UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

*MALAYSIAN TEACHERS' OVERALL WILLINGNESS TO
COMMUNICATE DURING CLASSROOM DISCUSSION AND FACTORS
AFFECTING THEIR COMMUNICATION INTERACTIONS*

MARYAM JAHEDI

FPP 2022 17

MALAYSIAN TEACHERS' OVERALL WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE DURING CLASSROOM DISCUSSION AND FACTORS AFFECTING THEIR COMMUNICATION INTERACTIONS

By

MARYAM JAHEDI

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2021

MALAYSIAN TEACHERS' OVERALL WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE DURING CLASSROOM DISCUSSION AND FACTORS AFFECTING THEIR COMMUNICATION INTERACTIONS

By

MARYAM JAHEDI

December 2021

Chair   **: Lilliati binti Ismail, PhD**
Faculty   **: Educational Studies**

Willingness to Communicate (WTC) is defined as language learners' willingness to use the opportunities for authentic communication which has received considerable attention in the field of second language acquisition as it brings together the factors that can describe and predict L2 communication (Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Peng, 2007). Most of these studies were mainly conducted through self-report questionnaires and few of them focused on the situational factors affecting learners' WTC. This study is significant as it investigates teachers' overall WTC and their WTC during the classroom discussion.

The willingness to communicate model and discourse analysis were employed to examine Malaysian English teachers' overall WTC and communication behavior. Therefore, their interactions during the classroom were video- and audio-recorded and journal entries were collected. Moreover, two questionnaires were administered, and an interview was conducted. The WTC Model explained why they do or do not participate in the classroom discussion, and discourse analysis helped to describe their communication behavior.

The results of the study revealed that the teachers' general WTC was not consistent with their L2 use during the classroom discussion. The study also found affecting situational WTC factors, which include classroom-contextual factors, interpersonal influencing factors and linguistic-related factors. The major speech functions were questions and statements, which indicates that WTC was displayed through the predominant use of declaratives and interrogatives. Moreover, the study found the predominant interactional resources used to display WTC.

i

The study will benefit learners since the affective WTC factors in the L2 can be made known to the learners, which can increase their engagement in the classroom interactions. Moreover, the outcomes of the study are expected to provide insights for teachers about the factors that affect learners' WTC in the L2 so that they can modify their instructions to encourage learners' WTC.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

KESEDIAAN KESELURUHAN GURU MALAYSIA UNTUK BERKOMUNIKASI SEMASA PERBINCANGAN BILIK DARJAH DAN FAKTOR-FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI INTERAKSI KOMUNIKASI MEREKA

Oleh

MARYAM JAHEDI

Disember 2021

Pengerusi : **Lilliati binti Ismail, PhD**
Fakulti : **Pengajian Pendidikan**

Kesediaan untuk Berkomunikasi (WTC) ditakrifkan sebagai kesediaan pelajar bahasa untuk menggunakan peluang untuk komunikasi autentik yang telah mendapat perhatian yang besar dalam bidang pemerolehan bahasa kedua kerana ia menggabungkan faktor-faktor yang boleh menggambarkan dan meramalkan komunikasi L2 (Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Peng, 2007). Kebanyakan kajian ini dijalankan terutamanya melalui soal selidik laporan kendiri dan beberapa daripadanya memfokuskan kepada faktor situasi yang mempengaruhi WTC pelajar. Kajian ini penting kerana ia menyiasat keseluruhan WTC guru dan WTC mereka semasa perbincangan bilik darjah.

Kesediaan untuk berkomunikasi model dan analisis wacana digunakan untuk mengkaji keseluruhan WTC dan tingkah laku komunikasi guru Bahasa Inggeris Malaysia. Oleh itu, interaksi mereka semasa bilik darjah adalah rakaman video dan audio dan catatan jurnal dikumpulkan. Selain itu, dua soal selidik telah ditadbir, dan temu bual telah dijalankan. Model WTC menjelaskan mengapa mereka menyertai atau tidak mengambil bahagian dalam perbincangan bilik darjah, dan analisis wacana membantu menggambarkan tingkah laku komunikasi mereka.

Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa WTC am guru tidak konsisten dengan penggunaan L2 mereka semasa perbincangan bilik darjah. Kajian juga mendapati mempengaruhi faktor WTC situasi, yang merangkumi faktor konteks bilik darjah, faktor pengaruh interpersonal dan faktor berkaitan linguistik. Fungsi pertuturan utama ialah soalan dan pernyataan, yang menunjukkan bahawa WTC dipaparkan melalui penggunaan utama deklaratif dan soal siasat. Selain itu, kajian mendapati sumber interaksi utama yang digunakan untuk memaparkan WTC.

iii

Kajian ini akan memberi manfaat kepada pelajar kerana faktor WTC afektif dalam L2 boleh diketahui kepada pelajar, yang boleh meningkatkan penglibatan mereka dalam interaksi bilik darjah. Selain itu, hasil kajian diharapkan dapat memberikan pandangan kepada guru tentang faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi WTC pelajar dalam L2 supaya mereka boleh mengubah suai arahan mereka untuk menggalakkan WTC pelajar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my Dissertation Committee, Dr. Lilliati Ismail, Dr. Nooreen Noordin, Dr. Tam Suet Yet, for their intellectual and emotional support.

