THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE IN LEARNING PROCESS OF THE FRESHMEN'S GROUP A OF SPEAKING CLASS OF FACULTY OF LETTERS, JEMBER UNIVERSITY, IN THE FIRST SEMESTER OF ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2013/2014

(HUBUNGAN ANTARA KECEMASAN BERKOMUNIKASI DAN KEINGINAN BERKOMUNIKASI DALAM PROSES PEMBELAJARAN MAHASISWA BARU SEMESTER PERTAMA PADA KELAS SPEAKING GRUP A DI FAKULTAS SASTRA UNIVERSITAS JEMBER, PADA TAHUN AKADEMIK 2013/2014)

David Prasetya, Hairus Salikin, Reni Kusumaningputri
English Department, Faculty of Letters, Jember University
Jln. Kalimantan 37, Jember 68121
E-mail: hairussalikin@yahoo.com

ABSTRAK

Dalam kelas speaking, melakukan interaksi dengan bahasa kedua sangat penting (Chaudron, 1988:10). Kenyataannya, setiap individu tidak selalu dapat berinteraksi dengan baik. Hal ini terjadi karena ada 2 faktor yang saling mempengaruhi, yaitu kecemasan berkomunikasi (McCroskey, 1977, b, 27-28 dikutip dari Resnick, 1980:11) & (Arnold dan Brown 1999:8 dikutip dari Dörnyei, 2005:198) dan keinginan berkomunikasi (Morreale, 2007:7). Untuk itu, studi ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui apa hubungan antara kecemasan berkomunikasi dan keinginan berkomunikasi dengan bahasa kedua, seberapa kuat hubungan itu, dan bagaimana deskripsi tingkah laku pembelajar dihubungkan dengan hubungan antara kecemasan berkomunikasi dan keinginan berkomunikasi dengan bahasa kedua. Metode campuran, quantitative (kuesioner) and qualitative (observasi), diaplikasikan dalam studi ini dengan populasi mahasiswa baru semester pertama pada kelas speaking grup A di jurusan Sastra Inggris Fakultas Sastra Universitas Jember pada tahun akademik 2013/2014. Hasil dari studi ini adalah bahwa ada hubungan bertolak belakang yang agak kuat antara kecemasan berkomunikasi dan keinginan berkomunikasi dalam proses pembelajaran oleh mahasiswa baru semester satu grup A di kelas speaking, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Jember tahun akademik 2013/2014 yang signifikan, yaitu -.362 dalam nilai korelasi Spearman dengan .027 sebagai nilai signifikan (1-tailed). Kecemasan berkomunikasi menggunakan bahasa kedua dipengaruhi oleh 3 faktor, yaitu personaliti, lawan bicara dan situasi; sedangkan keinginan berkomunikasi menggunakan bahasa kedua dipengaruhi oleh 4 faktor, yaitu personaliti, kepercayaan diri sendiri, kepercayaan diri karena situasi, dan penggunaan bahasa kedua. Studi ini diharapkan dapat memberikan kontribusi dalam pemahaman tentang gambaran permasalahan berkomunikasi. Dengan demikian, mahasiswa-mahasiswi mungkin dapat menyadari permasalahan mereka dalam komunikasi, dan dapat menemukan cara untuk mengatasi permasalahan masing-masing dalam komunikasi.

Kata Kunci: kecemasan berkomunikasi, keinginan berkomunikasi, pembelajaran bahasa kedua

