



## **An Exploration of Factors Contributing to Students' Unwillingness to Communicate in a Foreign Language across Indonesian Secondary Schools**

**Sri Kusuma Ningsih**

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka, Indonesia, [sri\\_kusuma@uhamka.ac.id](mailto:sri_kusuma@uhamka.ac.id)

**Stephanie Narahara**

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka, Jakarta, Indonesia

**Herri Mulyono**

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka, Indonesia, [hmulyono@uhamka.ac.id](mailto:hmulyono@uhamka.ac.id)

This quantitative survey attempts to explore factors that contribute to English as a foreign language (EFL) students' unwillingness to communicate across Indonesian secondary schools. To this end, an online questionnaire was distributed to the students via school Facebook pages and Twitter. A total of 158 students volunteered to participate, of which 122 were female, and 36 were male. The qualitative data were analyzed statistically using factor analysis, ANOVA, correlation, and regression. The study findings showed that there was significant correlation between the unwillingness to communicate scale (UCS) and its two factors, i.e. UCS1 and UCS2 were significant ( $r\text{-UCS1} = .867, p < .01, r\text{-UCS2} = .772, p < .01$ ). These results indicate that students' unwillingness to communicate was highly influenced by whether or not students decided to stay away from the conversation or on the extent to which students valued the communication itself and vice versa. In addition, the regression analysis of the two variables, students' risk-taking to communicate and engagement in communication, revealed that none of the variables were perceived as predictors of the students' unwillingness to communicate [language class risk (LCR),  $\beta = -.198, t = -2.64, p = .009$ ; and language class sociability (LCS),  $\beta = -.352, t = -4.69, p = .000$ ].

**Keywords:** students' unwillingness to communicate, risk-taking, engagement in communication, English as a foreign language (EFL), schools

### **INTRODUCTION**

The term willingness to communicate (WTC) was first introduced by McCroskey and Bear (1985) on their paper in the Convention of Speech Communication Association, Colorado (see Khany & Nejad, 2016). Although, early development of WTC was aimed to portray individual differences to communicate in their first language (MacIntyre,

**Citation:** Ningsih, S. K., Narahara, S., & Mulyono, H. (2018). An Exploration of Factors Contributing to Students' Unwillingness to Communicate in a Foreign Language across Indonesian Secondary Schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 811-824.  
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11451a>

Baker, Clément, and Conrod, 2001; Yashima, MacIntyre & Ikeda, 2016). WTC itself is seen as a psychological condition and is employed to refer to communication intention or one's readiness to communicate. Khany and Nejad (2016) for example define WTC as "the intention to take part in [second language or L2] communication when given opportunity" (p. 2). They argue that limited opportunity to take part in communication may lead to individuals' passiveness in such a situation because their communication desire is not triggered (see also in Syed & Kuzborska, 2018).

Willingness to communicate (WTC) is also viewed as a situation when someone is ready to use the target language (TL) they are learning to communicate without force and burden. Many authors, such as Macintyre (2007), Bernales (2016) and Bursali (2017), perceive WTC as a situation when second language (L2) learners completed the psychological step to initiate the communication in the target language. WTC can draw on the psychological situation of one's strong desire to communicate in the target language. In other words, WTC may refer to people using TL they are learning without being forced. For example, students who are familiar with a topic of the discussion tend to communicate more freely without any barriers than students given an unfamiliar topic. Indeed, Saberirad, Ahmadi, Fakhrmohamadi, and Sanei (2016) argue that learners who perceive that they are already able to communicate in L2 are more likely to seek an opportunity to communicate.

Besides many literature have sought WTC as individual's intention or readiness to communicate in certain communicative events as discussed earlier, such a term is employed to represent one's choice to remain silent (see MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011). Within this regard, individual's choice to avoid communication can be considered as an unwillingness to communicate (UWTC) (Burgoon, 1976). MacIntyre et al. (2001) and MacIntyre and Legatto (2011) argued that one's choice whether or not to take part in communication is particularly determined by several factors including anxiety level, communication competence as well as other personality characteristics (e.g., introversion or extroversion). While these factors remain low or one is characterized as introversion, for example, it is very likely he or she would isolate him or herself from communication.