My sincerest gratitude goes to Dr. Lilliati Ismail, Chair of my Dissertation Committee, for her insightful feedback and constructive comments. I always thank her for being kind and supportive.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Moomala for her encouragement on the research topic and for her support and assistance in collecting the data of the study.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for supporting me. I appreciate my husband for his unconditional support and understanding. Without his devotion, I could not have completed my doctoral studies. In addition, l am grateful to my kids for their love and care.

This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

Lilliati binti Ismail, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairman)

Nooreen binti Noordin, PhD
Associate Professor
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Tam Suet Yet, PhD
Senior Lecturer
Faculty of Educational Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD
Professor and Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 11 August 2022

Declaration by Graduate Student

I hereby confirm that:
- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and the copyright of the thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as stipulated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from the supervisor and the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and innovation) before the thesis is published in any written, printed or electronic form (including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials) as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld in accordance with the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2015-2016) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software

Signature: _____   Date: _____

Name and Matric No.: <u>Maryam Jahedi_____</u>

Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:
- the research and the writing of this thesis were done under our supervision;
- supervisory responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2015-2016) are adhered to.

Signature:
Name of Chairman
of Supervisory
Committee: Dr. Lilliati Ismail

Signature:
Name of Member of
Supervisory
Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nooreen Noordin

Signature:
Name of Member of
Supervisory
Committee: Dr. Tam Suet Yet

ix

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA	Conversation Analysis
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
SFL	Systemic Functional Linguistics
WTC	Willingness to Communicate
WTS	Willingness to Speak

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background to the Study

Over recent years, particular importance has been given to the study of willingness to communicate (WTC) in second language (L2). WTC plays a vital role in learning a language (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999) since communication and social contacts are the primary function of speech among individuals (Vygotsky, 1978). WTC can help English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to attain adequate oral English language proficiency and to be linguistically competent; however, "learners who do not engage in second language interaction are usually regarded as being passive and unmotivated" (Cao, 2009, p. 1).

There is a concern for ESL/EFL learners who are unwilling to communicate in the second language (MacIntyre, & Doucett, 2010), especially for new graduates whose lack of adequate English proficiency can make them not to be marketable in the job market (Nair et al., 2012). In order for the learners to reach the level of English proficiency, there is a need to encourage them to communicate more in English language (Yousef, 2013).

The concept of WTC as a construct was introduced by McCroskey and Baer (1985) in L1 communication as "a personality-based, trait-like predisposition which is relatively consistent across a variety of communication contexts and types of receivers" (McCroskey & Baer, 1985, p. 6). Later, MacIntyre et al. (1998) developed the WTC in L2 communication, which is "conceptualized as a readiness to speak in the L2 at a particular time with a specific person, and as such, is the final psychological step to the initiation of L2 communication" (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010, p.162). Kang (2005) defined WTC as "an individual's volitional inclination towards actively engaging in the act of communication in a specific situation" (p. 291). Therefore, the WTC model can be used to explain "why some learners speak in spite of limited communicative competence, whereas others are quite reluctant to talk even with high competence" (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 558).

A number of studies focused on trait-like variables, such as self-esteem, perceived competence, emotion and anxiety influencing learners' WTC in L2 and employed a quantitative method, such as structural equation modelling or self-measured questionnaires (Clément, et al., 2003; MacIntyre et al., 1998). For example, by investigating the correlation between trait-like constructs and learners' WTC, MacIntyre et al. (1999) found that the learners' emotion led to high self-esteem and those with high self-esteem had high level of perceived competence which then affected their WTC. The research on WTC trait-like variables showed that these factors prepare the learners to have the tendency to participate in a communication at a particular situation.

1

A special attention has recently been given to the importance of situational WTC factors or the combination of both trait-like and situational WTC variables (Cao & Philp, 2006; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; MacIntyre et al., 2001; MacIntyre & Ducette 2010; Peng, 2007). Yashima's (2002) study confirmed the importance of situational factors on learners' WTC in L2. Yashima (2002) investigated Japanese students' WTC trait-like variables, such as age, gender and personality as well as situational WTC factors related to Japanese culture and found that learners' WTC are affected by both the traits of the learners and situational factors. Besides, Kang's (2005) study emphasized the fluctuating nature of WTC and more importantly it employed the qualitative methodology in the study of willingness to communicate. Cao and Philp (2006) also supported Kang's (2005) findings that qualitative approach provides more information about the situational variables affecting learners' WTC.

Since willingness to communicate is related to language teaching and learning, some studies examined WTC in relation to l2 classroom-based contexts (Abd Rahman et al., 2020; Cao, 2009; Manipuspika, 2018; Riasati, 2018; Riasati, 2012). Peng's (2007) findings showed that Chinese students' WTC in EFL classroom was dynamic and dependent on situational factors. Moreover, Cao (2014) argued that the fluctuation of WTC in the classroom context is "due to variations in the individual, environmental, and linguistic antecedents" (Cao, 2014, p.807). Although Cao (2014) found the influence of linguistic resources on learners' WTC, she did not employ a linguistic theory to study the linguistic elements in detail.

