

Factors Contributing to Willingness to Communicate in English of Thai Undergraduate Students in the Immersion Programs

Nitchamon Suvongse

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

Natthapong Chanyoo*

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

Abstract—The present study investigated psychosocial and psychocultural variables contributing to willingness to communicate in English as a second language (L2WTC) and determined the influence of the variables towards L2WTC of Thai undergraduate students in the immersion programs. Three hundred and forty-one students in the immersion programs at a Thai public university participated in the study. A mixed-method research design was employed with a questionnaire, focus group interview questions, and observation record. Data were analyzed utilizing frequency, percentage, one-way ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis. The findings revealed that the psychosocial variables influencing L2WTC of the participants were communication apprehension, introversion, and instrumental motivation, and select psychocultural variables of *kwam kreng jai*, fear of losing face, unity, and teacher status. Multiple regression analysis revealed that the variables altogether accounted for 78% of influencing variables on L2WTC, including self-perceived communicative competence, fear of losing face, teacher status, introversion, and communication apprehension, respectively. The results of this study explain the L2WTC contexts of Thai students in immersion programs that teachers, course designers, and scholars can take into account to design a more effective learning environment for students to speak out where participation in English is required.

Index Terms—L2WTC, willingness to communicate, English immersion program, communication competence

I. INTRODUCTION

MacIntyre & Charos (1996) define Willingness to Communicate in English (L2WTC) as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using an L2”. MacIntyre et al. (1998) developed a Heuristic Pyramid Model of L2WTC as their conceptual framework to investigate the factors underlying the communication intention of L2 speakers. The model hierarchy indicated a few communication factors immediately influenced by situational variables (Layer I-III) and individual influences (Layers IV-VI). The situational variables may change depending on contextual factors, while individual effects were relatively stable and long-lasting through different communication settings. However, the results of previous studies on psychosocial variables were still varied. Other studies conducted in Asian contexts where L2 is studied as a second (ESL) or as a foreign language (EFL) also discovered new constructs mainly relative to cultural orientations. For example, Wen & Clement (2003) and Maftoon & Ziafar (2013) found that Chinese learners' L2WTC was influenced by 'Confucianism' – the belief which values the wisdom and knowledge of teachers – to the extent that the learners would feel more or less discomfort to express their opinion if it contradicts to their teachers and classmates.'

Nevertheless, the said findings do not apply to a limited number of L2WTC research in a Thai context, where few unique cultural constructs, such as *Kwam Kreng Jai* (KKJ) and *Fear of Losing Face* (FLF), are greatly exercised (Chaidaroon, 2003; Pattapong, 2010). Previous L2WTC studies in Thailand mainly related to classroom contextual factors (Suksawas, 2001; Thong-Iam, 2010). Moreover, the studies were conducted on participants with low proficiency, which highly influenced low L2WTC. Therefore, this present study opted to investigate a group of participants with a high level of English proficiency to reveal actual variables influencing L2WTC. The purpose of the current research is thus twofold: (1) to investigate the psychosocial and psychocultural variables influencing L2WTC, and (2) to determine the influence of these variables towards L2WTC of Thai undergraduate students in the immersion programs.

Two research questions were addressed to fulfill the research objectives: (1) What are psychosocial and psychocultural factors influencing willingness to communicate in English among Thai students in immersion programs? And, (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 programs?

* Corresponding author

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous L2WTC research in EFL contexts yielded mixed results. However, Communication Apprehension (CA) and Self-Perceived Communicative Competence (SPCC) were the most significant predictors of L2WTC in most studies. CA is defined as "an individual's level of fear of anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991). If a person has a high level of CA, a low L2WTC level is expected, and vice versa. A significant positive and direct path from CA to L2WTC was found in L2WTC studies in Chinese contexts (Yu, 2009; Peng, 2015) and was reported to highly influence L2WTC among language learners in the Thai context (Boonsongsup & Rimkeeratikul, 2012; Thong-Iam, 2010; Pattaong, 2010). Ponata (2015) found that Thai EFL learners' CA was underlined by fear of negative evaluation and was related to classroom management in terms of communication, informal testing, and the teacher's characteristics. CA is closely associated with SPCC, "the perception that one can perform effective communication in a given L2 context" (McCroskey & Richmond, 1991). If a person has a low level of CA and a high level of SPCC, the person would have high L2WTC and vice versa. MacIntyre & Charos (1996) found that SPCC played the most significant role influencing L2WTC among language beginners, and Clement, Baker, & MacIntyre (2003) proposed that SPCC drives one's L2WTC than actual competence does. However, Hashimoto (2002) found that SPCC did not significantly affect the communication frequency among L2 advanced Japanese learners. This implied a further layer of mediating factors between having the competence to engage in L2 conversation situations and the actual performance (Dornyei, 2010).

