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Abstract

This paper reviews research on various factors of willingness to communicate (WTC) in a second language (L2), and discusses antecedents of unwillingness to use English among Japanese youth. Past research identified the critical role of learners’ own beliefs in their WTC, but little research has been done on how particular types of self-belief are negatively related to WTC. The present study introduces Higgins’ self-discrepancy theory into WTC research and proposes that the lack of WTC is associated with discrepancy between actual self-concept and ought standards imposed by other people. Using questionnaire data collected from 249 university students, structural equation modeling was performed to evaluate two proposed WTC models distinguished by whether communication opportunities arise inside or outside the EFL classroom. The results of this study support both proposed models that integrate English anxiety, motivation to learn English, perceived present communication competence, and future communication competence. Pedagogical implications for treating psychological problems leading to decreased WTC are discussed.

1. Introduction

In response to ongoing globalization, contemporary foreign language education in Japan highlights the necessity of cultivating students’ communicative competence in English with attitudes envisioning a future international career (see Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology in Japan, 2011). For this purpose, laborious effort has been made at all levels of education under governmental guidelines (see Sugawara, 2012). However, since Japanese youth are said to be “inward-oriented,” this national level of enthusiasm and investment does not always motivate students to be active participants in communities where the “willingness to communicate” (WTC) in English is needed (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science & Technology in Japan, 2011). WTC, which was originally conceptualized as the probability that an individual would engage in conversation when free to do so (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987), has been seen as one of the main learner characteristics in the psychology of second language (L2) acquisition (SLA) and as a variable linked with L2 motivation (Dörnyei, 2005). The recent focus of L2 motivation study has been on the learners’ self-concepts since Dörnyei (2005, 2009) proposed a theoretical
framework of the L2 motivational self system. To test and extend this theory, many studies have been conducted in various social contexts, and they have shown the significant role of positive self-states in motivated behavior. Despite the rich findings from previous research, however, little effort has been put into exploring the type of self-beliefs that reduce motivation to learn an L2 and lead to a lack of WTC, especially in the context of actual communication (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Studying this aspect of the self-system is of great importance to understanding the motivational problems with learning and using English among Japanese youth. Accordingly, the present study was carried out with the aim of testing whether particular types of self-states predict negative motivational reactions to WTC in English both inside and outside the English as a foreign language (EFL) classroom, utilizing statistical techniques including structural equation modeling (SEM).

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Research in L2 WTC

It is commonly acknowledged in SLA research that using the L2 for authentic communication increases the learner’s chances of improving their communicative competence. With this in mind, some people are eager to seek out opportunities to use the L2, while others are reluctant to do so even if they are highly motivated to enhance their ability to communicate effectively in the L2. Examining the factors affecting the level of behavioral intentions toward L2 communication is the main focus of previous research on L2 WTC (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, & Noels, 1998). In an effort to explain the complex psychological process of L2 use, MacIntyre et al. (1998) considered that pre-existing constructs of WTC in a first language (L1) conceptualized as a personality trait (see McCroskey & Richmond, 1987) need to be extended by adding situational and social variables, and outlined a comprehensive model of L2 WTC.

Moving from top to bottom in MacIntyre et al.’s (1998, p. 547) pyramid model, we see that L2 WTC, defined as readiness to enter into discourse using an L2 given the opportunity, is directly affected by the “desire to communicate with a specific person” accompanied with the “state of communicative self-confidence.” This desire inherently comes from different orientations divided between affiliation motives directed toward others of interest or control motives often found in task-related situations. The model represents that these orientations are derived from the lower level factors of L2 WTC known as “interpersonal/intergroup motivations.” As described in Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model, these motivations are created by underlying positive “intergroup attitudes” toward meeting and communicating with members of the L2 community. Thus, “social situations” (concerning the communication settings required to use the L2) and “communication competence” (accompanied with communication anxiety), forming the traits of “L2 self-confidence,” were included in the pyramid WTC model. At the bottom of this model, predetermined “personality” and “intergroup climate” are illustrated as the lowest level factors of L2 WTC.