Willingness and unwillingness to communicate in English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom have been issues for foreign language teachers and learners (e.g. Amiryousefi, 2016; Cao, 2010; Goldoust, 2017; Peng, 2012; Zarrinabadi, 2014; Zarrinabadi, Ketabi & Abdi, 2014) because they affect students' FL learning and achievement. Peng (2012) states that student participation and successful classroom interaction may primarily rely on the degree of students' willingness or unwillingness to use the target language for communication. Several authors have identified contributing factors to WTC. Zarrinabadi et al. (2014) for example found that students reported difficulties in practicing their L2 knowledge due to an uncomfortable classroom climate, the unfamiliar topic under discussion, group size and even that interlocutors did not support them in communicating in the target language. Furthermore, Cao (2010) identified a few factors that contributed to WTC, including students' cultural background, shyness, their troublesome partner, or all combination of these factors in a classroom situation.

Moreover, Zarrinabadi (2014) highlighted several factors that promote students' WTC in classroom learning, such as teacher's wait-time, teacher's decision on the topic, the way in which errors were corrected, and that the teacher support can influence students' WTC. Likewise, Amiryousefi (2016) showed that interest and motives to communicate with instructors can also affect students' WTC. They suggest that having an interest can motivate students to make learning enjoyable, increases their involvement with tasks and activities, thereby resulting in active and successful learners.

Goldoust (2017) argues that WTC can be developed in an L2 classroom if students were given opportunities to do so. These opportunities would thus encourage students to learn how to use the target language in the classroom. More importantly, as Goldoust suggests, teachers need to motivate their students to practice the target language with their teachers and peers, in the form of interpersonal conversations in their target language. The current study investigates students' WTC across EFL secondary school classrooms in Indonesia, specifically attempting to answer the research question: what are the factors causing EFL students' unwillingness to communicate? The study findings will help teachers and students to understand the obstacles students encounter when communicating in the target language within and outside classrooms. Teachers can then plan and create a better classroom climate, encouraging students to communicate in the target language.

## **METHOD**

The current study aimed to examine factors contributing to Indonesian secondary school students' willingness or unwillingness to communicate in EFL settings. Particularly, it explores factors causing EFL students' unwillingness to communicate. The study design was based on that of Liu and Jackson's (2008) study, except that it was conducted in secondary school contexts and involved a small number of participants. The questionnaire used for the data collection as well as the method of data analysis was also modified in reference to the current study's objectives.

### **Participants**

Data for the current study were gathered from an online questionnaire posted on Indonesian secondary school social media, such as Facebook and Twitter. A total of 158 secondary school students voluntarily participated in the study and completed the questionnaire. They were 60 junior high school students and 98 senior high school students aged between 12 and 18. The participants were predominantly female (77.2%), with 122 females and 36 males. Consequently, the findings of the current study cannot be generalized to all EFL students and further research should address this gender issue.

### **Data Collection Instruments and Analysis**

A five-point Likert scale online questionnaire was distributed to collect the data from the participants. According to Peng (2012), the use of questionnaire survey to examine relationships of WTC with other variables among EFL students have been a common methodological orientation for research in the field. Although, he argues that such a use of quantitative survey may restrain the exploration of actual L2 WTC in particular classroom contexts (p. 203). It is thus, the further qualitative study is encouraged to address the limitation of the current study.

In the current study, Liu and Jackson's (2008)<sup>1</sup> questionnaire was adopted as data collecting instruments from the participants. The questionnaire involved four constructs, including Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (UCS), Language Class Risk-taking Scale (LCR), Language Class Sociability Scale (LCS), and Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). In Liu and Jackson's study (2008), UCS itself was designed to examine whether or not students were willing or unwilling to communicate. However, items in UCS may be interpreted to promote positive behavior, in that the alternative responses may be used to predict students' willingness to communicate. For example, 'strongly agree' was given a score of 1 instead of 5, whilst the response 'strongly disagree' was scored of 5 instead of 1 and so forth. In other words, the less willing a student was to communicate, the higher their score was.

