evidenced in Griffiths' (1991b) and Naiman et al.'s (1978) study respectively, which shows that teachers consider it to be an important aspect in L2 language learning. As for measuring personality, different language specific questionnaires have been developed to determine "dimensions of personality" like tolerance of ambiguity or risk taking. "Eysenck Personality Questionnaire" or the "Myers Briggs Type indicators" are examples of two types of general questionnaires to identify a learner's personality.

Among the many dimensions of personality, the most notable is extraversion/introversion. Two hypotheses have been made for correlating extraversion/ introversion with L2 learning. The first hypothesis, the one which has been widely researched, states that extrovert learners acquire basic interpersonal communication skills better due to the opportunity for more practice leading to a bigger chance of success. The second hypothesis states that cognitive academic language develops more for introvert learners due to their time dedication towards academic reading and writing. Strong's (1983) review of 12 studies revealed that extroversion was at a point of advantage for language acquisition which supports the first hypothesis. However, Dörnyei and Kormos' (2000) study failed to find a positive correlation between language acquisition and extraversion. Dewaele and Furnham (1999), on the other hand, concluded from their study that extrovert learners though may be fluent in both L1 and L2 but it is not necessary for them to be accurate (cited in Ellis, p. 674). Much research has been conducted to prove the validity of the second hypothesis. However, most of those (Busch, 1982; Carell, Prince, and Astika, 1996; Ehrman and Oxford, 1995) have found either an insignificant or a weak relationship (cited in Ellis, p. 674) between extraversion/ introversion and academic proficiency.

The Big Five Model, an important theory of personality in psychology, has five dimension of personality (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion-introversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism-emotional stability) (Big Five Personality Test, June 05, 2015). This model has been modified and used by Verhoeven and Vermeer (2002) where it was found that children showing interest in belonging and identifying with their target language speaking peers achieve success in learning (p. 373).

Recent studies have seen more success than that of the previous ones in correlating language with personality traits. However, there are limitations like situational dependence of personality, variables like attitude, motivation, situational anxiety influencing the effect of personality, and methodological deficiency.

Anxiety

The learning situation affects the learning process of both naturalistic and classroom learners. Language, according to Pavlenko (2006b), is an "inherently emotional affair" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p.691). Researchers like Horwitz, and Young (1991), Arnold (1999), and Young (1999) (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 691) believe anxiety to be SLA's most noticeable affective aspect. The three types of anxiety that are present are – trait anxiety, state anxiety, and situation specific anxiety. Trait anxiety is the tendency of being anxious all the time, whereas state anxiety is what a learner feels in a particular moment as a reaction to a certain situation (Spielberger, 1983, cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 691). Finally, situation specific anxiety is the apprehension a learner feels in situations like examination, public speaking, etc. (Ellis, 2012, p. 691).

Among the many techniques of measuring the correlation between anxiety and achievement diary data, questionnaire responses correlating to achievement, experiments, report of learners' response to language learning condition are mentionable. Spielmann and Radnofsky's (2001) ethnographic studies containing "rich description of learners' reactions to their learning situations" address "three issues: 1) the source of language anxiety, 2) the nature of the relationship between language anxiety and language learning, and 3) how anxiety affects learning" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 692).

Another notable study, the diary study by Bailey (1983, cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 692) has the analysis of 11 learners where she found that when learners find themselves more proficient than their peers, their anxiety decreases. She mentioned tests, teacher-student relationships, etc. to be some sources of anxiety. Ellis and Rathbone (1987) found from their study that teachers' questions can be another source of anxiety. However, it is really hard to identify the sources of anxiety because Horwitz (2001), from the review of her studies, revealed that in most of the cases the tasks that were considered "comfortable" by some were considered to be "stressful" by others(p.118).

Among the many instruments of measuring anxiety level Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale is notable. Their 33-itemed questionnaire tries to relate to the three sources of anxiety (communication apprehension, test, and fear of negative evaluation) for speaking and listening in L2 acquisition (Ellis, 2012, p. 693). On the other hand, Cheng, Horwitz, and Schallert (1999) developed a questionnaire to identify the relationship of reading and writing anxiety with general language anxiety (Ellis, 2012, p. 693).