Given the discussion interaction as a significant part of human education, it seems that learners' WTC in classroom discussions plays an important role in learning L2 since their participation helps to develop a more critical understanding of a topic, to increase their self-awareness, to raise appreciation for diverse opinions, and to enhance their ability to take action (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999). Although there are substantial studies conducted regarding language learners' WTC (Cao & Philp, 2006; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; MacIntyre et al., 2001; MacIntyre & Ducette 2010; Peng, 2007; Yashima, 2002), few studies have concentrated on WTC in relation to how L2 learners' WTC was displayed and how linguistic strategies was used (Suksawas; 2011).

This study not only tried to investigate teachers' overall WTC and to uncover the factors that enhance their WTC in the classroom discussion, but investigated linguistic resources using discourse analysis. It has added a new methodology in anticipation of findings through discourse analysis which incorporates both systemic functional linguistics and conversation analysis.

1.2   Problem Statement

In recent years, researchers have focused on EFL/ESL learners to find willingness to communicate in English (Ayedoun, 2015; Cao, 2014; Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005; Lo, 2018, MacIntyre, 2007; MacIntyre & Ducette, 2009). While the goal of teachers is to encourage their students to speak effectively in English classrooms, the issue of whether the learners are ready to communicate in the classroom when they are given a

2

chance, and the factors that may influence their willingness to communicate are important to be scrutinized. Previous research focused on willingness to communicate among L1 or L2 language learners to find the learners' perceptions of WTC in L2 (House, 2004; de Saint Leger & Storch, 2009); to investigate the relationship between trait-like variables and WTC (Clément, et al., 2003; Kang, 2005); and also to explore situational variables underlying WTC (Cao &Philp, 2006; Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000; Peng, 2007).

According to the literature, factors such as communicative competence, personality and anxiety may affect learners' WTC. For instance, communication apprehension is an affective factor that influences "the quality of oral language production, making individuals appear less fluent than they really are" (Horwitz & Young, 1990, p. 56) and, thus, constrains their communication in L2.

Previous research has shown that Malaysian "students have a high degree of L2 communication apprehension" (Yousef et al., 2013, p. 207) which inhibits their willingness to communicate and their poor communication skills in English can be seen as a reason for their unemployment (Darmi, & Albion, 2014; Spawa & Hassan, 2013) since "a major reason why some people are less willing to communicate than others is because of deficient communication skills" (McCroskey, & Richmond, 1990, p. 26) and people who are highly willing to communicate receive preference in the hiring process and are more likely to be promoted to positions of importance in the organization. Poor communication proficiency in ESL among Malaysian learners has been a national concern (Spawa & Hassan, 2013).

The Malaysian Education Blueprint 2013-2025 put an "increasing emphasis on English communication, whereby a greater section of classroom and textbook activities has focused on face-to-face interaction," which requires that Malaysian ESL teachers to have a high WTC in English as they have a significant impact on communication outcomes (Lo, 2018, p. 594). L2 teachers require WTC to be effective in their teaching (Wang & Tseng, 2020); however, some studies (Fahim & Dhamotharan, 2016; Lo, 2016; Yousef et al., 2013) showed that Malaysian "ESL in-service teachers' WTC in English is not consistent across geographic regions" and teachers' WTC is influenced by a number of personal factors (Wang & Tseng, 2020, p. 3). The effect of situational factors on willingness to communicate in English among ESL students, and ESL teachers remained unclear and need empirical analysis (Lo, 2018, p. 594; Kho-Yar et al., 2018).

Studies on WTC "centered mainly on the use of structural models and trait, self-reported measurements of WTC, but recent research has shown that WTC is also heavily dependent on the situation" (Robson, 2015a, iii). However, situational variables have not been addressed adequately (Yashima, MacIntyre & Ikeda, 2018; Robson, 2015a, iii). Research on WTC has mostly relied on learners' perceptions on their willingness to communicate in the L2 and a few studies focused on learners' WTC regarding to a particular context such as classroom interactions; however, their actual behavior in the classroom in relation to WTC deserves much attention since "people's intuitions about how they behave in interaction often conflict with their actual behavior" (Hoey & Kendrick, 2017, P. 4).

3

WTC as a construct is treated more as "a measure of whether someone will initiate talk rather than how much the person actually speaks" (Dörnyei & Kormos, 2000, p. 286); in other words, a few research investigated situational WTC, "but it was mainly through self-report questionnaires that only dealt with hypothetical situations, not the WTC characteristics that can be observed in situ in actual communicative interactions;" (Lee, 2018, p. 31); thus, studies on second language learners' situational WTC observed in classroom context are quite few.

According to Cao (2014), WTC in class results from the interdependence of three factors, including "individual characteristics, classroom environmental conditions, and linguistic factors" (Cao, 2014, p. 789). She argued that these factors "exert either facilitative or inhibitive effects on an individual student's WTC in class at any point in time" (Cao, 2014, p. 789). Although the use of linguistic means and strategies contributes to learners' WTC in English language classrooms (Cao, 2014), which can increase their English proficiency level (Nakatani, 2006), research on WTC from linguistic point of view is scarce.

This study attempted to examine teachers' WTC to find how their WTC occurs in general and in the classroom and to uncover the predominant situational factors that promote their WTC. Moreover, it was aimed to identify the linguistic strategies and interactional resources used by participants to display their WTC in the classroom discussion. Understanding these strategies can help English learners to "utilize their existing knowledge to reach their communicative goal more effectively" (Omar et al., 2012, p. 536).