Over the last 15 years, several empirical studies conducted mostly in North America to
describe the interrelationships of the variables affecting L2 WTC (see Dörnyei, 2005; Peng & Woodrow, 2010) demonstrated that the strongest predictors of L2 WTC are perceived communication competence and anxiety (e.g., Maclntyre & Charos, 1996). Along with these two variables, other situational and social variables accounting for portions of the variance in L2 WTC have been taken into consideration in a number of past studies. For instance, using a sample of French immersion students, MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, and Conrod (2001) found relations among L2 WTC, L2 learning orientations, and social supports containing Ajzen’s (1991) notion of “subjective norms,” reflecting the belief that other people want you to behave in a particular way. Moreover, a study by Clément, Baker, and Maclntyre (2003) found a positive effect of subjective norms on L2 WTC through L2 self-confidence in Anglophone (majority) students attending a Canadian university. On the other hand, for Francophone (minority) students who had already developed a high level of L2 self-confidence due to social pressure, Clément et al. indicated that subjective norms were not the main factor affecting L2 WTC.

Regarding L2 WTC research conducted outside the North America, Yashima (2002) examined the internal structure of L2 WTC in a Japanese EFL context by adding the attitudinal construct of “international posture.” The results of SEM analysis confirmed that international posture predicts L2 WTC and L2 learning motivation; the motivation in turn predicts L2 communication confidence that has a strong effect on L2 WTC. In exploring the relationship between international posture and self-related L2 motivation, previous studies found that international posture directly influences the ideal L2 self (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Sugawara, 2012; Yashima, 2009), which is a component of Dörnyei’s (2005, 2009) L2 motivational self system.

2.2 L2 Motivational Self System and L2 WTC

As thoroughly described in Dörnyei (2005, 2009), the L2 motivational self system was developed to understand L2 learning motivation with reference to the individual’s self system, explaining the motivational function of mental imagery (or sets of beliefs) which cannot be captured by Gardner’s (1985) widely-adapted social psychological approach. In an effort to reform previous motivational thinking, this system was theorized not only by synthesizing past L2 motivation research, but by also using the psychological theories of possible selves (Markus & Nurius, 1986) and self-discrepancy (Higgins, 1987), which are composed of three constituent components: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience. The ideal L2 self refers to the L2 speaker you would really like to become, the ought-to L2 self refers to self-representation concerning the L2 abilities that others believe you should possess, and L2 learning experience concerns situation-specific motives affected by elements of the immediate learning environment, such as the teacher, classmates, or experiencing failure in the EFL classroom (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009).

To test and validate this theory, several empirical studies mainly using SEM have been carried out in various social contexts. All these studies provided clear confirmation of the underlying tenet of Dörnyei’s self-system in relation to motivational variables (including “intended effort”) and
attitudinal or belief variables (for reviews, see Dörnyei, 2009; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). For instance, Csiszér and Kormos (2009) found that in Hungarian youth, “parental encouragement” to study English directly influenced the ought-to L2 self and indirectly the ideal L2 self through L2 learning experience. Similarly, the influences of the family and learning experiences on L2 self-concepts were revealed in studies of Japanese EFL students. Using a sample of university students, Taguchi, Magid, and Papi (2009) confirmed that “family influences” and “instrumentality-prevention” (e.g., guilt or fear of receiving a bad test score) had positive effects on the ought-to L2 self, but not on the ideal L2 self that contributed to L2 learning experience. Moreover, Sugawara (2012) found that, among Japanese university students, belief in the “social importance of learning English” had a stronger effect on the ought-to L2 self than the ideal L2 self. Besides these socio-contextual influences, emotional factors in L2 use were found to be interrelated with L2 self-concepts. Data from Papi’s (2010) Iranian students showed that the strength of English anxiety is affected negatively by the ideal L2 self but positively by the ought-to L2 self.