Language learning and anxiety are related to each other and three positions have been identified regarding the relationship between anxiety and language learning. The first position, anxiety facilitates learning, was supported by Eysenck (1979) who said that "low level anxiety" motivates learners to give more effort (Ellis, 2012, p. 694). MacIntyre (2002), Chastain (1975), Kleinmann (1978) assumed a similar position in their studies. The second position, anxiety, has a negative impact on language learning, and was supported by Chastain (1975)and Horwitz (1986) who found a negative correlation between anxiety and grades or marks. Ely (1986a) found that learners having high anxiety levels took less risk.That is, their motivation was negatively affected (Ellis, 2012, p. 694). The third position, language anxiety, the result of difficulty with learning rather than its cause, was supported by a series of studies conducted by Sparks, Ganschow, and Javorsky (2000) which claims that anxiety regarding L2 learning is a result of language difficulties faced by the learners (Ellis, 2012, p. 695).

An important model on anxiety and the language learning process was proposed by MacIntyre and Gradner (1991a), known as the developmental model, which tries to relate learners' developmental stage and situation specific learning experiences with learner anxiety. This model justifies Parkinson and Howell-Richardson's (1990) diary studies which revealed that anxiety develops because of learners' "bad learning experience" (Ellis, 2012, p. 695). Elkhafaifi's (2005) study showed that beginner learners had more listening anxiety than intermediate or advanced learners as "anxiety reduces as they develop" (Ellis, 2012, p.695).

MacIntyre and Gardner (1991b) developed their model based on their study in which they used video cameras to observe anxiety levels in the three stages (input stage, processing stage, and output stage). They found the anxiety level to be highest just after introducing the video camera. However, gradually, learners overcame the anxiety and compensated it by increasing performance (Ellis, 2012, p. 696).

Willingness to communicate

Willingness to communicate (WTC), in other words, "the intention to initiate communication given a choice" (MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, and Conrad, 2001) is considered to be a variable that is "determined by other variables" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 697). The factors influencing WTC are situation specific (Ellis, 2012, p. 697).

One of the prominent studies on this variable was done by Yashima (2002) who

illustrated in her study the necessity of knowing what learning a language means in a context before imposing a definition/model developed elsewhere. In other words, the definition and attitudes of language learning should be bottom up as opposed to top-down. Yashima's (2000) study reveals how international posture (general attitude of the international community) figures both as a direct and indirect variable depending on the context (p.62). However, Kang's (2005) study on four Korean adult males learning English where they were paired with native speakers to communicate freely showed no direct relationship between international relationship and WTC (Ellis, 2012, p. 698).

As far as learning the language to communicate is concerned, Ellis (2012) related WTC to CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) as he said that learners who are willing to communicate are benefitted from CLT whereas learners who are not willing to communicate learn better from more traditional approaches. Comparing the difference of WTC inside and outside of classes, MacIntyre et al. in their study found WTC to be a "stable, trait like factor" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 698), the same both inside and outside the classroom for Anglophone learners of L2 French in Canada.

Adding an interesting dimension, Dörnyei and Kormos' (2000) study revealed a relation between WTC and attitude towards the task. They found that learners with a positive attitude towards the task had more willingness to communicate whereas the correlation was close to zero when the learners had a negative attitude towards the task (Ellis, 2012, p. 698).

The current study

To develop a general understanding of the roles these IDs played in Masha's acquisition of English, the current two-phase study adopts a concatenated approach, or a research-then-theory approach through a structured questionnaire interview with a general research question, "To what extent do learning styles, personality, anxiety, and willingness to communicate account for Masha's L2 achievement?" The questionnaire has 33 questions with separate sections on each of the IDs mentioned above. Analyzing the interviewee's responses to these questions, the researcher narrowed down the focus of the research question to the two most important IDs influencing Masha's learning of English, namely 'anxiety,' and 'willingness to communicate.'