Originally, the questionnaire was written in English and it consisted of 70 items. This number of items was considered too many for participants in the current context and thus required a long time to complete. A lengthy and timely questionnaire could potentially impact the participation rate and the quality of data collected (Crawford, Couper, & Lamias, 2001; Deutskens, De Ruyter, Wetzels, & Oosterveld, 2004; Galesic & Bosnjak, 2009). Indeed, Crawford et al. (2001) argue that a questionnaire requiring a long time to complete seems to result in "nonresponse rates" or may promote identical responses to the questionnaire items (Deutskens et al., 2004). So, in reference to the literature and to improve the participation rate and quality of data collected, the current study only selected 29 out of 70 items in Liu and Jackson's (2008) questionnaire. These items were from the three of four scales offered, UCS, LCR, LCS, and each scale was reported to have a medium and high level of reliability. The following Table 1 details the number of items and reliability of each instrument:

Table 1  
Details of each research instrument

Instrument	Number of items		Item number	Reliability
	Original	Used		
Unwillingness to Communicate Scale (UCS)	20	20	Item 10-29	.840
Language Class Risk-taking Scale (LCR)	6	6	Item 1-6	.600
Language Class Sociability Scale (LCS)	4	3	Item 7-9	.760

To ease distribution and target wider participation and to enable automated the collection of the data, the questionnaire was developed in an online format (Wright, 2017). In the current study, Google form was developed to facilitate the online survey, and each item in the survey was translated into Bahasa Indonesia. Google form was considered simple and easy in the process of development, and it was viewed easy for the students to complete (Mulyono, Zulaiha, & Ningsih, 2018). Prior to the distribution of questionnaire, the researchers asked permission from the school Facebook page and Twitter administration to join the page and distribute the questionnaire. After obtaining permission, the link to the questionnaire was posted to the two social media applications

<sup>1</sup> Permission to use the instruments were obtained from the authors prior to the data collection.

and left open for one month. After the one-month period, the questionnaire was closed with 158 records. A spreadsheet was then created from the Google form and downloaded to allow statistical analysis.

The statistical analysis of the quantitative data from the questionnaire was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, the data collected were screened (DeSimone, Harms, & DeSimone, 2015; Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2016) to identify incomplete or missing value in the data and fix them, so that the rigour of the data analyses could be obtained (DeSimone et al., 2015). Of 158 records from the questionnaire, four records were identified incomplete, and there were two record duplications. In the second stage, the screened data were analyzed statistically. Six incomplete data and duplications were excluded during the data analysis, and the remaining 152 records were analyzed using factor analysis, ANOVA, correlational and regression calculations.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Students' Willingness or Unwillingness to Communicate

The calculation of factor analysis on 152 records was performed using varimax rotation with two factors as proposed by Liu and Jackson (2008), including the approach-avoidance factor (AAF) and Reward Factor (RF) (see Field, 2013). AAF highlights the probability of someone approaching and joining particular communication situations, whilst RF depicts a moment when someone values the communication he/she attends when others (interlocutors) listen to, comprehend and show sincere communication intention, or unrewarding because others were perceived to take advantage of them. The items in the UCS were classified into two factors: AAF-UCS (coded as with UCS1) with 26.61% of total variance and RF-UCS (coded as UCS2) calculated as 11.84% of the total variance. Table 2 below presents the results of varimax rotation in the factor analysis.

Table 2

Varimax rotation result in the factor analysis of UCS (N = 152)

No.	Items	Factor 1	Factor 2
10.	I'm afraid to speak up in conversations	.702	.192
11.	I talk less because I'm shy	.752	.105
12.	I talk a lot because I am not shy	.714	-.022
13.	I like to get involved in group discussions	.508	.232
14.	I feel nervous when I have to speak to others	.688	.120
15.	I have no fears about expressing myself in a group	.495	.160
16.	I am afraid to express myself in a group	.682	.286
17.	I avoid group discussions	.367	.318
18.	During a conversation, I prefer to talk rather than listen	.283	-.051
19.	I find it easy to make conversation with strangers	.414	-.021
20.	I don't think my friends are honest in their communication with me	.070	.407
21.	My friends and family don't listen to my ideas and suggestions	.073	.685
22.	I think my friends are truthful with me	.084	.468
23.	I don't ask for advice from family or friends when I have to make decisions	.010	.401
24.	I believe my friends and family understand my feelings	.081	.427
25.	My family doesn't enjoy discussing my interests and activities with me	.057	.420
26.	My friends and family listen to my ideas and suggestions	.260	.666
27.	My friends seek my opinions and advice	.262	.398
28.	Other people are friendly only because they want something out of me	-.058	.405
29.	Talking to other people is just a waste of time	.319	.315

Note. Factor 1 (UCS1) = Approach-Avoidance; Factor 2 (UCS2) = Reward

The results presented in Table 2 showed that each item in UCS correlated with the two factors: UCS1 and UCS2. Items 10 to 19 were shown to correlate positively with UCS1 showing coefficients ranging from .367 to .752, whilst items 20 to 29 had a positive correlation with UCS2 with coefficients ranging from .315 to .685. More importantly, there was significant correlation between UCS and its two factors, UCS1 and UCS2 ( $r_{UCS1} = .867, p < .01, r_{UCS2} = .772, p < .01$ ), indicating that AAF and RF were necessary factors of UCS.