Based on the past research reviewed in this paper, Sugawara et al. (2013) aimed to understand the internal structure of WTC in English among Japanese youth. To explore an individual’s L2 self in detail, they conceptualized perceived future communication competence as a part of the desired possible self, and examined the links of this self-cognition with WTC constructs using path analysis. The model used in that study revealed that “attitudes toward the international environment” had positive effects on the motivation to learn English and the domains of perceived future competence, contributing to WTC both inside and outside the EFL classroom. Contrary to expectations, the strength of English anxiety, which was found to have a negative effect on perceived future competence, did not affect WTC inside the classroom as it did outside the classroom. These findings were not fully compatible with MacIntyre and Doucette’s (2010) path model tested using data from Canadian high school students studying French. In that study, French anxiety contributed directly to WTC inside the classroom and indirectly to WTC outside the classroom through present perceived communication competence, which was not dealt with in Sugawara et al. (2013).

Thus, further research is required to investigate how different contexts of WTC are related to different types of perceived communication competence, distinguished by whether this competence is evaluated from the perspective of the present actual self or the future possible self. In addition, the relation between these communication variables should be examined with L2 learning motivation and different kinds of situation-specific anxiety, distinguished by whether this negative emotion arises in the immediate L2 classroom or in real communicative settings, using contextual differences that have not been investigated carefully in previous studies. Furthermore, previous studies investigating the links between L2 WTC and the ideal or possible selves (Sugawara et al., 2013, Yashima, 2009) are limited in that they have not considered how WTC constructs are associated with L2 ability-related self-discrepancies, which is another key element of Dörnyei’s L2 motivational self system. According to Higgins’ (1987) self-discrepancy theory, “if a person possesses this discrepancy, the current state of his or her actual attributes, from the person’s own
standpoint, does not match the state that the person believes some significant other person considers to be his or her duty or obligation to attain” (p. 323), and the person is vulnerable to agitation-related emotion. Exploring this type of incompatible belief among L2 learners may deepen the understanding of the links between the ought-to L2 self and anxiety (Papi, 2010), socially-constructed beliefs of L2 learning (Sugawara, 2012), and other people’s expectations or external pressures (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2005; Taguchi et al., 2009) which are critical factors of WTC (Clement et al., 2003; MacIntyre et al., 2001). It will be especially interesting to investigate L2-related actual/own:ought/other discrepancy among Japanese university students, since ought selves tend to be realized through the period from adolescence to emergent adulthood (Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Dörnyei, 2009; Sugawara, 2012) and these students are said to have motivational problems with learning and using English (see Introduction in this paper).

3. Objective of the Present Study and Hypothesized Model

Based on the review of the literature, the present study examined whether actual/own:ought/other discrepancy in L2 ability predicts situation-specific anxiety and motivation to learn English, and whether these variables predict both perceived present communication competence and future communication competence for WTC in English. The SEM model specification to test was based on the following theoretical considerations.

Self-discrepancy was considered to be closely associated with anxiety and motivation (Dörnyei, 2005; Higgins, 1987). The greater the magnitude of self-discrepancy students possess, the more they would experience anxiety and the less energy they would put toward goal-directed behavior. Thus, in the model a positive path leading from self-discrepancy to anxiety and a negative path from self-discrepancy to motivation were hypothesized. Similarly, students with high anxiety embodied in this discrepancy suffered from a perceived lack of ability (Higgins, 1987; Markus & Nurius, 1986). Accordingly, besides the negative path from anxiety to perceived present competence confirmed in previous studies (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996, and others), the negative path from self-discrepancy to perceived present competence were hypothesized in the present study. Following previous empirical evidence, the three negative paths from anxiety to motivation (Papi, 2010), perceived future competence (Sugawara et al., 2013), and WTC (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010) were expected. Furthermore, previous empirical evidence led me to expect positive paths from motivation to perceived present competence (Peng & Woodrow, 2010; Yashima, 2002). Regarding the positive path drawn from motivation to perceived present competence through perceived future competence, my hypothesis was based on the findings from previous studies (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Sugawara et al., 2013) that the stronger the intensity of motivation, the greater the likelihood that its possessor envisions positive possible selves, generating feelings of efficacy for given tasks. Finally, the three positive paths leading to WTC from perceived present competence (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010, and others), motivation, and perceived future
competence (Sugawara et al., 2013) were hypothesized.