Meanwhile, SPCC was not included in the Thai context as the preeminent variable in any studies. Regarding motivation variables to L2WTC, Gardner (2002) found the correlations between integrative motivation—or "a desire to understand the language and culture of another group for interaction"—and higher L2 level achievement, and between integrative motivation and quick L2WTC response in the classroom. Yashima (2002) also replicated a similar result in a Japanese classroom, where motivation directly influenced L2WTC. However, both results on motivation were in contrast to MacIntyre and Charos (1996), Kimsuvan (2004), and Yashima et al., (2004) – that reported the indirect influence of motivation on L2WTC.

Only a few studies on the influences of personality traits on L2WTC were found. However, most studies replicated similar results that introversion and extroversion are the most consistent variables impeding L2WTC and that introverts are more prone to anxiety than extroverts (MacIntyre & Thivierge, 1995; MacIntyre and Charos, 1996). Yu (2009) found that the personality traits of Chinese participants remained constant across different language uses in L1 or L2 in communication situations.

Previous L2WTC studies in the EFL context proposed new constructs to MacIntyre et al. (1998)'s Model. One of the constructs was International Posture (IP), which refers to "how an individual does not relate oneself to any specific L2 group, but the international community" (Yashima, 2009). According to Yashima et al. (2004), the participants who had a greater interest in international affairs, careers, and activities – also had high L2WTC. In addition to the Japanese context, IP was reported in China (Yu, 2009; Peng, 2015) and Korea (Edward, 2006). Other additional constructs to the heuristic pyramid model were psychocultural variables. According to Fishbein & Ajzen (1970), the individual's L2WTC can be influenced by social norms to some extent that one might feel pressured to engage in an L2 communication situation. A qualitative study by Pattapong (2010) revealed some preeminent psychocultural factors in the Thai L2WTC context, which included Fear of Losing Face (FLF), Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ), Unity, and Teacher Status (TS). FLF refers to "participants' response, which discloses their concerns about others' negative evaluation towards themselves." Pattapong (2010) found that low L2WTC learners had FLF towards their peers and teachers, and high L2WTC learners also had FLF when they lacked confidence in vocabulary use in communication situations.

However, the context of the studies was dissimilar to those conducted in Japan and China. In Japan, Matsumoto (1988) found that FLF appeared when learners were required to use honorifics to gain social acceptance and conformity to group goals. In China, Gu (1990) found that FLF was caused by one's lack of ability to observe how others behave, not because their face concept is being threatened. Another psychocultural variable was KKJ, a concept of politeness found at the root of Thai society (Pattapong, 2010). KKJ refers 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" (Komin, 1990). Pattapong (2010) found that KKJ among low and high L2WTC learners often appeared during the conversations with their peers, and its causes included not wanting to take speaking opportunities from classmates, wasting others' time, and disagreeing with the justified agreement within the group. Another psychocultural variable is unity, or "the participants' responses indicating the need to comply with what others do in class." According to Thong-Iam (2010), the influence of unity on L2WTC was inevitable in the classroom with more united relationships, leading to positive communication behavior and greater L2WTC level. Pattapong's (2010) findings also reported that unity could affect low and high L2WTC learners. The last psychocultural variable was TS, or "the influence of learners' feelings of social distance between themselves and teachers based on the belief that they are obliged to respect the teachers. According to Pattapong (2010), the hierarchy issue of TS was reported when a proficient L2 participant decides to speak with her peer instead of the teacher or when other participants avoid challenging or arguing with their teacher due to uncomfortable feelings.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The target population of this study was 3,068 Thai undergraduate students in the immersion programs who majored in six different fields of study. The immersion programs refer to "full-time academic programs in which English was used as a medium for teaching and learning. It is an academic program where students are exposed to more frequent L2 contact and experience with a supportive environment of possessing the abilities to perform their target language (in this case is, English) regardless of any academic language situation, as compared to those who study in the non-immersion program". The minimum English proficiency level of the participants was equal to B2 of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) scale as corresponding to their minimum required TOEFL score at 79 or IELTS score at band 6 for their admittance to the college. The researchers chose these participants to reveal the L2WTC influencing variables, which are not misdirected by the L2 proficiency.