ABSTRACT

In speaking class, doing interaction by using second language is very important (Chaudron, 1988:10). In fact, every individual is not always be able to interact well. It occurs because there are 2 factors that influence each other, communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1977, b, 27-28 cited in Resnick, 1980:11) & (Arnold and Brown 1999:8 cited in Dörnyei, 2005:198) and willingness to communicate (Morreale, 2007:7). In this case, the study is done to acknowledge what the relationship between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate by using second language is, how strong the relationship between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate by using second language is, and how the description of the students associated with the relationship between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate by using second language is. Moreover, mixed method, quantitative (by questionnaires) and qualitative (by observation), is applied in this study with freshmen's group A of speaking class of English Department of Faculty of Letters, Jember University in the First Semester of Academic Year of 2013/2014 as the population. The result of this study is that there is a moderate downhill linear relationship between communication apprehension and willingness to communicate in Learning Process of the Freshmen's Group A of Speaking Class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the First Semester of Academic Year of 2013/2014 that is statistically significant, in which -.362 in the Spearman's correlation coefficient with .027 as the significance (1tailed) value. Communication apprehension using second language is influenced by 3 factors, personality him/herself, interlocutor, and situation; whereas willingness to communicate is influenced by 4 factors, personality, self-confidence, state communicative self-confidence, and second language use. This study is expected to give contribution to better understanding about description of communication problems. Thus, student might be able to recognize their own problem in communication, and find their own ways to solve their problems in communication.

Keywords: communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, second language acquisition

Introduction

Speaking class is one of the major classes that has to be taken by the English Department students in Faculty of Letters, Jember University. To be good in speaking class, the students have to make interactions because interactions are significant things that can naturally improve speaking skill. According to Allwright and Breen, in Chaudron, (1988:10):

> "Interaction is viewed as significant because it is argued that 1) Only through interaction can the learner decompose the TL structures and derive meaning from classroom events, 2) interaction gives learners the opportunities to incorporate TL structures into their own speech (the scaffolding principle), 3) the meaningfulness for learners of classroom events of any kind, whether thought of as interactive or not, will depend on the extent to which communication has been jointly constructed between the teacher and learners"

In fact, in learning process of speaking, some students have an obstacle which influences their learning progress. Thus, some students become communicative, but some students are uncommunicative. It occurs because of the existence of individual differences (Dörnyei, 2005:3). However, the concept of individual differences is too broad. Therefore, the study is narrowed into 2 points based on communication issue. The 2 points are communication apprehension and willingness to communicate.

According to McCroskey (1977b:27-28 cited in Resnick, 1980:11), communication apprehension is "an anxiety syndrome associated with real or anticipated communication with another person or persons"; whereas willingness to communicate, positive motivation, is "the individual's tendency to initiate communication" (Morreale, 2007:7). Hence, communication apprehension (CA onwards) and willingness to communicate (WTC onwards) are two fundamental factors which cannot be separated in the learning process of speaking. Moreover, based on the contrary points, CA (that obstruct communication) and WTC (that initiate communication), it can be obtained a hypotheses that there is a negative relationship between CA and WTC. Furthermore, gesture is also concerned to describe the behavior of the students because one function of gesture is as anxiety or tension-reduction device in the context of communication problem (Barker, 2004 in Arabski and Wojtaszek, 2010:71). Thus, gesture is helpful in order for describing the behavior of the students.

In this case, the population of the study is the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014. Freshmen are first-year students that might have some obstacles because they have to accustom themselves in period of transition from high school to college. Moreover, they have to learn how to communicate well in order to make friends and especially interact with the lecturer in speaking class for the language acquisition (Eugene Lang College, 2012)

There are 3 questions that are discussed as follow:
1. Is there relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014?
2. How strong is the relation between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014?
3. How is the description of the relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014?

In line with the problems, the study is done to achieve some goals:
1. To know if there is relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 or not.
2. To know the strength of the relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014.
3. To describe the behaviour of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 based on the relationship between CA and WTC.

In addition, to ease in answering the third research question, a list of behaviors and gestures is made based on some theories in order to observe the students. Following is the list:

Table 1. The List of Gestures and other behaviors

Behaviors		Gestures
1. Silence/ uncommunicative	12. Communicative/ tend to be a volunteer	1. Looking away
2. Greater interpersonal distances	13. Smaller interpersonal distances.	2. Strokes chin/ cock head
3. More taking note	14. More listening to teacher	3. Rubbing/ touching nose lightly
4. Rarely ask or answering a question	15. Often ask or answering a question	4. Tapping finger
5. Pauciliquent	16. Long speech for feedback	5. Turning down the corner of the mouth
6. Feel shy	17. Have more eyes contact	6. Tight-lipped
7. Feel fearful	18. Direct body orientation	7. Shifting eyes
8. Have less eyes contact	19. Attentive posture	
9. Indirect body	20. Keep the hands still	
10. Inattentive posture	21. Smile	
11. Cannot keep the hands still		
12. Diverting attention to another focus		