In order to explore contextual differences, the proposed initial model (Figure 1) was tested using two WTC variables (whether communication opportunities arose inside or outside the EFL classroom) and two kinds of English anxiety (classified as “English class anxiety” or “English use anxiety outside the classroom”).

![Figure 1. Initial model to be tested.](image)

4. Methods

4.1 Participants

The present study investigated 249 university students (male, \( n = 210 \); female, \( n = 36 \); unknown, \( n = 3 \)) from one private and two national universities in Sapporo, the capital of Hokkaido, Japan. At the time of the survey, the students ranged from ages 18-24 with an average age of 20.1 (six students did not indicate their age). All students were non-English major undergraduate students (five students did not indicate their year of study). Only 14 students (5.6%) had previously spent more than 3 months in English-speaking countries. All students except two reported that their mother tongue was Japanese (language data were missing for 5 students).

After eliminating data from the 2 students whose mother tongue was not Japanese and data with missing values in the measurement scale, data from 218 students with an average age of 20.1 (male, \( n = 184 \) [84.4%]; female, \( n = 34 \) [15.6%]) were statistically analyzed.

4.2 Procedures

The data for the present study were collected using a questionnaire containing a demographic section and eight scales. The first seven scales (used in Sugawara et al., 2013) were adapted from
previous studies and translated into Japanese through a series of rigorous translations by the author and English teachers who had studied procedures for questionnaire item translation. The last scale for measuring self-discrepancy was developed by the author and peer-reviewed for use in the current study. Based on the results of reliability and exploratory factor analyses conducted in preliminary studies, unreliable scale items were omitted and modified. After completing a consent form, the students responded to the scale items pertaining to the final version of questionnaire, which was administered from September 2012 to June 2013.

4.3 Materials

Below is a brief description of each of the questionnaire scales along with their Cronbach’s $\alpha$ coefficients.

*WTC in English inside the classroom ($\alpha = .93$)*

Twelve items were adapted from Weaver’s (2005) scale. These items measured students’ willingness to speak in meaning-focused activities and form-focused activities implemented in an EFL classroom (Peng & Woodrow, 2010). Example items are “Tell someone in English about the story of a TV show you saw” and “Translate a spoken utterance from Japanese into English in your group.” These items were rated on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from *almost never willing* (1) to *almost always willing* (6).

*WTC in English outside the classroom ($\alpha = .96$)*

Twelve items from McCroskey and Richmond’s (1987) scale measuring WTC in 12 situations that consisted of crossing contexts (dyad, group, meeting, and public presentation) with types of receivers (friend, acquaintance, and stranger) were adapted and measured on the above 6-point Likert scale. Example items are “Talk with a friend” and “Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.”

*English class anxiety ($\alpha = .83$)*

Eight items were adapted from Gardner’s French class anxiety (reported in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1988). Example items are “I always felt that the other students were more at ease than I was in English class” and “Whenever I had to answer a question out loud, I would get nervous and confused in English class.” These items were rated on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6).

*English use anxiety outside the classroom ($\alpha = .86$)*

Adapted from Gardner’s French use anxiety (reported in MacIntyre & Gardner, 1988), 8 items were measured on the above 6-point scale. Example items are “I am sure that I would get nervous if I had to speak English to a sales clerk” and “When making a telephone call, I would get flustered if it were necessary to speak English.”

*Motivation to learn English ($\alpha = .90$)*

Eight items from Gardner’s (1985) Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) were modified and formatted on a 6-point Likert scale from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). Example
items are “I actively think about what I have learned in my English class very frequently” and “I find studying English very interesting.”