B. Sample Size and Sampling Methods

Determined by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) at a 95% confidence level, 341 students were recruited as the sample of this present study. The final number of participants was 409 because the researchers added 20% above the calculated number to compensate for dropouts or incomplete returns. This study employed purposive sampling to recruit participants for quantitative and systematic random sampling for the qualitative part. Participation in the study was entirely on a voluntary basis.

C. Data Collection

A questionnaire was employed for a quantitative part, and focused group interview and group observation were used for the qualitative part. The criteria for selecting participants in the qualitative part of this study were that: 1) the participants must have completed at least two of the compulsory English courses in their study to exclude the participant's proficiency level as an impeding factor to L2WTC; and 2) 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.

D. Validity and Reliability

The validity of the research instruments was verified using a method of index of item-objective congruence (IOC) to calculate the average scores given by experts. If any item received less than 0.67, it was revised according to the experts' suggestions until it finally received all approvals. The instrument was piloted prior to collecting quantitative and qualitative data. For reliability, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the Corrected item-total Correlation (CITC) was computed on quantitative data and reported 0.788. A qualified inter-rater was invited to co-analyze qualitative data.

E. Data Analysis

This study employed descriptive statistics to analyze demographic data, including the degree of L2WTC, psychosocial factors, and psychocultural factors based on percentage and frequency distribution. One-way ANOVA was conducted to find out the variables that significantly influenced L2WTC. Multiple regression was used for investigating the accountability of the L2WTC influencing variables. A Focus group interview was employed in the qualitative study to provide in-depth information on pre-selected discussion topics. The interview data were transcribed, coded, and grouped by content analysis and thematization to conclude the final patterns. Data from a group observation were collected on the observable L2WTC behavioral intentions and the frequency during the focus group interview.

IV. RESULTS

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 ($M = 3.21$).

RQ1: What are psychosocial and psychocultural factors influencing the willingness to communicate in English with Thai students in immersion programs?

The descriptive statistics revealed that SPCC ($M = 3.83$) and instrumental motivation ($M = 3.70$) were variables that highly contributed to L2WTC, while the rest of the variables had a moderate level of contribution. One-way ANOVA results showed that the significantly influencing variables to L2WTC were instrumental motivation and unity in public context; CA, introversion, KKJ, and TS in a group context; and FLF in dyad context, respectively. No significant influencing L2WTC variables were found in the meeting context.

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 programs?

The results from the questionnaire showed that L2WTC positively correlated to all variables and exceptionally had a significantly high correlation with FLF ($.632, p < .01$). Other variables were also positively correlated, except a few variables such as SPCC and introvert ($-.320, p < .01$), extrovert and introvert ($-.476, p < .01$), and integrative motivation and introvert ($-.069, p < .05$). Nevertheless, the linear relationships among these variables were not particularly strong.

The correlation results indicated that it was impossible to predict L2WTC based on a single variable. The result was supported by qualitative data, where few variables were detected in the interviewees' responses simultaneously.