Research Method

This study employs mixed method strategy (quantitative-qualitative). To answer the first research question, questionnaires (closed-ended questions) is used as quantitative data, and then SPSS is utilized after finishing in

scoring the questionnaires to answer the second research question. Next, to answer the third research question, observation supported by video recording is used in order to give vivid description about the relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014.

There are 2 instruments that are used as questionnaires to measure the relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014. They are Personal Report of Communication Apprehension-24 instrument (PRCA-24) to measure CA level and Willingness to Communicate instrument to measure WTC level (McCroskey *et al.,* 1985:166; and McCroskey, 1992 in Morreale, 2007:12-13).

Next, to answer the third research question, observation supported by video recording is applied. Moreover, in the observation forms are also available to note the students' behaviors when the class is running. The first sheet of the observation form is set based on the activities that related to communication, and the second sheet of the observation form is set based on the occurrence of the quantity of behaviors, including gestures. The forms can be seen at the appendix.

In addition, video recording is also used to support the observation. Three cameras are prepared to record. The first and the second cameras are mounted in front of the left and right corner of the class to record the whole classroom, and the third camera is on standby so it is ready to record when the students are asked by the lecturer to speak in front of the class. However, there are only 6 students as samples who are observed. Furthermore, quota-sampling is applied. There are 6 students that are chosen from several exclusive subgroups questionnaires (based on CA and WTC level; the highest, the middles, and the lowest score of them) (Castillo, 2009). In this case, the 6 students are observed 4 times meetings. The meetings are absolutely give clearer description about the relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014

Results

Based on the data, there are 2 main points and 4 additional points that can be concluded as the results of this study. The 2 main points are the answers of the 3 research questions that must be achieved; whereas the 4 additional points are the additional descriptions that give more information of the students' behavior.

The 2 main points include quantitative-qualitative methods. The quantitative method shows that there is a moderate downhill linear relationship between CA and WTC of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014, which was statistically significant (Spearman's correlation coefficient = -.362, and sig. (1-tailed) = .027). It means that if CA level was increased, WTC level would be decreased, and vice versa. On the other hand, the qualitative method shows that the level of CA and

WTC of student might be increased or decreased. In this case, the fluctuation of CA and WTC is influenced by several factors. CA might be increased or decreased because of the *personality him/herself, interlocutor* (classmates or lecturer) and *situation* (activities for 4 times meetings); whereas WTC might be increased or decreased because of *personality him/herself, social situation* (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication), *self-confident* (enduring personal characteristics because of self-perceived communication competence, how an individual believes his/her communication based on self awareness rather than the actual communication competence, and lack of anxiety or confidence), *state communicative self confident* (a momentary feeling of confidence because of situation), and *second language use* (the tendency to seek out communication opportunities using the second language).

Furthermore, the 4 additional points give more information of the students' behavior. The points show that, first, where a student chooses to take a seat does not always determine the level of CA and WTC; second, how long a student speaks does not always determine the level of CA and WTC; third, absence in class does not always determine that a student is high communicative apprehensive individual; and fourth, how many the gestures do does not always determine that the student has certain level of CA and WTC

Discussion

In this discussion, there are 5 steps of the explanation for gaining the results. The first, the second and the third steps are presented to answer the first and second research questions. The first step is distributing the questionnaires to all of the students in the classroom as the population, and then collecting the questionnaires after the students have finished completing the questionnaires. The second step is processing the questionnaires to obtain the scores, and then the scores are recapitulated. The third step is processing the scores using SPSS. Next, the fourth and the fifth steps are presented to answer the third research question. The fourth step is doing observation supported by video recording to get data from the field (classroom). The fifth step is analyzing the recording forms. Hence, the behavior of the students can be described.