Perceived present and future communication competence in English

This scale was created by adapting 12 items from McCroskey and McCroskey’s (1988) Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC), which were very similar to WTC items from McCroskey and Richmond (1987), and combining these items with possible selves measures adapted from MacIntyre, Mackinnon, and Clément (2009). For this scale, respondents were first asked to score the items (e.g., “talk in a small group of friends,” “talk in a large meeting of strangers”) based on a question to assess the present self (α = .97) (i.e., “describe your competence now”) using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from not able to do at all (1) to able to do very well (6). Then, they scored the same items based on a question to assess their perceived possibility of possible selves (α = .97) (i.e., “How likely is this in the future?”) using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from not likely at all (1) to very likely (6).

Actual/own:ought/other discrepancy in L2 ability (α = .91)

In the preliminary studies, 16 items were developed to reflect the notions of self-discrepancy (Higgins 1987), the ought-to L2 self (Dörnyei, 2005), parental expectations (Csiszér & Kormos, 2009; Taguchi et al., 2009), and social importance of learning English (Sugawara, 2012). Twelve items measuring a person’s belief in the strength of the mismatch between his or her actual abilities and the ought standards imposed by their teacher, parents, classmates, and society were used in this study (see Appendix A). These items were measured on a 6-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

4.4 Data Analyses

The obtained data were first entered into SPSS 22.0 to examine the internal consistency reliability of the scale. These SPSS data were then transferred into “Analysis of Moment Structures” (AMOS) version 22.0 to run the SEM. In this analysis, I followed the recommended modeling procedures described in Byrne (2010) and Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010). For estimating the parameters, the maximum likelihood estimation was selected. Prior to the SEM analysis, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted by separating the full structural model (Figure 1) into three measurement models. The first model contained two types of latent variables representing self-related emotion (relating self-discrepancy with English class anxiety or English use anxiety outside the classroom). The second model contained two latent variables representing self-related motivation (relating self-discrepancy with motivation). The third model consisted of the relationships among three kinds of communication variables (perceived present competence, perceived future competence, and WTC inside or outside the classroom). After confirming their validity, the measurement models were again combined into the full structural model to evaluate causal relationships among the latent variables.

In the model analyses, construct reliability was assessed by factor loadings from each
construct to measured variables (Hair et al., 2010), which were set up by aggregating the item scores in each scale. In this study, each construct possessed three measured variables, except self-discrepancy consisting of the following four types of ought/other domains: teacher (items 1, 5, and 10; α = .80), classmates (items 2, 6, 9, and 11; α = .71), parents (items 3 and 7; α = .76), and society (items 4, 8, and 12; α = .74). Construct validity was assessed by the following model fit indices (with good fit or acceptable fit level): chi-square divided by the degree of freedom ($\chi^2/df < 3$), Normed Fit Index (NFI > .90-.95), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI > .90-.95), Comparative Fit Index (CFI > .90-.95), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA within the .05-.08 range) (Byrne, 2010; Hair et al., 2010).

5. Results

The CFA results provided strong evidence for the adequacy of the measurement models (see Appendix B). In this analysis, the modification indices suggested additional covariances between error terms. In a stepwise manner, covariances were added between the error terms, which were reflected in performing the full SEM analyses.

Table 1
Modification Steps and Fit Indices for the Structural Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PCFI</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC inside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial model</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>342.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove path 1</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>341.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove path 2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>339.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove path 3</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>338.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC outside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial model</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>366.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove path 3</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>365.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove path 4</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>366.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Path 1 = English class anxiety → WTC inside the classroom; Path 2 = English class anxiety → perceived present competence; Path 3 = Motivation → perceived present competence; Path 4 = English use anxiety → perceived present competence.