The positive correlation between UCS1 and UCS presented in Table 3 ( $r = .352, p < .01$ ) is interesting as it shows that students' unwillingness to communicate was profoundly influenced by the probability of whether or not students decided to stay away from the conversation or on the extent to which students valued the communication itself. When students perceived that the communication was rewarding to them, it was more likely they would join the conversation and vice versa. This finding is in line with the earlier study by Shed and Kuzborska (2018) suggesting that students tended to get involved in L2 conversation with peers they were already familiar or friendly with. Shed and Kuzborska also found that students were shown to avoid to communicate with those who were disrespectful and non-serious peers.

Table 3  
Correlations between the UCS and its factors

Measure	UCS	UCS1	UCS2
UCS 1	.867**	1	
UCS 2	.772**	.352**	1

\*\*  $p < .01$

To show the general tendency of the UCS, LCR and LCS, as suggested by Liu and Jackson (2008), the current study calculated the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score, adopting Liu and Jackson's (2008) interpretation of general tendency of UCS, LCR and LCR as shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4  
Total score criteria

Scales	The range of the total score	Description
UCS	... > 80	Strong unwillingness to communicate
	60 – 80	Moderate unwillingness to communicate
	... < 60	Strong willingness to communicate
UCS1 and UCS2	... > 40	Strong unwillingness to communicate
	30 – 40	Moderate unwillingness to communicate
	... < 30	Strong willingness to communicate
LCR	... > 24	High risk-taking
	18 – 24	Moderate risk-taking
	... < 18	Low risk-taking
LCS	... > 16	High sociability
	12 – 16	Moderate sociability
	... < 12	Low sociability

In the UCS, a total score of more than 80 signified a strong unwillingness to communicate, a total score of 60 to 80 indicated a moderate unwillingness to communicate, and a score less than 60 indicated a strong willingness to get involved in interpersonal communication. In the same way for UCS1 and UCS2, a total score of more than 40 was considered as strong unwillingness to be involved in communication, a total score of 30–40 implied a moderate unwillingness or negative behavior and, a total score less than 30 represented a strong willingness or positive behavior towards interpersonal communication activity.

In contrast, LCR was scored differently, with items expressing an unwillingness to risk using English in classrooms assigned an alternative inverse value so that the results show which students were willing to take a risk to use the English language in the classroom. The more risk-taking students are, the higher their score is. For LCR, a total of more than 24 implied high risk-taking, 18–24 indicated an average risk-taking, and a total score less than 18 signified low risk-taking to use the English language in the classroom.

Items in LCS represent students' level of sociability in classroom learning. In LCS, a total score of more than 16 is considered as high sociability in classrooms, 12–16 indicates average sociability, and a total score less than 12 is considered as low sociability.

Table 5 below presents the result of statistical analyses of the three instruments of UCS, LCR, and LCS.

Table 5  
Statistical analyses of UCS, LCR, and LCS ( $N = 152$ )

Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mode	Minimum	Maximum
UCS	53.11	9.51	53	53	28	87
UCS1	27.30	6.46	27	29	11	47
UCS2	25.80	5.06	26	29	12	40
LCR	16.23	2.70	16	14	8	25
LCS	10.93	1.98	11	12	5	15

The statistical analysis of the UCS data in Table 5 shows that the outcome of the UCS data ranged from 28 to 87, with a mean score of 53.11 ( $SD = 9.51$ ), the median of 53, and mode of 53. These findings indicated that half of the participants were strongly willing to engage in a communicative situation that required them to use English. In contrast, the results of LCS ranged from 5 to 15, with a mean of 10.92, a mode of 12, and a median of 11, all of which were below 12, that is the minimum score of LCS, indicating that half of the students were lowly sociable or have a low enthusiasm to communicate in the English classroom. In the same way, students observed to have a low enthusiasm in English classrooms tend to have low risk-taking in learning the language. The LCR score ranged from 8 to 25, with a mean of 16.23, a median of 16, and a mode of 14, all below the average score of 18.