1.3   Purpose and Scope of the Study

The present study has been conducted at Universiti Putra Malaysia, UPM, based in Malaysia. Since "the association between the concept of WTC in English and ESL teachers is potentially of great importance in the Malaysian ESL context and needs to be examined as a variable that affects communication outcomes" (Lo, 2018, p. 594), the researcher carried out an investigation of the Malaysian English teachers' willingness to communicate in the classroom over a period of one semester during the "Advanced Communication" Master's course. The study aimed to investigate their WTC in general and during class discussion interactions in particular to find their overall WTC in L2 and their WTC in the classroom and to discover emerging themes and patterns to identify the factors that increase their willingness to communicate in the classroom. Moreover, it was aimed to find the linguistic strategies used by the teachers in the class discussions to manifest their WTC. More specifically, the study aimed to concentrate on the following objectives:

1. To examine the relationship between the Malaysian English teachers' overall WTC in English and their WTC during the L2 classroom discussion

2. To identify the situational factors that affect the Malaysian English teachers' WTC during the L2 classroom discussion

3. To discover the linguistic strategies used in the Malaysian English teachers' communication behavior during the L2 classroom discussion

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to address the problem and meet the objectives mentioned above:

1. How was the relationship between the Malaysian English teachers' overall WTC in English and their WTC during the L2 classroom discussion?

2. What situational factors affected the Malaysian English teachers' WTC during the L2 classroom discussion?

3. What linguistic strategies were used by the Malaysian English teachers in their communication behavior during the L2 classroom discussion?

1.5 Theoretical Framework

The study has mainly employed the model of WTC as the framework. However, this model includes various linguistic, communicative and socio-psychological factors and variables that are related to different approaches in the fields of second language learning and linguistics. Therefore, the study has used a combination of theories and analytical tools such as MacIntyre, et al.'s (1998) WTC model, Halliday's (1985) Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Conversation Analysis (CA). The in-depth description of the related theories is given in Chapter Two (Literature Review).

The present study has mainly drawn on WTC model by MacIntyre et al. (1998) which includes six layers with 12 variables. The three top layers, including Communication Behavior, Behavioral Intention and Situated Antecedents are situational factors which are momentary and dependent on the specific context, whereas the three layers at the bottom, including Motivational Propensities, Affective-Cognitive Context and Societal and Individual Context are trait-like factors which have enduring influence on L2 learners' WTC. By drawing on WTC model and bearing in mind why a person is willing to communicate at one time but not at another time, it is possible to appreciate the factors affecting willingness to participate in classroom discussions. The situational factors in the model can explain "why some learners speak in spite of limited communicative competence, while others are quite reluctant to talk even with high competence;" whereas enduring factors can explain why learners "are consistent in their communication over time and across situations" (MacIntyre, et al., 1998, p. 558).

Since this study was concerned with learners' L2 Use during social interaction, discourse analysis was also used to analyze the classroom discussions in two phases. The first phase included Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics due to its "social and context-embedded features" (Muller & Willson, 2008, p. 767). SFL can play a significant role in

5

describing display of learners' WTC in discussion discourse as it considers meaning and language function as foundation of communicative activities. Through functional approach, the study can analyze linguistic data to describe the learners' actual communication behavior. As Jacob and Ward (2000) stated, "Systemic Functional Linguistics focuses on the way in which language serves as a tool for communication and on how people choose which bits of language to deploy" (p. 5). SFL can provide a tool to analyze language use or function and to describe how linguistic choices made by the learners contribute to the demonstration of their WTC in classroom discussion discourse. SFL has been drawn with the focus on context of situation/register. However, the main focus was to provide an in-depth analysis of register variable of tenor as it is related to the interpersonal relations occur in the social setting (Eggins & Slade, 2004).

The second phase, involved CA to analyze the teachers' communication behavior in the classroom using the model of interactional practices (Wong & Waring, 2010). It considered the ways a turn is being constructed and allocated, the ways of initiating and responding to talk while communicating through asking, answering, agreeing, disagreeing, and so on, and examined openings, closings and repair practices.

1.6   Significance of the Study

The outcomes of this study provide significant data to expand our understanding of Malaysian teachers' willingness to communicate in L2, especially since limited number of studies have been conducted in Malaysian context. The study examined their WTC and the affecting WTC factors inside the classroom discussions, which provides insights for ESL/EFL teachers about the factors that affect learners' WTC in L2, especially in classroom discussions so that they can modify their instructions to encourage learners' willingness to participate in the class discussions. The study will benefit ESL/EFL learners as well since the affective factors to WTC can be made known to learners which will help them to increase their engagement in classroom interactions and, thus, help them to be more efficient and proficient in L2 language and communication.

Unlike most of the studies on WTC, this study investigated linguistic strategies such as mood and speech functions used by the learners to display WTC in the classroom, which provides insights into an understanding of linguistic resources that contribute to L2 learners' participation in the classroom discussion interactions. Therefore, the results contribute to the body of literature, including second language acquisition, ESL/EFL learning, TESL, linguistics and communication studies by identifying linguistics strategies used to display WTC in the class discussions.

Previous studies have mostly focused on learners' WTC as a communicative readiness or "the final psychological step to the initiation of L2 communication" (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010, p.162) following the definition of WTC as the "readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using an L2" (MacIntyre et al. 1998). However, this study not only focused on teachers' WTC as a readiness to enter into a conversation, but examined their WTC in the actual communicative interactions to find how their WTC changes according to situational factors. This is

pedagogically important as it gives more insights into learners' communication behavior and the affecting situational WTC factors through which teachers can encourage greater participation in the classroom.