Table 1 presents the modification steps and fit indices for the SEM models and shows that the initial model for WTC inside the classroom provided good fit to the data. However, the model contained three non-significant paths that required removal. In removing these paths, we assessed the Parsimony Comparative Fit Index (PCFI) and Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) to address
the issue of parsimony (Byrne, 2010; Hair et al., 2010). PCFI fell within the expected range and AIC was improved in the final model, which resulted in a better fit to the data (see Table 1). Regarding the WTC outside the classroom model, initial evaluation indicated an adequate fit to the data (see Table 1). In that model, two non-significant paths were removed. Since removing these paths did not change the adequacy of the fit of the model to the data, no further modifications to the final model were necessary.

Figure 2 and Figure 3 present a schematic representation of the final models with standardized estimates. All paths and covariances between error terms were significant at the level of .05 or below. Furthermore, all factor loadings from each of the constructs to measured variables were near .70 or higher, indicating good construct reliability (Hair et al., 2010).

Figure 2. The final model for Japanese students' WTC in English inside EFL classroom. MF = meaning-focused activities; FF = form-focused activities; FR = friend; AC = acquaintance; ST = stranger; MO = motivation; ECA = English class anxiety; TE = teacher; CL = classmates; PE = parents; SO = society.
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6. Discussion

The results of the SEM analyses supported the proposed hypotheses. The models revealed that actual/own:ought/other discrepancy predicted situation-specific anxiety and motivation, and through these variables, both perceived present competence and future competence for WTC can be predicted. However, not all the proposed relations between the latent variables were significant. Contrary to expectations based on previous studies (Peng & Woodrow, 2010; Yashima, 2002), the present study found that the path from motivation to perceived present competence was non-significant. Within both models, motivation exerted its influence on perceived present competence only through perceived future competence. However, considering the correlation that existed between motivation and perceived present competence ($r = .53, p < .01$), this result might be a
statistical artifact of the confirmed great influence of perceived future competence on perceived present competence. As expected from previous studies (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Sugawara et al., 2013), an antecedent of perceived future competence was motivation. These findings suggest that if motivation is high, an individual's perceived future competence will be higher, which in turn contributes to a greater perceived present competence.

Another non-significant path was found between situation-specific anxiety and communication variables. Although English use anxiety exerted its influence on WTC outside the classroom, English class anxiety did not exert its influence on WTC inside the classroom. In addition, the impact of English use anxiety on perceived future competence was stronger than that of English class anxiety. These results supported and extended Sugawara et al.'s (2013) research on WTC, suggesting that Japanese EFL students associate the rise of their anxiety more strongly with the probability of future success in entering discourse in the L2 in real situations rather than with the task-relevant events within the familiar classroom environment. Furthermore, the obtained effects of anxiety on perceived future competence and motivation seemingly induced a statistical artifact of the non-correlation between anxiety and perceived present competence. The negative link between these two variables were, indeed, confirmed in previous studies (MacIntyre & Doucette, 2010), which did not include perceived future competence within the tested model.

The impact of English use anxiety on motivation was nearly twice as strong as from English class anxiety. In addition, the impact of motivation on WTC outside the classroom was much weaker than that on WTC inside the classroom. In examining such contextual differences, the present study extended previous research (Papi, 2010) in that anxiety outside the classroom seems to play a more substantial role in reducing motivation than anxiety inside the classroom, which in turn leads to a lower association between motivation and WTC.

Actual/own:ought/other discrepancy was linked directly to anxiety and motivation. This result indicates that the greater the magnitude of the discrepancy, the more students are likely to experience anxiety and the less motivated they may be. More specifically, combined with the finding that anxiety contributed negatively to motivation, students with higher anxiety embodied in this discrepancy would suffer more from a decline in motivation. Furthermore, we also found that this discrepancy was linked directly to perceived present competence and indirectly to other communication variables. This suggests that if the magnitude of this discrepancy is strong, not only would an individual's perceived present competence be low, but through a negative effect of anxiety, his or her perceived future competence would also be low, which in turn contributes to a weaker WTC. This psychological state may be activated when students believe they have failed to attain others' expected standards of their ability to enter into L2 discourse, especially outside the classroom context. Future research should further explore the connections among incompatible self-beliefs, affective reactions, and communication variables. Indeed, by taking a closer look at the factors for self-discrepancy in the SEM models, I found that the first ought/other factor (teacher) correlated with motivation and perceived future competence ($r = -.26, p < .01; r = -.32, p < .01$, respectively)
less than the fourth ought/other factor (society) did \( r = -0.41, p < .01; r = -0.45, p < .01, \) respectively.