As the researcher analyzes the raw data collected through the questionnaires, he found that Masha was mostly an autonomous learner who learned best by working on her own. She found classroom learning boring and frustrating whereas she learned unconsciously through TV or movies and found it fun. She was very conscious about making errors in class, whereas she did not care much about the errors she made outside classes during her spontaneous speech. She also learned through application, so, naturally, she did not find the grammar-focused classroom instructions very engaging, frequently getting distracted. Moreover, being quite a

talkative person outside class, Masha was quite reserved in the classrooms. Finally, although unwilling to communicate in the classroom, Masha was quite enthusiastic about out-of-class communication.

Summarizing her responses from the general questionnaire, the researcher could detect a very different behavioral pattern in Masha's attitude inside and outside of classrooms. Based on this finding, he decided to further explore Masha's 'anxiety' and 'willingness to communicate' in and out of the classroom.The research question was revised to the following:

- *To what extent do 'anxiety' and 'willingness to communicate' account for Masha's language development in and out of class?*

The researcher adapted each of the scales into two parts: one part investigating Masha's behavior in the classroom and the other part outside of class. Each of the parts had 10 statements to specifically find out Masha's behavioral differences in and out of class (please see the fully developed scales as appendix B, C, D, and E). In designing both the scales, the same items (for example, her level of confidence in and out of class) were used for the researcher to be able to compare the findings with each other. The researcher adapted a well-organized pattern for the interviewee to feel comfortable in answering the questions. In the questionnaire, the interviewee had to check the appropriate box from five options for each item. For analysis, the responses were converted into mathematical figures as follows:

Response	Score
Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

The two interpretation keys were developed to interpret the range of responses for anxiety and willingness to communicate:

Range	Level of anxiety	Range	Level of willingness to communicate
50-4	Very low	50-40	Very high
30-3	Moderate	30-39	High
20-3	High	20-38	Moderate
1-19	Very high	1-19	Very low

Results and Discussion

The results of Masha's scale surveys are the following:

Anxiety (in class)	Anxiety (out of class)	Willingness to communicate (in class)	Willingness to communicate (out of class)
29	40	25	44

The scale survey results both in 'anxiety' and 'willingness to communicate' strongly correlate with the findings of the general questionnaire interview in that Masha's anxiety level is very high when she learns in class and extremely low (in fact the lowest) during her outside class interactions. Similar results were found with her 'willingness to communicate': very low in class yet, very high outside of classes.

Anxiety

Masha's response to classroom anxiety is similar to one of the students, namely Monique, in Ellis and Rathbone's (1987) study in which the learner "felt stupid and helpless in class" (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 692). Also, Eyseneck's findings that low level anxiety can lead to more effect is similar to Masha's since her low anxiety outside the classroom was proved to be facilitative in acquiring English. However, unlike Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) findings, Masha's high anxiety level may not entirely reflect her "apprehension at having to communicate spontaneously" (as cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 692). It is applicable only when she is in the classroom.

Willingness to Communicate

As presented in McIntyre's (2001) research, WTC is influenced by variables like "communication anxiety" (cited in Ellis, p. 697) which is strongly reflected in Masha's case as communication anxiety in the classroom prevents her from participating actively in the classroom activities. It can also be concluded that given her autonomous and experiential learning style, she did not enjoy the teacher-centered deductive presentations of grammar rules. Also, Masha's personality had a decisive effect on her language learning. Being an extrovert outside class and quiet in the class, Masha did not like to spend time in classrooms, and therefore, she did not quite enjoy her "academic success" as noted by Griffith (1991) with regards to introverted learners (cited in Ellis, 2012, p. 674).