It is also methodologically significant since unlike previous research which focused mostly on quantitative analysis of trait-like WTC factors, self-report and learners' perceptions of WTC (MacIntyre, 2007; MacIntyre & Ducette, 2009), this study investigated teachers' WTC by combining the quantitative analysis of self-rated questionnaire with the qualitative analysis of interviews, journal entries and observational data, which showed the demonstration of their WTC in the classroom.

Although some studies described learners' WTC according to psychological or situational factors (Ayedoun, 2015; Cao, 2014; Cao & Philp, 2006; Kang, 2005; Lo, 2018, MacIntyre, 2007; MacIntyre & Ducette, 2009), this study contributes to L2 learners' participation in the classroom by investigating it from the perspective of the WTC model combining with the linguistic theory, which will contribute to communication and learning theories and will benefit language teaching, especially in the ESL context. Furthermore, school authorities, policy makers and material designers can be aware of linguistic and communicative needs of second language learners to improve the school curriculum which plays a significant role in language pedagogy.

1.7 Conceptual and Operational Definition of Key Terms

The important concepts are defined in the following sub-sections according to their use in the present study:

1.7.1 Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

Willingness to communicate is defined as "an individual's volitional inclination towards activity engaging in the act of communication in a specific situation, which can vary according to interlocutor(s), topic, and conversational context, among other potential situational variables" (Kang, 2005, p. 291). "The trait-level WTC reflects an individual's general tendency for communication, whereas the state-level WTC determines whether initiation of communication occurs" (Cao, 2014, p. 790). WTC and classroom participation are closely related. WTC is "treated as voluntary behaviour, whereas some types of participation could be regarded as obligatory" (Cao, 2014, p. 795). In this study, WTC refers to participants' behavioral intention to communicate and their willingness to take up opportunities to engage in the classroom discussion interactions using language devices where communication actually occurs.

7

1.7.2   Classroom Discussion Discourse

Discussion is concerned "with the development of knowledge, understanding or judgement among those taking part" (Bridges, 1988, p. 17) which "involves members of the group contributing from their different perspectives, opinions, or understandings" (Bridges, 1987, p. 34). Discourse refers to "text and context together, interacting in a way which is perceived as meaningful and unified by the participants (who are both part of the context and observers of it)" (Cook 2001, p. 4). In the present study, discussion discourse refers to the participants' classroom interactions based on the various topics and materials assigned to them. The method used in discussion was based on Socratic Method which allowed them to produce questions and collaborate with each other in answering them. Moreover, the teacher has the role of "a facilitator and an active participant in the learning community rather than an expert passing on knowledge" (Richards & Rogers, 2001b, p. 110).

1.7.3   Communication Behavior

Communication behavior refers to speaking up in a class "as the result of a complex system of interrelated variables" (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 547). Communication is the process by which individuals can express their thoughts, feelings, ideas and so on which affect their condition and behavior (Bourantas, 1992). In this study, communication behavior refers to the ways participants use linguistics resources to participate in the classroom discussions.

1.7.4   Linguistic Strategies

Linguistic strategies refer to the "ways in which a particular subarea of meaning and function is structured and expressed," in order to reach a particular communicative goal (Bleys & Steels, 2009, p. 150). In this study, linguistic strategies concern interpersonal meaning of tenor, including speech functions and mood patterns. Initiating speech functions contain offer, command, statement and question; while responding speech functions include acceptance or rejection; compliance or refusal; acknowledgement or contradiction; and answer or disclaimer. The mood patterns refer to declarative, imperative and interrogative moods. Different strategies can be used in certain circumstances; therefore, the present study aimed to find what strategies were selected by participants to manifest WTC in the classroom situation.

1.7.5   Socratic Teaching Method

The Socratic teaching method is named after Socrates who was a Greek philosopher and taught his students by asking questions to delve into their views and encourage them to ask questions about things as well. In this method, "the classroom experience is a shared dialogue between teacher and students in which both are responsible for pushing the dialogue forward through questioning," and the teacher acts as a facilitator who "asks

8

probing questions in an effort to expose the values and beliefs which frame and support the thoughts and statements of the participants in the inquiry" (Reich, 2003, p. 1). In this study, the Socratic questioning teaching method is a student-centered strategy guided by a facilitator, the lecturer, in which students could ask open-ended questions based on the reading materials and respond to the questions without being categorized as wrong or right, which facilitate the collaborative discussions among the students.

1.8   Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The primary limitation of the present study is the small sample size. Moreover, since this study is concerned only with classroom discussion interactions, the findings of the study cannot be generalizable to other contexts. The justification for the small number of the participants in the classroom context is that since this study aimed to mostly focus on qualitative data, the small sample size could meet the objectives of the study. As Baker and Edwards (2012) states, in the qualitative research "a small number of cases, or subjects, may be extremely valuable and represent adequate numbers for a research project" (p. 8). Although, this study focused on small number of Malaysian teachers, it delved more deeply into their WTC in general and inside the classroom, WTC factors and linguistic strategies used to display their WTC through observations supplemented with journal entries and interviews.