One limitation of the present study is that only specific types of discrepancies that were associated with WTC were explored. Different types of discrepancies, inducing different kinds of psychological situations (described in Higgins, 1987), may be associated with WTC in particular contexts that can be further subcategorized by situations or task events. Another limitation relates to the disproportionate male-female ratio in our sample. The results of this study might reflect the characteristics of male students rather than students in general. Finally, it should be noted that SEM implies a structure of variance and covariance matrix of the measures and has limited capacity to support the hypothesized relationships among variables (Hair et al., 2010). Further mixed-methods research designed to explain complex interactions of elements composing self-systems is necessary (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Nevertheless, the results of the present study present a new avenue of investigation into self-related WTC research and help to clarify a type of self-belief reducing WTC among Japanese EFL students. Furthermore, our models are useful to generate hypotheses for treating psychological problems leading to unwillingness to communicate. For instance, if ought/other attributes could change an individual’s actual/own self-concept to be more similar to his or her own directive standards, then his or her positive state (decrease in anxiety and increase in motivation) would be induced. If this positive state could be maintained to increase self-evaluation of his or her own present and future competence, then an increase in WTC would be expected. Given the influence of others and society on self-related WTC both inside and outside the classroom context, research that considers ecological and developmental issues is needed for a more comprehensive understanding of the psychological problems of learning and using English.

Notes

1. Part of the process to develop the scales was presented at the 13th Annual Meeting of The Hokkaido English Language Education Society in October 2012.
2. Prior to SEM, the expected pattern of relationships among all the latent variables was confirmed using Pearson’s product-moment correlation analyses. The correlation matrices, which were omitted due to space limitations, are available upon request.
3. In fact, in the correlation analyses, perceived present competence was significantly correlated with English class anxiety \( r = -0.32, p < .01 \) and with English use anxiety \( r = -0.54, p < .01 \).
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Appendices

Appendix A: Self-Discrepancy Scale Used in this Study (*reverse item)

1. My current level of English ability does not match the level that my English teacher believes is my duty to attain.
2. I am concerned that my current level of English ability does not match the level that my classmates believe is my duty to attain.
3. If I speak English, my parents may think that my current level of English ability does not match the level that they believe is my duty to attain.
4. *My current level of English conversation skills matches the level that university students ought to attain.
5. If I speak English, my English teacher may give me bad grades.
6. My current level of effort to study English does not match the level that my classmates believe is my duty to attain.
7. My current level of English conversation skills does not match the level that my parents expect me to attain.
8. I think that my current level of English conversation skills does not match the level that potential employers expect me to attain.
9. If I speak English, my classmates may think that I’m not good at speaking English.
10. My current level of English ability does not match the level that my English teacher expects me to attain.
11. My current level of English ability does not match the level that international students who can speak English believe is my duty to attain.
12. My current level of English conversation skills does not match the level that globalized society expects me to attain.

Appendix B: Fit Indices for the Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1.1 (SD, ECA)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1.2 (SD, EUA)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2 (SD, MO)</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3.1 (PPC, PFC, WTCIC)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3.2 (PPC, PFC, WTCOC)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SD = Self-discrepancy; ECA = English class anxiety; EUA = English use anxiety outside the classroom; MO = Motivation; PPC = Perceived present competence; PFC = Perceived future competence; WTCIC = WTC inside the classroom; WTCOC = WTC outside the classroom.