First, there are 2 instruments that are distributed in this study, Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) instrument and Willingness to Communicate instrument, originally created by McCroskey (Morreale, 2007:10). In this case, there are 21 students that are given the questionnaires in the class. However, the 2 instruments that are given to the students have a little modification.. For PRCA-24, the arrangement of the items based on the four communication context (group, meeting, interpersonal, and public), so it my get the best results. For Willingness to Communicate instrument, the modification is concerned for replacement of the distracted items based on the context where the research takes place. Moreover, the 2 instruments are also translated into Indonesian to avoid misunderstanding. Furthermore, the instruments of PRCA-24

and Willingness to Communicate can be seen at the appendix.

For the second step, on the basis of the results of the questionnaires, following is the recapitulation of the scores of the questionnaires:

Table 2. The Recapitulation of the Scores of the Questionnaires

Num	Name	Scores of	
		PRCA-24	WTC
1	Student B	75	55
2	Student C	69	69,2
3	Student D	61	70,8
4	Student E	71	52,4
5	Student G	81	36,8
6	Student H	78	55
7	Student I	69	38,3
8	Student J	62	52,5
9	Student K	55	58,4
10	Student L	51	54,2
11	Student N	71	52,5
12	Student O	72	47,5
13	Student P	62	59,2
14	Student Q	59	79,2
15	Student R	62	46,6
16	Student S	91	41,3
17	Student T	59	66,6
18	Student V	76	32,9
19	Student X	68	65,4
20	Student Y	47	39,6
21	Student Z	78	60,5

Third step, based on the recapitulated scores, SPSS is applied to answer the second research question. In this case, Spearman's rank order correlation is applied because the two variables existing in this study are ordinal data (Riwidikdo, 2008: 86). Furthermore, it is the SPSS results of the relationship between CA and WTC in learning process of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014:

Figure 1. The SPSS Results of the Relationship between Communication Apprehension and Willingness to Communicate

Correlations

		PRCA24	WTC
Spearman's rho	PRCA24 Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.362
	PRCA24 Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.054
	N	21	21
	WTC Correlation Coefficient	-.362	1.000
	WTC Sig. (1-tailed)	.054	.
	N	21	21

In the box, there are four boxes with number, but there are only two boxes that are concerned. The two boxes are the boxes with smile mark in which the two boxes have same information. Thus, only one of the boxes needs to read as the interpretation.

There are three kinds of numbers. They are a value for Spearman's correlation coefficient, a Sig. (1-tailed) value, and a number (N) value. First, the value for Spearman's correlation coefficient is -.362. It means that the relationship between CA and WTC in learning process of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 is a moderate downhill linear relationship. Moreover, the downhill means that the value is negative. Therefore, if the value of CA moderately increases, the value of WTC will decrease, and vice versa. Second, the Sig. (1-tailed) value is .054. The significance must be 1-tailed because this study apply directional hypothesis (Nisfiannoor, 2009:9-10). The Sig. (significance) determines the probability that the correlation value is truly existing or not. If the Sig (p) $\leq$ 0.01, the correlation is very significant; if the Sig (p) $\leq$ 0.05, the correlation is significant; and if the Sig (p) > 0.05, the correlation is not significant (Nisfiannoor, 2009:9). Moreover, because the significance applied 1-tailed, so the value shown in the output must be divided by 2. Thus, the value is .054/2= .027, so the relationship between CA and WTC in learning process of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University , in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 is significant. Third, a number (N) value is the total freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 that have completed the questionnaires. There are 21 students.