Multiple regression analysis revealed the R^2 value of 78%. The result showed that the highest predictors of psychosocial variables were SPCC ($\beta = .350$) and introversion ($\beta = .188$), and the highest predictors of psychocultural variables were FLF ($\beta = .228$) and TS ($\beta = .188$), respectively. Qualitative data supported the quantitative results. For example, the participants with high SPCC would not feel uncomfortable using the L2, but they would switch to L1 depending on their interlocutor's L2 proficiency level or preferred language. On the other hand, the participants with low to moderate levels of SPCC would consider factors such as their L2 ability and their topical knowledge before engaging in a particular L2 conversation. For motivation, the participants who had the instrumental motivation (such as getting grades from participation) were more likely to participate in L2 communication than those who had integrative motivation. In terms of personality, the introverts would not intend to be the first to speak up in a communication situation, while the extroverts always did. However, despite having higher possibilities to join L2 conversation, an extrovert could hesitate to speak using an L2 if the environment was not in their favor.

The interview data also explained why FLF and TS were the highest psychocultural predictors of L2WTC. FLF had its roots in Thai culture that involved shyness, and it explained the participants' hesitation to bring up L2WTC if they were uncomfortable with some topics being discussed or possibly judged by others. Meanwhile, TS would interfere with the decision of immersion students to engage in L2WTC based on the positive or negative responses 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 the classroom.

The observation schedule revealed that more frequently noticeable behavioral performances were detected among the participants, who were likely to engage in L2 conversations. The data showed that being the first person to answer the discussion question and having hand gestures had the highest mean score ($M=7.00$), whereas nodding had the lowest mean score ($M=1.40$). However, no clear distinction between the introvert and extrovert interviewees regarding behavioral performances that could predict L2WTC was found.

The correlation results of this present study 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 almost all variables were significantly related. However, one-way ANOVA results made it possible to look at a few variables which significantly influenced L2WTC at a significant level of .05 during communication contexts, including instrumental motivation and unity in public, CA, introversion, KKJ, and TS in the group schedule of the interviewees.

V. DISCUSSION

Based on key findings, this current study presents four significant conclusions of the L2WTC research in the Thai context following MacIntyre et al. (1998) 's Heuristic Model of L2WTC as a conceptual framework, as well as Pattapong (2010) 's conceptual framework on the variables contributing to L2WTC. Since all of the variables were found to be significantly influence L2WTC and correlated with one another, a chain-effect among the variables can be seen, and the initial cause of impeding variable to L2WTC could neither be singled out nor can they be generalized. SPCC ($\beta = .167$) held the highest contribution level to L2WTC because the participants of this study perceived their proficiency as high. This can be supported by the high SPCC score from questionnaire items ($M = 3.83$). The result also showed that FLF could influence the participants who were not confident in the classroom situation, while the interview results suggested that such a factor might lie in introverted personality. Introversion is also linked to the fear of being judged by their interlocutors. Therefore, the variables contributing to L2WTC were not entirely isolated.

According to the result of this present study, two significant CA scores laid on the other ends of the reversed score items from quantitative data ('I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions,' $M = 3.48$) and ('I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions,' $M = 2.77$). Such results revealed that the level of CA among immersion students was relatively moderate and would fluctuate concerning the context of communication, which was group discussion. CA might link to SPCC as the two significant variables that can predict L2WTC in the general context. If one had a low level of CA and a 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 this present study came from participants with high fluency in the target language, SPCC, or the perception that one can perform well in an L2 communication context, leaned towards the high, positive side for the participants. Therefore, the result suggested that the level of CA did not solely rely on the level of SPCC in the case of the highly proficient participants in the target language. The results showed that once L2WTC research excluded the low proficiency factor from the research context, the variables accounted for L2WTC became more apparent. With the qualitative findings of this present study, it was believed that the cause of CA might come from the communication situation involving peers and teachers, yet in various contexts. The following sub-section will discuss the case where CA might be influenced by interacting with peers.

According to MacIntyre et al. (1998), some of the numerous factors influencing the level of L2WTC are familiarity between speakers: the number of people present, the formality of the situation, the degree of to which the speakers might be evaluated, the topic of discussion, and situational elements. Some of these conditions were met in the group discussion situation of the present study, which was the communication situation where L2WTC was affected the most.