Moreover, the study has not focused on dual characteristics of WTC i.e., trait-like variables and situated variables. In other words, it was attempted to focus merely on situated variables as they can lead to meet the objectives of the study and to find the factors that are related to the specific situation, whereas trait-like variables were not necessarily needed for examining actual classroom behavior (Cao & Philp, 2006).

1.9   Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation is structured in five chapters. The present Chapter, Introduction, includes the background of the study, problem statement, research questions, purpose and scope of the study, theoretical framework, significance of the study, definition of key terms, and overview of the dissertation. Chapter Two, Literature Review, presents concept of willingness to communicate, the WTC model, sociocultural theory, communicative approaches and communicative competence. Subsequently, Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, interpersonal context, speech roles and functions as well as conversation analysis are explained. Finally, it presents the conceptual framework of the study. Chapter Three, Methodology, introduces research methods and design, sampling procedures, data collection methods, data analysis, quality of the present study, trustworthiness of the data and researcher's subjectivity and ethical considerations. Chapter Four, Results and Discussion, offers the findings of the study in relation to the analysis of WTC in general and in classroom situation, predominant situational factors affecting WTC, functions analysis, mood analysis and conversation analysis. Chapter Five, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research, presents an overview of the study, summary of the main findings, conclusions of the study, implications of the study and recommendations for further studies.

REFERENCES

Abd Rahman, S. N., Abd. Samad, A. & Abu Bakar, N. (2020). Exploring learners' perception on improving their willingness to communicate in English through experiential learning among undergraduate students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(1A), 62-69.

Al-Seghayer, Kh. (2017). The central characteristics of successful ESL/EFL teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(5), 881-890. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0805.06

Ayedoun, E., Hayashi, Y., & Seta, K. (2015). A conversational agent to encourage willingness to communicate in the context of English as a foreign language. 19th International Conference on Knowledge Based and Intelligent Information and Engineering, *Systems: Procedia Computer Science*, 60, 1433-1442.

Bachman, F. L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.

Bailey, K. M. (1990). The use of diary studies in teacher education programs. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 215-226). Cambridge University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (Ed.). (1990). *Art and answerability*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baker S. E., & Edwards R. (2012). How many qualitative interviews is enough? Expert voices and early career reflections on sampling and cases in qualitative research. *National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper*. http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273/4/how_many_interviews.pdf

Başöz, T., & Erten, H. I. (2018). Investigating tertiary level EFL learners' willingness to communicate in English. *English Language Teaching*, 11(3), 78-87. URL: http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n3p78

Bleys J, & Steels L. (2009). Linguistic selection of language strategies: a case study for colour. In European Conference on Artificial Life, 150–157. Springer.

Bourantas, D. (1992). Management: Organizational theory and behavior. Athens University of Economics.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3, 77-101.

Bridges, D. (1987). Discussion and questioning. *Questioning Exchange*, 1, 34-37.

Bridges, D. (1988). *Education, democracy, and discussion*. University Press of America.

97

Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (1999). Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques or democratic classrooms. Jossey-Bass.

Burgoon, K. J. (1976). The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs*, 43, 60–69.

Burgoon, K. J., & Koper, R. J. (1984). Nonverbal and relational communication associated with reticence. *Human Communication Research*, 10(4), 601626.

Bursali, N., & Öz, H. (2017). The Relationship between ideal L2 self and willingness to communicate inside the classroom. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(4), 229-239. http://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n4p229

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1– 47.

Cao, Y. (2014). A sociocognitive perspective on second language classroom willingness to communicate. TESOL Quarterly, 48(4), 789-814.

Cao, Y. (2009). Understanding the notion of interdependence, and the dynamics of willingness to communicate, Doctoral dissertation. URL:// https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/5584

Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System*, 34, 480-493.

Cervel, P. S. M. (2011). An Overview of systemic (functional) linguistics. In, M. R. Usón, E. A. M. Álvarez, & P. S. M. Cervel, S. E. Fernández (Eds.), *Current trends in linguistic theory* (pp. 177-228). Universidad Nacional De Educacion A Distancia.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Clément, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 22(2), 190-209.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Cook, G. (2001). *The discourse of advertising* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Darmi, R., Albion, P. (2014). Assessing the language anxiety of Malaysian undergraduate English language learners. *Proceeding of the Global Conference on Language Practice & Information Technology*, 1-10.

de Saint Leger, D., & Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: Implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 37(2), 269-285.

Dewaele, M. J., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Learner-internal and learner-external predictors of willingness to communicate in the FL classroom. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 2(1), 24–37.

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

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analyzing causal conversation*. Equinox.

Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (2004). *Analyzing causal conversation* (2nd ed.).Equinox.

Fahim, A., & Dhamotharan, M. (2016). Willingness to communicate in English among trainee teachers in a Malaysian Private University. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 105–112.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Færch and G. Kasper (Eds). *Strategies in Interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Longman.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). Strategic competence in foreign language teaching. In G. Kasper, (Ed.). *Learning, teaching and communication in the foreign language classroom* (pp. 179-193). Aarhus University Press.

Fushino, K. (2010). Causal relationships between communication confidence, beliefs about group work, and willingness to communicate in foreign language group work. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 44(4), 700-724. doi: 10.5054/tq.2010.235993

Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom: Students, teachers and researchers*. Continuum.

Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1970). Language structure and language function. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New Horizons in* Linguistics (pp. 140– 465).   Penguin.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. (1985). Language, context and text. In *aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Deakin University.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. (2009). *The essential Halliday*. Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2 use. *Second Language Studies*, 20(2), 29-70.

Hoey, E. M., & Kendrick, K. H. (2017). Conversation analysis. In A. M. B. de Groot & P. Hagoort (Eds.), Research methods in psycholinguistics: A practical guide (pp. 151–173). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (1990). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Upper Saddle River. Prentice Hall.

House, A. (2004). *Learner Perceptions of Willingness to Communicate*.(Unpublished Master's Thesis). The University of Auckland, Auckland: New Zealand.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Jacob, G., & Ward, C. (2000). Analyzing student-student interaction from cooperative learning and systemic functional perspectives. [Electronic version]. *Electronic Journals of Science Education*, 44(4). URL:// http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/7639/5406

Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. Longman.

Kang, S. (2005). Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System*, 33, 277-292.

Kangai, C. (2012). Social research methods in higher education: A critical analysis of methodological issues and emerging trends at the Zimbabwe Open University. In *theoretical and methodological approaches to social sciences and knowledge management* (pp. 1-32). https://www.intechopen.com/chapter/pdf-download/38278

Kho-Yar, A. S., Rafik-Galea, S., & Kho, E. A. H. (2018). Willingness to communicate in English among ESL undergraduates in Malaysia. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*, 4(1), 28-34.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Sage.

Lee, J. (2018). Tracking individual change in willingness to communicate: A comparison of whole class, group, and dyadic interactions across two classroom contexts. English Teaching, 73(3), 29-52. DOI: 10.15858/engtea.73.3.201809.29

Lee, Y. A. (2007). Third Turn Position in Teacher Talk: Contingency and the Work of Teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1204-1230.

Legg, M. (2005). *Student and Tutor Roles in Problem-based Learning Medical Tutorials at the University of Hong Kong*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). The School of English, Linguistics and Media, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2009). Reticence in Chinese EFL Students at varied proficiency levels. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26 (2), 65-81.

Lo, Y. Y. (2018). The ESL teachers' willingness to communicate in English. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7 (3), 594-603. ISSN 2301-9468

MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(iv), 564-576.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Doucette, J. (2010). Willingness to communicate and action control. *System*, 38(2), 161-171.

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Cle´ment, R., Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support and language learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 23, 369-388.

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Cle´ment, R., Conrod, S. (1999). Willingness to communicate: Antecedents & concequences. *Communication Quarterly*, 47(2), 215-233.

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

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

101

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA Publishers. Malinowski, B. (1935). The language of Magic and Gardening, Vol. 2: *Coral gardens and their* magic. G. Allen and Unwin.

Manipuspika, Y. S. (2018). Correlation between anxiety and willingness to communicate in the Indonesian EFL context. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(2), 200-217. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.14

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Sage.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. & Halliday, M. A. K. (1997). *Systemic functional grammar: a first step into the theory*. URL: http://minerva.ling.mq.edu.au

McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Willingness to communicate, communication apprehension, and self-perceived communication competence: Conceptualizations and perspectives. In J. A. Daly, J. C. McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D. M. Sonadre (Eds.), *avoiding communication: shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension* (pp. 75-108). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Willingness to communicate: A cognitive view. In M. Booth-Butterfield (Ed.), *communication, cognition, and anxiety* [Special issue] (pp. 19-37). *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality,* Vol. 5, No. 2.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1982). Communication apprehension and shyness: Conceptual and operational distinctions. *Central States Speech Journal*, 33, 458-468.

McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement. Paper presented at the annual convention of the speech communication association, Denver, CO.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2013). Willingness to communicate (WTC). Measurement for the Social Science. URL: http// midss.ie

McNabb, E. D. (2015). *Case Research in Public Management*. Routledge.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills. Sage.

Mirsane, M., & Kabiri, M. (2016). The Effect of teaching communicative strategy on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6 (2), 399-407.

Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2003). *Meaning making in science classrooms*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Muller, N., & Willson, B. (2008). Collaborating role construction in a conversation with dementia: An application of systemic functional linguistics. *Clinical linguistics & Phonetics*, 22(10-11), 767-774.

Nair, S. K. G., Rahim A. R., Setia, R., Husin N., Sabapathy, E., Abd Jalil, A. N., Mohd Razlan, R., Mohamad, R., Mat So'od, M. S., Md Yusoff, I. N., Madihah Mohamed, M. N., & Abu Seman, N. (2012). Malaysian graduates English adequacy in the job sector. *Asian Social Science*, 8(4), 143-147.

Nakatani, Y. (2006). Developing an oral communication strategy inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(2), 151-168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j. 1540 4781.2006.00390.x

O'Donnell, M. (2012). Introduction to systemic functional linguistics for discourse analysis. *Language, Function and Cognition*, 2011(12), 1-8.

Omar, H., Embi, A. M., & Yunus, M. M. (2012). Learners' use of communication strategies in an online discussion via Facebook. International Educational Technology Conference IETC2012. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 64, 535-544.

Parahoo, K. (1997). *Nursing research: principles, process and issues*. Macmillan.

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. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Division of Doctoral Studies, Faculty of Education and Social work, The University of Sydney.