The fourth step, doing observation supported by video recording is done to get data from the field (classroom). In this case, 2 observation forms are inevitable to get the data. The observation forms included sitting position, behaviors and gestures. The sitting position shows where the students take a seat in class, and then behaviors and gestures show the movement and their tendency to do in classroom. Moreover, there are only 6 students as the samples that are observed in 4 meetings. Furthermore, based on the recapitulation scores, the 6 students are student S, student C, student Y, student Q, student T, and student V. Based on the results of the observational analysis, the behavior of the 6 students can be described as follow:

First, student S is the student whose the highest score of CA (with low WTC). The student S tends to have a seat at rear of the classroom because the student high communicative apprehensive individual. Thus, it is natural that the student S tends to sit along the sides and in the rear of the classroom to avoid communication (McCroskey, 1984:146-147). Next, the student tends to be nervous and uncomfortable in communication, especially in presentation because of existence of communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1977, b, 27-28 cited in Resnick, 1980:11). The existence of the communication apprehension is shown by the tendency of the student S in behaving and gesturing because the student feel uncomfortable. Indeed, the student

confess the feeling of being nervous to have presentation. On the other case, the student tends to be more comfortable in communication with friend than lecturer because the existence of the characteristics of situational CA in which it is influenced by interlocutor (McCroskey, 1984:140). it is shown by the student's tendency in some activities in which the student S tend to be talkative and to give more attention to a friend than to the lecturer in speaking activity. Furthermore, in communication, the student S tends to be more comfortable in exam meeting than regular meeting. It occur because in the test (exam meeting), the student S has the tendency to seek and approach success or in contrast to avoid failure (Atkinson, 1964; Atkinson & Feather, 1966 in Zeidner, 1998:283-284). Thus, it is normal if the student S has preparation for conversation before the test, so that the student is ready having conversation in the test, and the student feel more comfortable. However, it do not guaranteed that the student do not feel anxious at all because anxiety might conditionally increase or decrease based on the existence of affective filter (barrier that is created by affective factor, exp: apprehension) (Yule, 2006:164; Stevick, 1976 in Krashen 1982:31); in which the apprehension is influenced by the personality of the student, interlocutor and the situation (McCroskey, 1984:140). Therefore, although the student feel comfortable, the student do some gestures to reduce anxiety because one function of gestures is as anxiety reduction (Barker, 2004 in Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2010:71).

Second, student C is the student whose the middles score of CA (with average WTC). The student C tends to have a seat at rear of classroom, even though the student C is not high communicative apprehensive individual. It occurs because the student C take a seat where the student's C friend takes a seat. Next, the student C tends to be more communicative (as volunteer to answer questions) because of the existence of second language use (the tendency to seek out communication opportunities using the second language), even though sometimes experience apprehension by showing gestures because of interlocutor (being asked for presentation by the lecturer) and situation (having conversation in front of the classroom) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29; Barker, 2004 in Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2010:71; McCroskey, 1984:140). In some cases, the student C also tends to be comfortable in communication with both friend or lecturer because the existence of the characteristics of generalized CA (her own personality) in which her behavior is influenced by general feelings about communication (McCroskey, 1984:140). Furthermore, the student C tends to be not pauciloquent because the student C tends to feel comfortable in communication (Phillips, 1968:40 in Resnick, 1980:9; Arabski &Wojtaszek, 2010:73). At last, in communication, the student C tends to feel comfortable to have communication in both exam meeting and regular meeting.

Third, student Y is the student whose the lowest score of CA (with low WTC). The student Y tends to have a seat at rear of classroom, even though the student Y is not high communicative apprehensive individual. It occurs because the student Y take a seat based on the position where the student's Y friend takes a seat. Indeed, the student move to