During group discussion, the level of CA rose higher, resulting in a lower level of L2WTC. Nevertheless, the qualitative part of this study suggested that a higher level of CA was not necessarily caused by the participants' awareness of having to speak in L2. The result replicated to McCroskey et al. (1985), who found that the CA level of their participants did not necessarily increase from L2 speaking, and one of the factors contributing to this condition was their high level of language proficiency. The result also replicated another study by Hashimoto (2002), who conducted a study among ESL advanced language learners and found that SPCC did not significantly predict frequent communication in L2. In this present study, the possible cause that might lead to the increasing level of CA could come from knowledge on the topic under discussion and might be relative to fear of losing face rather than from proficiency level. This finding also replicated Boonyaparakob et al. (2015), who investigated the anxiety level among the EFL students in the Thai context in an English classroom and found that students with high and low anxiety were afraid to be negatively evaluated by their classmates. Those with moderate pressure were anxious about CA. However, with regards to the fact that the study was conducted in a non-immersion context where the language proficiency still accounted for low L2WTC, and to the fact that the participants' awareness of having to speak in L2 in this present study did not lead to higher CA level, the actual causes leading to CA was still in question.

According to MacIntyre et al. (1998), it is not confident that proficient learners would use L2 to communicate, although they become communicatively competent in the classroom. This present study revealed the SPCC level among the immersion students could vary in L2 communication, particularly during group conversation where L2 was required. The highest level of SPCC was detected in a communication situation with a small group of friends ($M = 4.20$) rather than with a big group of strangers ($M = 3.16$). The result can be relative to MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) L2WTC pyramid model at Layer IV: Motivational Propensities, where 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), which could explain the rationale behind the moderate L2WTC level of the immersion students despite having high SPCC. The group's climate and the influence from external factors such as contextual factors and topical knowledge could lead to CA from interactions with peers among the immersion students. The qualitative results suggested that a higher level of CA did not necessarily cause the participants' awareness of having communication in L2. Such a result replicated a study by McCroskey et al. (1985), who found that L2 speaking does not necessarily lead to CA, and Hashimoto (2002), who studied ESL advanced language learners and found that SPCC did not significantly predict L2 communication frequency. Hence, it might be convincing to claim that the statement 'if a person has a high level of CA and low SPCC, he/she is likely to communicate using L2' did not apply to the immersion context. On the other hand, the substitution for the relationship between CA and the other variables must also be considered. For example, 'if a person had a high level of CA and any psychocultural variables, which were uniquely applicable to Thai context, the person would not likely engage in the L2 communication'.

Teacher status (TS) was the psychocultural variable among the four that contained the third-highest contributing level to L2WTC of the immersion students ($\beta = .188$) along with introversion. The quantitative result revealed that the participants perceived TS in public context-type as very important ($M = 3.24$: 'I use Thai in conversations with my Thai teachers outside the classroom because I think the language is more polite than the English language.') compared to the group context-type which had the least mean score ($M = 2.79$: '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 such results, it became clear that the concept of TS, which mainly involved teachers' strong presence and great social distance exercised between teacher and students, was extraordinarily practiced in the context of an immersion program in Thailand. Even in the immersion contexts, a few participants still felt how the presence, social distance, and negative response of a teacher would stop them from willingly engaging in communication situations and remained silent instead.

As it was mentioned in the first discussion section that all the influencing variables to L2WTC were very interrelated, it was essential to consider the relation between TS and other psychosocial variables, including Fear of Losing Face (FLF), Kwam Kreng Jai (KKJ), and unity. The result of multiple regression revealed that FLF significantly contributed to L2WTC at $\beta = .288$. It should also be noted that although the result of FLF in this present study only impeded on the immersion students' L2WTC moderately as a variable, the item having the highest mean score in meeting context-type related to teacher presence ($M = 2.89$: 'I fear that my teacher would point out that I do not have enough knowledge on the topic under discussion.');

and the item that had the lowest mean score in dyad context-type related to peer presence ($M = 2.62$: 'I fear that my friend would know that I do not have enough knowledge on the topic under discussion.'). These results replicated a study of Pattapong (2010), who found that her study participants chose to remain silent in both interactions with teachers and with peers to avoid the risk of losing face.