Conclusion

Finally, as the researcher compared his findings to that of his own learning background and IDs, he finds a number of similarities as well as differences. The major similarities are:

- Both of them are the products of teacher-centered pedagogy
- Both of them studied similar textbooks
- Both of them had a high level of anxiety in the classroom
- Both of them were unwilling to communicate in class

While observing their differences, the researcher found the following:

- The interviewee had access to satellite TV channels while the researcher did not, and thereby could not avail the opportunity of input flooding
- The interviewee's anxiety level was low outside the class, but the researcher had a high level of anxiety both inside and outside of his class till his tertiary level of education
- The interviewee was very willing to communicate outside the classroom whereas the researcher was not until the later part of his tertiary level of education.

Based on the similarities and differences between the researcher and the interviewee, it may be surprising to note that, despite the fact that the researcher did not have much opportunity for input for a long time, and that his anxiety level was pretty high both inside and outside of class, the researcher still managed to learn English and reached an advanced stage of learning. So, it can be concluded that it may be difficult to measure the effect of IDs on language learning since the apparent negative impact of an ID may not be negative and vice-versa.

Limitations of the study

This study has a few limitations. Firstly, the researcher of the study, being the primary instrument for data collection and analysis, may not have fully overcome the human subjective bias in selecting and organizing issues that he found pertinent. Therefore, though the researcher was conscious about not influencing the study at all, there may have been unconscious attempts to manipulate the subject's answers, thereby affecting the reliability, validity, and generalizability of the study. Secondly, since it is a case study, it may never claim its findings to be truly representative of similar sets of subjects as Hamel (1993) said, "…case stud [ies] [have] basically been faulted for its lack of representativeness" (p. 23).However, the researcher has listened to the tape recorded interview repeatedly to detect and thereby remove any single example of subjective bias to make the findings as objective as possible.

References

Bailey, P., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Daley, C. (2000). Using learning style to predict foreign language achievement at the college level. *System*, 28(1), 115-134.

Big Five personality traits. (2015, June 5). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved 10:57, June 10, 2015, fromhttp://en. wikipedia.org/w/index.php? title=Big_Five_personality_traits&oldid=665582580

Dörnyei, Z., &Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), 275-300.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nded.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hamel, J. (1993). *Case Study Methods. Qualitative Research Methods*. Vol. 32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language Anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112-126.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codifications, and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (pp.11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keefe, J. W. (1979). Learning style: An overview. In J.W. Keefe (Ed.). *Student Learning Styles: Diagnosing and Prescribing Programs*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1-17.

MacIntyre, P, Baker, S., Clement, R., & Conrad, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social supports, and language learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*,23, 369-388.

Reid, J. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(1), 87-111.

Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (2002). Communicative competence and personality dimensions in first and second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23(3), 361-374.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: the Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86, 54-66.

Appendix A

General Questionnaire Interview

I would like to talk to you about your experiences of learning English. In the first part of the interview, I would like to ask you questions pertaining to when and how and in what sequence you learned English. I may give you a more specific questionnaire later on addressing any one or two of the topics that may emerge out of the interview today. The purpose of the questionnaire would be to collect more in-depth information about the chosen topics.

Part I: Personal Profile, Learning History, and Linguistic Environment

1. Languages spoken at home

2. The first language you learned

3. At what age did you start learning your second language?

4. Where and under what circumstances did you learn?

Possible sub-questions:

a. From what grade in your school did you start learning English? Typically how many hours of classroom instruction did you have in your school (primary, secondary, and post-secondary)?

b. Did you learn English as a subject or as a medium of instruction for all the content areas?

c. Were there separate classes for each of the language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) or was there a general English class?

d. What about grammar? Was there a separate grammar class? (please mention the level of study, for example, primary school, secondary school, higher secondary school or college, and tertiary level education) while answering this question

e. Tell me about your textbook: what was it like? Were there a lot of grammar exercises? Did you have to speak or write in the classroom?

f. What kind of speaking or writing activities did you have to do? Can you give an example? (Please mention the level of study, for example, primary school, secondary school, higher secondary school or college, and tertiary level education).

g. Do you remember what kind of homework you had to do? What was difficult for you?

h. What about class work? What type of class work did you find particularly challenging?

i. Did you have opportunities to practice the language with anyone else outside your classes? At what level of education did you have the maximum opportunity to practice your English beyond classrooms?

j. Did you watch English movies or listen to the radio? Typically how many movies did you watch? Was there any other source of English input? Please mention each of them.

k. Which of these languages do you maintain to the present time?

l. Which of the following statements would be more appropriate as you categorize yourself as a language learner?