Moreover, the UCS1 score ranged from 11 to 47, with a mean of 27.30, a median of 27, and a mode of 29, whereas the UCS2 score ranged from 12 to 40, with a mean of 25.80, a median of 26, a mode of 29. These scores were below the minimum criteria of the total score, suggesting that around half of the participants were strongly willing to communicate with interlocutors in English and were positive regarding speaking with interlocutors.

To examine if gender played a significant role in students' WTC, ANOVA calculation was performed. Table 6 presents the general tendency of UCS, LCR, and LCS based on gender differences.

Table 6

Statistical Analyses of the Unwillingness to Communicate, Language Class Risk-Taking, and Language Sociability Scales based on gender differences (  $N = 151$ , one unidentified gender was excluded in the calculation)

Gender	UCS	UCS1	UCS2	LCR	LCS
Female (N=117)					
Mean	53.82	27.97	25.85	16.30	10.79
Standard Deviation	8.96	6.07	5.01	2.27	1.93
Median	53	28	26	16	11
Minimum	28	14	12	12	5
Maximum	87	47	40	23	15
Male (N =34)					
Mean	50.88	25.05	25.82	15.85	11.35
Standard Deviation	11.06	7.38	25	3.83	2.15
Median	52	26	25	15	12
Minimum	28	11	15	8	7
Maximum	70	39	36	25	15

As shown in Table 6 above, the female students' data range for UCS was 28 to 87, with the mean score 53.82 from 117 female students (SD = 8.96) along with the median (53). This results implied that half of the female students were willing to get engaged in interpersonal communication. More importantly, this was supported by UCS1 output data which ranged from 14 to 47, a mean of 27.97, and median (28). Besides, the UCS2 had scores ranging from 12 to 40, a mean of 25.85, and median (26) confirming the results that most of the students were willing to participate in interpersonal communication and they also have a good attitude towards the communication itself.

On the contrary, the analysis of LCR and LCS resulted that most of the students were have a low risk of using the target language in the classroom and they did not seem to enjoy communicating using English. As seen in Table 6 above, the LCR data ranged from 12 to 23, with a mean score 16.30, and median (16). These data were all below the LCR minimum score of 18. Also, the LCS data were between 5 and 15, a mean of 10.79, median (11), that were below the minimum score of LCS.

Likewise, the data from the male students were similar to the females'. Their UCS data ranged from 28 to 70, a mean of 50.88 (SD = 11.06), and median (52), from 34 male students. The range UCS1 data were from 11 to 39, a mean of 25.05, median (26), and

the UCS2 data range from 15 to 36, a mean of 25.82, and median at 25, indicating that half of the male students were willing to interact in interpersonal communication, and they also seemed to favour the impact of the communication itself.

On the other hand, their LCR and LCS results were quite similar to the female students. Most of the male students possessed a low level of risk-taking to use the target language in the classroom, and they did not seem to have the motivation to communicate with other students using English. Table 6 above also showed that male students' LCR data ranged from 8 to 25, a mean of 15.85, and median at 15. Additionally, the LCS data range from 7 to 15, a mean of 11.35, and median at 12, all below the minimum score of LCR and LCS scales.

In other words, most of the female and male students in the current study were shown to have a strong willingness to take part in communication. However, their LCR and LCS score were below the minimum score. This indicated that most of them had a low risk-taking level to use the English language in the classroom. More importantly, they did not seem to enjoy the whole communication using English with peers.

In order to see whether gender affects these scales, the gender cohorts were defined: 1) Male, 2) Female. Table 7 below presents the results of the ANOVA calculation.

Table 7

Anova table results for the gender effects on UCS, LCR, and LCS.