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 that it led them to behave in the way of remaining silent to people whom they were not closed with. This was regarded as the concept of 'face protection.' In some sense, it would mean that the level of CA would rise higher during the communication situation. However, the study of L2WTC in the Thai context should not focus only on the relationships between CA and TS or CA and FLF, as all the variables were interrelated. It should be noted that both variables not necessarily relied on the

communication contexts involving their peers and teachers but were more relative to other contextual factors such as intrapersonal relationships between the interlocutors.

This section discusses the connection between KKJ and unity, with the framework in mind that KKJ in the Thai context is so broad and out of the scope of this present study and that unity influenced the least to L2WTC based on the quantitative result of this current study. The connection between the two variables might not seem plausible; however, according to the correlation results, both variables highly and significantly correlated at $p < 0.05$ (.562**). KKJ was a variable found in learners with high and low L2WTC (Pattapong, 2010) and impeded the L2WTC of the participants the most in terms of public context-type ($M = 2.94$: 'I hesitate to request for products or services from strangers.') and impeded L2WTC the least in group context-type ($M = 2.71$: 'I hesitate to request for cooperation from my group members.'). The results may suggest that the number of people presented in the scene, the intrapersonal level among the interlocutors, and the event's formality could alter the immersion students' decision to engage in L2 conversation in English. Moreover, these contexts would fall in the definition of KKJ 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 to protect the face of another interlocutor while expecting that the interlocutor would respond with the similar KKJ in return.' Concerning this definition, the qualitative result of this present study suggested how KKJ would intervene with L2WTC if the participant perceived that their interlocutor would feel uncomfortable using L2.

The context of KKJ did not stand as a single variable in the immersion students as similar to other psychosocial and psychocultural variables. Instead, a relationship between KKJ and unity might exist in the immersion students because KKJ concerns social respect and recognition from other people and agreement regarding conformity in society as more usual practice in Thai culture. This trait is different from the western culture, which is more expressive and individualistic. According to the qualitative result, a person might develop KKJ towards the other person if they use the language not complying with what the other person was comfortable with. Similarly, Pattapong (2010) 's concept of 'unity responses,' which referred to 'the participants' responses indicating the need to follow what others do in class,' meant one's decision to engage in a communication situation depended on the role of their peers. The result is similar to Thong-Iam (2010), who found a similar concept on the influence of group cohesiveness and classroom communication behaviors on L2WTC.

Nevertheless, the context of unity in this present study relied not only on classroom communication but also extended outside the classroom environment. The result of this current study revealed that unity had the lowest mean score for questionnaire items out of the four psychocultural variables. The highest mean score belonged to the item assessing dyad context-type (e.g., 'I hesitate to use English with my friend if he/she usually replies to me in Thai.'), while the lowest mean score belonged to the public context-type (e.g., 'I hesitate to initiate the talk in a group discussion when my peers are quiet.'). Therefore, this study suggested that the definition of 'unity' from previous studies needs to be revised to be more applicable to immersion contexts.

According to the interview results, some other influencing variables to L2WTC, which were not included in this present study based on literature review, were detected. The variables had the preferred language of the other interlocutor; topical knowledge; interpersonal relationship; judgmental culture; the nationality of interlocutor; and learning style, as follows:

A. Preferred Language of the Other Interlocutor

The participants would observe which language their interlocutor would be comfortable speaking and shift to L1 or L2 depending on the person they were talking with. Such a condition would be part of behavioral intention, which lies in the KKJ factor to avoid causing inconvenience to the other interlocutor if they seem to feel uncomfortable using L2 to communicate.

B. Topical Knowledge

Evidence also shows that the participants' knowledge on the topic for discussion, feelings of comfort with the environment, and intrapersonal relationship with their teacher and peers presented during the L2 context, would influence them to be more or less confident to engage in L2 conversation. Such condition would lie in the FLF variable. For example, engaging in L2 conversation relative to topical knowledge would naturally lead the students to become the center of attention, creating the risk of losing face if they respond with incorrect answers or have false expertise on any topic.