Pawlak, M., Mystkowska-Weirtelak, A., & Bielak, J. (2016). Investigating the nature of classroom willingness to communicate (WTC): A micro perspective. Language Teaching Research, 20(5), 654-671.

Peng, P. E. (2007). Willingness to Communicate in an L2 and Integrative Motivation among College Students in an Intensive English Language Program in China. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 2, 33-59.

Pilot, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Hungler, B. P. (2001). *Essentials of nursing research: Methods, appraisal and utilization* (5th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Punch, K. F. (1998). *Introduction to social research: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Sage.Reich, R. (2003). The Socratic Method: What it is and how to use it in the classroom. Center for Teaching and Learning Stanford. https://tomprof.stanford.edu/posting/810

Riasati, M. J. (2018). Willingness to speak English among foreign language learners: A causal model. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1-17. 1455332, DOI:10.1080/2331186X.2018.1455332

Riasati, M. J. (2012). EFL learners' perception of factors influencing willingness to speak English in language classrooms: A Qualitative Study. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 17(10), 1287-1297.

Richards, C. J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., & Rogers, T. (2001a). The oral approach and situational language teaching. In *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 36 49). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9780511667305

Richards, J., & Rogers, T. (2001b). Whole language. In *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 108-114). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9780511667305

Richmond V. P., & McCroskey J. C. (1985). *Communication: Apprehension, Avoidance, and Effectiveness*. Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Rigg, P. (1991). Whole language in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3), 521–542.

Robson, C. (1997). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. Blackwell.

Robson, G. G. (2015a). *A model of Situational Constructs Accounting for Willingness to Communicate at a Japanese University*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University Graduate Board.

Robson, G. G. (2015b). A model of situational willingness to communicate (WTC) in the study abroad context. *International Education Studies*, 8(10), 114-125.

Rustandi, A., & Mubarok, A. H. (2017). Analysis IRF (Initiation-Response Feedback) on Classroom Interaction in EFL Speaking Class. *Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture,* 2(1), 239-250.

Ryan, A. (2006). Post-positivist approaches to research. In M. Antonesa, H. Fallon, A. B. Ryan, A. Ryan, T. Walsh, & L. Borys (Eds.), *Researching and writing your thesis: A guide for postgraduate* students (pp. 12-26). MACE.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language, 50(4), 696-735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243.

Saldanha, G. (2009). Literary translation. In M. Baker, & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.) (pp. 152-154). USA: Routledge.

Savignon, S. J. (2005). Communicative language teaching: strategies and goals. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 653-561). Elbaum Associates.

Scott, P. (2008). Talking a way to understanding in science classrooms. In N. Mercer, & S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring talk in schools* (pp. 17-36). Sage.

Sidnell, J. (2016). Interactional trouble and the ecology of meaning. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 20(2), 98-111. https://doi.org/10.1515/plc 2016-0006

Spawa, C. M. C., & Hassan, F. (2013) "I doesn't know English": beliefs and practices in the teaching of speaking in ESL classroom. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 21(2), 449-460. ISSN 01287702; ESSN: 2231-8534

Suksawas, W. (2011). *A Sociocultural Study of EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong. URL: http:// ro.uow.edu.au/theses/3427

Stoynoff, S. (2004). Case studies in TESOL practice *ELT Journal*, 58 (4)1, 379-393.

Sturman, A. (1999). Case study methods. In J. P. Keeves, & G. Kakomski (Eds.), *Issues in educational research*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Swain, M. (1984). Large-scale communicative language testing. In S. Savignon, & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiative in communicative language teaching: A book of readings*. Addison-Wesley.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471 484). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford University Press.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher psychological process*. Harvard University Press.

Wang, C., & Tseng, W. (2020). Toward an Instructional WTC-Mediated Model for L2 Classroom Interaction. *Sage Open*, 1-16.

Weaver, C. (2007). Willingness to communicate: A mediating factor in the interaction between learners and tasks. In K. Van den Branden, K. Van Gorp, & M. Verhelst (Eds.), *Tasks in action: Task-based language education from a classroom-based perspective* (pp. 159-194). Cambridge Scholars Press.

Wells, G. (1999). Diologic inquiry: Toward sociocultural practice and theory of education. Cambridge University Press.

Wells, G., & Arauz, R. M. (2006). Dialogue in the classroom. *The journal of the learning Sciences*, 15(3), 379-428.

Wen, W. P., & Clément, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualisation of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16(1), 18-38.

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers. Routledge.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 54-66.

Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affection willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54, 119–152. doi:10.1111/j.1467 9922.2004.00250.x.

Yashima, T., MacIntyre, P. D., & Ikeda, M. (2018). Situated willingness to communicate in an L2: Interplay of individual characteristics and context. Language Teaching Research, 22, 115–137. DOI: https://doi. org/10.1177/1362168816657851

Yin, R. (1989). *Case study research: design and methods*: Sage.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: design and methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Young, L. (2011). Systemic functional linguistics. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 625-637). Routledge.

Yousef, R., Jamil, H., & Razak, N. (2013). Willingness to communicate in English: A study of Malaysian pre-service English teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 6(9), 205-216.

Zulkifly, H. N., Omar, N., Zulkifly, M., Ismail, N., Zali, F. D. M., & Jusoh, F. M. (2021). Classroom Discourse as Institutional Interaction: From the Perspective of Conversation Analysis. *Revista Geintec*, 11(4), 4573-4585.