UCS	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2	1.643	.197
Within Groups	149		
Total	151		
UCS1			
Between Groups	2	2.765	.066
Within Groups	149		
Total	151		
UCS2			
Between Groups	2	.907	.406
Within Groups	149		
Total	151		
LCR			
Between Groups	2	1.356	.261
Within Groups	149		
Total	151		
LCS			
Between Groups	2	1.039	.356
Within Groups	149		
Total	151		

The result from ANOVA calculation as in Table 7 above shows that there is no significant difference between gender and students' level of UWTC ( $F(2) = 1.643$ , sig = .0197). This finding was also supported by the result of ANOVA calculation for UCS1 and UCS2 showing that gender also did not have any effects on students UWTC and their behavior towards it (UCS1  $F(2) = 2.765$ , sig = .066, and UCS2  $F(2) = .907$ , sig =

.406). Similar results were shown in LCR and LCS. As it can be seen in the table above, students' risk-taking level to use the target language in communication was not influenced by the gender differences (LCR  $F(2) = 1.356$ , and  $\text{sig} = .261$ ) and their sociability (LCS  $F(2) = 1.039$ , and  $\text{sig} = .356$ ).

In summary, these findings showed that half of the participants possessed a willingness to communicate ( $M = 25.80$ ). However they had little confidence to take a risk to use the English language in the classroom ( $M_{LCR} = 16.23$ ). Also, by looking at the LCS scale score ( $M_{LCS} = 10.92$ ), half of the students did not seem to enjoy communicating in English with interlocutors. In other words, although students have a willingness to communicate, they did not have enough motivation to use English for communication, because they did not enjoy talking in English with their peers. The findings correspond the earlier study by Peng (2012) and Syed and Kuzborska (2018). In the study, for example, Peng (2012) found several classroom conditions that promoted students' WTC such as "the mood, emotions, or climate sensed and shared by the class group" (p. 208) in addition to their motivation to use the target language for communication. Peng also suggests that students' WTC would be triggered with they found the interaction meaningful for them. More comprehensively, Syed and Kuzborska (2018) classified some more psychological factors such as pre-occupation, cognitive block and perceived appearance in addition to perceived opportunity, anxiety, motivation, and emotions.

#### **Correlation between Students' Unwillingness with Language Class Risk-taking and Language Class Sociability**

Correlational analyses were employed to examine the relationship between students' unwillingness to communicate (UCS), language class risk-taking (LCR) and language class sociability (LCS) as shown below in Table 8.

Table 8

Correlation calculation between students' UCS, LCR and LCS ( $N = 152$ )

Measure	UCS	LCR	LCS
LCR	-.257**	1	
LCS	-.385**	.166*	1

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$

UCS significantly negatively correlated with LCR ( $r = -.257$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and LCS ( $r = -.385$ ,  $p < .01$ ), indicating that those students who are less willing to communicate tend to be less risk-taking and less sociable in English class. Similarly, LCS significantly positively correlated with LCR scale ( $r = .166$ ,  $p < .05$ ), demonstrating that students who determined to take a risk to use English in the classroom tended to engage more in social interaction in the classroom and vice versa.

#### **The Regression Model**

In the current study, a multiple regression analysis was employed to follow up the earlier findings from the correlational analysis, to determine which predictors affected UCS as shown in Table 9. A stepwise method was used in this regression model.

Table 9  
Regression Coefficients and Significance

Measure	Unwillingness to Communicate		
	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
LCR	-.198	-2.64	.009
LCS	-.352	-4.69	.000

The regression analysis revealed that none of the variables were perceived as predictors of the students' unwillingness to communicate (LCR,  $\beta = -.198$ ,  $t = -2.64$ ,  $p = .009$ ; and LCS,  $\beta = -.352$ ,  $t = -4.69$ ,  $p = .000$ ). This agrees with Liu and Jackson's (2008) findings, suggesting that LCR and LCS are not the strong predictors for UCS. Students' choice to take risks and to engage in communication does not affect students' unwillingness to communicate in their target language in or outside the classroom. Nonetheless, the more risk-taking or more sociable students are in the English language classroom, the more willing they are to engage in interpersonal communication. Some earlier studies have valued the role of risk-taking strategy to promote learning motivation (e.g. Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007) and to encourage communication in L2 (e.g. Chuanchaisit, S., & Prapthal, K., 2009; Uztosun & Erten, 2014).

#### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR CLASSROOM PRACTICE

In the current study, two factors were examined for their potential to impact on students' willingness or unwillingness to communicate in Indonesian EFL classrooms, including students' risk-taking to use English and their engagement in communication. Findings of the current study have revealed that most student participants possessed strongly motivated to get involved in interpersonal communication in the classroom. Few who avoided such a communication event thought that they did feel comfortable with the whole communication activity or perceived it as meaningless. Therefore, it is recommended that EFL teachers inform their students of the importance of classroom communication and interaction, and their impact on students' life. Teachers should also expose the students to authentic materials that depict the real-life use of the target language. Nonetheless, it is of note that students' risk-taking and engagement in communication cannot be viewed as predictors for their unwillingness to communicate.

## REFERENCES

- Amiryousefi, M. (2016). Willingness to communicate, interest, motives to communicate with the instructor, and L2 speaking: a focus on the role of age and gender. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1170838>
- Bernales, C. (2016). Towards a comprehensive concept of willingness to communicate: Learners' predicted and self-reported participation in the foreign language classroom. *System*, 56, 12.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs*, 43, 60-69.
- Bursali, N. (2017). The Relationship between ideal L2 self and willingness to communicate inside the classroom. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(4), 229–239. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n4p229>
- Cao, Y. (2010). Investigating situational willingness to communicate within second language classrooms from an ecological perspective. *System*, 39(4), 468–479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.016>
- Cheng, H. F., & Dörnyei, Z. (2007). The use of motivational strategies in language instruction: The case of EFL teaching in Taiwan. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 153-174.
- Chuanaisit, S., & Prapphal, K. (2009). A study of English communication strategies of Thai university students. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities*, 17, 100-126.
- Crawford, S. D., Couper, M. P., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web surveys: Perceptions of burden. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(2), 146–162.
- DeSimone, J. A., Harms, P. D., & DeSimone, A. J. (2015). Best practice recommendations for data screening. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(2), 171–181.
- Deutskens, E., De Ruyter, K., Wetzels, M., & Oosterveld, P. (2004). Response rate and response quality of internet-based surveys: An experimental study. *Marketing Letters*, 15(1), 21–36.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics, 4th Edition*. SAGE Publications.
- Galesic, M., & Bosnjak, M. (2009). Effects of questionnaire length on participation and indicators of response quality in a web survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(2), 349–360.
- Goldoust, A. (2017). Willingness or unwillingness? The investigation of Iranian EFL learners' tendency toward willingness to communicate. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(1), 260–267.

- Khany, R., & Nejad, A. M. (2016). L2 Willingness to Communicate, Openness to Experience, Extraversion, and L2 Unwillingness to Communicate: The Iranian EFL Context. *RELC Journal*, 48(2), 241-255.
- Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00687.x>
- 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(4), 564–576.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 23(3), 369-388.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Legatto, J. J. (2011). A dynamic system approach to willingness to communicate: Developing an idiodynamic method to capture rapidly changing affect. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 149-171.
- McCroskey, J.C & Bear, J.E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: the construct and its measurement research. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Dever, Colorado.
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2016). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. SAGE.
- Mulyono, H., Zulaiha, S., & Ningsih, S. K. (2018). *An application of online surveys to facilitate EFL students' learning of speaking and assessment*. Work in Progress Manuscript.
- Peng, J. E. (2012). Towards an ecological understanding of willingness to communicate in EFL classrooms in China. *System*, 40(2), 203-213.
- Saberirad, H., Ahmadi, H., Fakhrmohamadi, E., & Sanei, S. (2016). Willingness to communicate, self perceived communication competence and communication apprehension in L2 English : Effect of Iranian junior high school textbooks. *Journal of Productivity and Development*, 2(2), 73–79.
- Syed, H., & Kuzborska, I. (2018). Dynamics of factors underlying willingness to communicate in a second language. *The Language Learning Journal*, 1-20.
- Uztosun, M. S., & Erten, İ. H. (2014). The impact of English proficiency on the use of communication strategies: An interaction-based study in Turkish EFL context. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 10(2), pp.169-182.
- Wright, K. B. (2017). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3), JCMC1034.

Yashima, T., MacIntyre, P. D., & Ikeda, M. (2016). Situated willingness to communicate in an L2: Interplay of individual characteristics and context. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(1), 115-137.

Zarrinabadi, N. (2014). Communicating in a second language: Investigating the effect of teacher on learners' willingness to communicate. *System*, 42, 288–295.

Zarrinabadi, N., Ketabi, S., & Abdi, R. (2014). Facilitating willingness to communicate in the second language classroom and beyond. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 87(5), 213–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2014.924895>