C. Interpersonal Relationship

Intrapersonal relationships among interlocutors can also influence the L2WTC of the immersion students. Based on how close or how they felt comfortable with the other interlocutor, the participant would feel more or less encouraged to engage in L2 conversation. Such conditions would be part of motivational propensities. For some participants, it might be more comfortable speaking in English with those close to them rather than with doing the same with strangers.

D. Judgmental Culture

Another evidence also suggests that judgmental culture can influence the participants' L2WTC. Based on how they were judged or feeling as if being evaluated, the participants would feel more or less encouraged to engage in L2 conversation. This circumstance would not solely be based on FLF but rather on the participants' personality and secondary school background. The present study found that extroverts were more willing to take risks using L2 in situations where there was a possibility of FLF than introverts do. The participants who graduated from a Thai school background would develop a sense of being an introvert in English communication situations due to their passive learning behaviors and being exploited in the limitation of 'teacher-students' classroom relationship, which the teachers typically hold the highest authority in the classroom.

E. Nationality of the Interlocutor

Evidence also supported that the nationality of the other interlocutor can influence the L2WTC of the immersion students. For example, the participants could feel more or less likely to engage in L2 conversation with foreign interlocutors than with people who share the same mother tongue. Such conditions might lie in unity, FLF, or even the strong influence of L1. Due to the everyday necessity of using L2 to speak with Thai peers, even inside the classroom where the use of L2 was required, the presence of an international student in a group would be a common factor for the immersion students to use English in a group discussion.

F. Learning Style

Learning style is another factor that influenced the immersion students' L2WTC. To quiet or to be willing to speak might depend not only on the personality but also on the participants' learning style. If a participant prefers being a passive learner rather than an active learner, it would be one of the possibilities how they might keep quiet in L2 conversation as they like to listen rather than speak up. Immersion students from Thai secondary school backgrounds were probably influenced by passive learning behavior. However, further research has to investigate this topic.

Regarding the variables mentioned above, it would seem that there are more sub-variables influencing L2WTC of the immersion students in addition to psychosocial and psychocultural variables. It is significant to note that a few variables may appear when the speakers are under different conditions of L2 communication context such as public, meeting, group, and dyad. Also, the level of formality of the context could influence the cause of L2WTC among the immersion students.

VI. CONCLUSION

As this present study employed a mixed-method design, not only did multiple regression reveal the contribution of overall and each psychosocial and psychocultural factors of each individual, but the qualitative data of this present study also provided a piece of in-depth information remarking such findings. Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that, even though the immersion students studied in an environment full of English use and were equipped with English ability to communicate naturally regardless of the situations, they could be influenced by the psychocultural variables which were unique in the Thai context. All in all, it was found that factors based on the literature review of previous studies and sub-variables discovered in this present study were different, depending on each spontaneous communication context.

VII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDIES

According to the results of this present study, in which SPCC was highlighted as the most influencing factor on L2WTC, this current study recommended further research on L2WTC considering of proficiency factor and select participants with a high level of proficiency such as participants with studying abroad background or international program background, to participate in the study. It would allow seeing factors influencing L2WTC without being impeded from a low proficiency variable. Future research may follow the module of the triangulation concept. Instead of adapting the data collecting framework employed in this research, future researchers may conduct qualitative data collecting procedures separately. Following the focus group interview, observation should be completed to ensure participants. The purpose of adaptation would be to explore the validity of quantitative data and whether the participants would behave in spontaneous L2 situations similar to their response during the focus group interview. Again, further studies may use the findings of this present study, which found that the psychosocial and psychocultural variables mentioned above can account for 78% of influencing variables on L2WTC as an observation schedule framework to investigate the relationships among the variables in a more specific manner.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to express sincere gratitude to our professors and colleagues whose kind effort made the completion of this study possible.