	Below elementary	Elementary proficiency	Working knowledge	Advanced
Understanding				
Speaking				
Reading				
Writing				

Part II: Individual differences (IDs)

Anxiety (5-11)

5. Many language learners feel very negative about their learning experiences. They say they feel discouraged, frustrated, impatient, or confused by the difficulties of learning a language. Have you ever experienced any of these feelings?

6. There are other learners who say that they feel shy or embarrassed expressing themselves in the foreign language. Have you ever felt this way? Can you explain?

7. When you are learning a language, are you usually:

a. highly motivated, and do everything possible to learn the language?

b. quite motivated, and try to do what you can to learn the language, but it is not your priority?

c. not very motivated, because you are too busy or tired to concentrate on it? You are learning out of necessity.

d. not very motivated, because you find learning languages boring?

8. Do you give yourself encouragement, by saying things to yourself like: "I'm doing okay" or "I'm right, I know it"?

9. In your language class, do you often think about other things that have nothing to do with learning the language? Can you explain why?

10. Are you very performance-conscious when you speak English in class? In other words, do you think you should not make any error so that other people have a positive impression about your language ability?

11. How do you feel about giving an unrehearsed talk in class? Can you think of an example to illustrate your point?

Learning Styles: (12-19)

12. How do you usually learn best?

- _____ working on my own and taking my own time.
- _____ from an instructor's lecture.
- _____ from an instructor who works personally with me.
- _____ working in a small group of people I feel comfortable with.
- _____ seeing practical application.
- _____ following written directions.
- _____ from a small group of people with an instructor available to answer questions.

13. What most helps your learning? (Check as many as you want; rank in order of importance.)

- _____ having my own routine.
- _____ talking with others while learning.
- _____ being able to take my time.
- _____ having fun while learning.
- _____ being able to practice what I am learning.
- _____ getting support and encouragement from instructors/people at home.

14. What occurs to you first when you are learning something?

- _____ remembering something you did once that was similar.
- _____ thinking up a picture of how something ought to be.
- _____ getting as much information as you can about the topic.

15. What is the easiest part or stage of learning for you?

- _____ beginning something.
- _____ working on the details and practicing.

- _____ completing something.

16. What is the most difficult part of learning for you?

- _____ beginning something.
- _____ working on the details and practicing.
- _____ completing something.

17. In putting something together, I:

- _____ read instructions first, then look at the pieces.
- _____ look at the pieces, then read the instructions.
- _____ look at the instructions but make up my own way of putting the pieces together.
- _____ try to put pieces together first; then if it doesn't work, I look at the instructions.

18. How do you best learn ideas and theories?

- _____ talking about them
- _____ working on applying them
- _____ reading about them

19. How do you know when you have really learned something? (Check one)

- _____ I feel comfortable doing it again.
- _____ I show or tell my family and friends what I can do.
- _____ Other: _____

Personality (20-25)

20. Would you like to define yourself as a talkative or quiet person? What about your interaction in a language class? Are you the same talkative or quiet person in the outside world too?

21. Generally speaking, do you think you are creative and can come up with new ideas? Please give an example.

22. Are you curious about many different things or just do whatever you have to do?

23. Do you see yourself as someone who is disorganized? Why or why not? I would appreciate an example.

24. How do you handle stress? Do you think you can remain calm in tense situations?

25. Do you make plans and follow through or do you just do things as they come?

26. If a stranger walks into your class, how willing would you be to have a conversation with him/her, if s/he talked to you first?