REFERENCES

- [1] Boonsongsup, N., & Rimkeeratikul, S. (2012). *Willingness to communicate and communication apprehension in English among Thai employees*. Thammasat University, Thailand. pp. 76-88.
- [2] Boonyaparakob, K., Puntai, W., & Ponata, W. (2015). A study of upper-secondary school EFL Thai students' anxiety in English language classroom. *Proceedings of the international conference on language, literature, culture, and education*, pp. 76-88. Retrieved March 23, 2020, from <http://icsai.org/procarch/2icllce/2icllce-103.pdf>
- [3] Chaidaroon, S. (2003). When shyness is not incompetence: A case of Thai communication competence. *Intercultural Communication Studies XII-4, Asian Approaches to Human Communication*.
- [4] Clement, R., Baker, S. & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of contexts, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 22(2), pp. 190-209.
- [5] Dornyei, Z. (2010). Chapter 7 Other Learner Characteristics. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 207-210. New York: Routledge.
- [6] Edwards, P. A. (2006) *Willingness to communicate among Korean Learners of English*. PhD Thesis. The University of Nottingham. Retrieved March 25, 2020, from <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/12676/1/508743.pdf>
- [7] Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- [8] Gardner, R. C. (2002). Social psychological perspectives in second language acquisition. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics*, pp. 160–169. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, pp. 237–257.
- [10] Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as a predictor of reported L2 use: the Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies*, 20(2), pp. 29-70.
- [11] Kimsuvan, A. (2004). Summary of research report: Foreign language teaching in the northern part of Thailand. *Manusia*, 7, pp. 78-79.
- [12] Komin, S. (1990). *The psychology of Thai people*. Bangkok: Research Institute of Development Administration.
- [13] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, pp. 607-610. Retrieved March 12, 2018, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001316447003000308?journalCode=epma>
- [14] MacIntyre, P. 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, pp. 545-562.
- [15] MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 15, pp. 3-26.
- [16] MacIntyre, P.D. & Thivierge, K.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, pp. 125-133.
- [17] Maftoon, P. & Ziafar, M. (2013). Effective Factors in Interactions within Japanese EFL Classrooms. *The Clearing House*, 86: pp. 74–79. Taylor and Francis Group, Routledge.
- [18] Wen, W. P., & Clement, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*, 16, pp. 18-38.
- [19] Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, pp. 403-426.
- [20] McCroskey, J. C., Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1985). Communication apprehension among Japanese students in native and second language. *Communication Research Reports*, 2, pp. 11-15.
- [21] McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1991). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. In M. Booth- Butterfield (Ed.), *Communication, cognition, and anxiety*, pp. 19–37. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [22] 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*. Thesis (PhD). Faculty of Education and Social work, University of Sydney.
- [23] Peng, E. J. (2015). L2 Motivational Self System, Attitudes, and Affect as Predictors of L2 WTC: An Imagined Community Perspective. *Asia-Pacific* (Eds.), 24(2), pp. 433-443, De La Salle University.
- [24] 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.
- [25] Suksawas, W. (2001) *A sociocultural study of EFL learners' willingness to communicate*. Doctor of Education thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong. Retrieved March 25, 2020, from <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3427>
- [26] Thong-Iam, N. (2010). Willingness to communicate and English classroom communication behaviors. *Vol.1, issue 1*, p. 2. Chulalongkorn University.
- [27] Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), pp. 54-66.
- [28] Yashima, T. (2009). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In D. Zoltán & U. Ema (Eds.), *motivation, language identity, and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- [29] Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication, *Language Learning*, 54, pp. 119-152.
- [30] Yu, M. (2009). *Willingness to communicate with foreign language learners in a Chinese setting*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Florida State University.

Nitchamon Suvongse (first author) holds an MA degree in Applied Linguistics from Mahidol University, Thailand. Her research interests include second language acquisition, classroom psychology, and non-verbal communication. She may be reached at nitchamon.s[at]gmail.com

Natthapong Chanyoo (corresponding author) is an assistant professor in the Graduate Program in Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Mahidol University, where he currently holds a Dean position. He earned a PhD in Instruction and Learning with concentrations in English Education and Applied Linguistics from the University of Pittsburgh, USA. His research interests include language acquisition, foreign language education, and the psychology of language learning. He may be reached at natthapong.cha[at]mahidol.edu