27. If you are confused about the teacher's instruction, how willing are you to ask for clarification?

28. Would you be interested to read a long letter from a pen pal closely? Why or why not?

29. If you take a fun quiz from a magazine, will you write down the answers for the quiz after you take it?

30. How willing would you be in describing the rules of your favorite game to a friend?

31. Would you be interested in reading an advertisement in the paper to find a good bicycle that you can buy?

32. Do you write down a list of things that you must buy tomorrow?

33. If you are confused about the direction of a place where you are heading, will you ask someone or study the map more closely?

Appendix B

Directions: Put a check in the boxes that you mostly agree with

Foreign Language Anxiety Scale in the Classroom
(Adapted from Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope, 1986)

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English language class					
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in English class.					
3. I stay calm when I don't understand the teacher's instructions and ask for clarification.					
4. It would not bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. I am usually at ease during tests in my English class.					
6. I never panic when I have to speak in my English class.					
7. I never worry about the consequences of failing in my English class.					
8. I never understand why some people get so upset over foreign language classes.					
9. I feel confident when I speak in my English language class.					
10. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for my English class.					
11. I never get intimidated by other students who are better than I am in my English class.					

Appendix C

Foreign Language Anxiety Scale Outside of Classrooms
(Adapted from Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope, 1986)

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking the foreign language outside of class.					
2. I don't worry about making mistakes while speaking the foreign language outside class.					

3. I stay calm when I don't understand the other person in a conversation and usually ask for clarification questions.					
4. It would not bother me to speak to a more competent speaker than myself.					
4. I am not embarrassed if the other speaker corrects my mistake.					
5. I never panic when a native speaker starts a conversation with me.					
6. I never worry about the consequences of not having a successful conversation with a native speaker.					
7. I never understand why some people get so nervous speaking English outside of class.					
8. I am never worried about the possibility that a native speaker may find my English not up to the mark outside of class.					
9. I always put active effort in making the other person understand me without being embarrassed.					
10. I never feel pressured to sound correct all the time when I speak in English.					

Scoring key:

Strongly Agree: 5
Agree: 4
Neutral: 3
Disagree: 2
Strongly Disagree: 1

Range of anxiety:

50-40 = Confident/very low-level of anxiety
30-39= Moderate level of anxiety
20-38= Anxious
1-19 = Extremely anxious

Appendix D

Directions: Put a check in the boxes that you mostly agree with
Foreign Language Willingness to Communicate Scale in the Classroom
(Adapted from MacIntyre *et al.*, 2001)

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I usually speak to my teacher in or after class if I don't understand the homework					
2. I usually talk to my classmates in English during break.					
3. I am comfortable reading a passage assigned by the teacher in a language class.					
4. I ask the teacher questions about the reading if I don't understand anything even if I try.					
4. I usually take notes in my language classes and write down all the important instructions.					

5. I quickly jot down a new word or phrase that the teacher has used and ask him what it means.					
6. I feel comfortable speaking with my peers during pair/group work.					
7. If a new student joins a class, I am comfortable talking to him first.					
8. I am happy to answer my peer's question related to a task during group work.					
9. I like to volunteer answers to questions asked by the teacher.					
10. I am willing to participate in the small talk initiated by the teacher.					

Appendix D

Directions: Put a check in the boxes that you mostly agree with
Foreign Language Willingness to Communicate Scale in the Classroom
(Adapted from MacIntyre *et al*., 2001)

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I love to talk to a group about my summer vacation.					
2. I usually talk to my classmates in English during break.					
3. I talk to my English teacher about homework after class.					
4. I am willing to help out a stranger with directions on the street					

5. I read articles in the newspaper that interest me.				
6. I frequently write letters/emails to my friends in English.				
7. I feel comfortable talking to a native speaker of English at a grocery store.				
8. I am willing to join an English conversation club to practice speaking.				
9. I am willing to write an article in English for a newspaper about a favorite topic of mine.				
10. I enjoy reading novels or story books in English.				

Scoring key: Range of willingness to communicate:

Strongly Agree : 5
Agree   : 4
Neutral   : 3
Disagree   : 2
Strongly Disagree: 1

50-40= Confident/Very low-level of anxiety
30-39=Moderate level of anxiety
20-38=Anxious
1-19 = Extremely anxious