take another seat next to a friend. Next, the student tends to be more communicative (as volunteer to answer questions) because of the existence of second language use (the tendency to seek out communication opportunities using the second language), even though sometimes experience apprehension by showing gestures because of situation (having conversation in front of the classroom) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29; Barker, 2004 in Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2010:71; McCroskey, 1984:140). On another case, the student Y tends to lose focus in class when the lecturer is explaining a lesson because of social situation (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29). Perhaps, the student Y feel bored so that the student Y tends to be easy to lose focus in paying attention, having some snack, speak to other friends and checking a laptop, sometimes lose focus because of checking the mobile phone, speak to a friend when the lecturer is explaining a lesson. Furthermore, the student Y tends to be pauciloquent in conversation because of feeling uncomfortable (Phillips, 1968:40 in Resnick, 1980:9; Arabski & Wojtaszek, 2010:73). in the conversation, the student Y tends to wait for feedback after speaking in few words because of feeling anxious. At last, in communication, the student Y tends to be more comfortable in exam meeting than regular meeting. In general meeting, the student Y tends to be comfortable. Moreover, the student Y feel more comfortable in exam meeting. It occurs because in the test (exam meeting), the student Y has the tendency to seek and approach success or in contrast to avoid failure (Atkinson, 1964; Atkinson & Feather, 1966 in Zeidner, 1998:283-284). Thus, it is normal if the student Y has preparation for conversation before the test, so that the student Y is ready having conversation in the test, and the student Y feel more comfortable.

Fourth, student Q is the student whose the highest score of WTC (with moderate CA). The student Q tends to have a seat at rear, even though the student Q is not high communicative apprehensive individual; indeed, the student should be interactive because the level of the student's Q willingness to communicate is high. It occurs because the student Q tends to take a seat based on the position where the student's Q friend takes a seat. Next, the student Q tends to be uncommunicative or communicative because of the interlocutor (being uncommunicative when the lecturer asks the students to construct a question tag, but being communicative when preparing a conversation for next meeting with a friend) (McCroskey, 1984:140). On the other case, the student tends to lose focus in class when the lecturer is explaining a lesson because of social situation (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29). Perhaps, the student Q have a problem outside the class (daydreaming at a glance), or the student thinks that the topic of lecturing is not interesting (sleep for a moment in class). Thus, communication cannot exist. Furthermore, in communication, the student Q tends to be more comfortable in exam meeting than regular meeting, even though the student Q feels threatened by face to face

contact because of being surrounded by CA. (Phillips, 1968:39-40 in Resnick, 1980:8).

Fifth, student T is the student whose the middles score of WTC (with moderate CA). The student T tends to have a seat at front of the classroom because the student T feel comfortable to have communicative activity, so that the student T tends to be more communicative. It is proven by his position that has same seat for 3 regular meetings (McCroskey, 1984:146-147). Even though the student T is comfortable in communicative activity, the student T tends to sometimes lose focus when the lecturer is explaining a lesson and when the other students are doing presentation. It occurs because of social situation (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29). Perhaps, the student T has another problem outside the class, or the student T may feel bored, or the student T wants to get some rest because the student T is sleepy (yawn for several times), so the student T is impatient to end the class. Furthermore, in communication, the student T tends to be more comfortable in exam meeting than regular meeting. In exam meeting, the student T tends to be more comfortable than in regular class. It occurs because in the test (exam meeting), the student T has the tendency to seek and approach success or in contrast to avoid failure (Atkinson, 1964; Atkinson & Feather, 1966 in Zeidner, 1998:283-284), so the student T prepares the exam well to get good score. Thus, it is normal if the student T has preparation for conversation before the test, so that the student is ready having conversation in the test, and the student T feel more comfortable.

Sixth, student V is the student whose the lowest score of WTC (with moderate CA). The student V tends to have a seat at rear of the classroom, even though the student V is not a high communicative apprehensive individual. It occurs because the student V tends to take a seat based on the position where the student's V friend takes a seat, or it may occur because of her personality in WTC (low WTC), so the student V tends to avoid communication. Thus, the student V is more uncommunicative. However, even though the student V is uncommunicative, the student V tends to focus in class when the lecturer is explaining a lesson. Perhaps, it occurs because of social situation (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication) (MacIntyre at al. 1998:546 in Yu, 2008:29). It may occur because the student V is interested in the topic. Next, the student V tends to be more communicative having communication with friend (having conversation in front of the classroom and preparing a conversation for next meeting) than lecturer (when the lecturer offer the student to ask a question and when the lecturer ask the students to construct a question tag) (McCroskey, 1984:140). it may occurs because the student V feel more comfortable to have communication with a friend than the lecturer. Furthermore, in communication, the student V tends to be more communicative in exam meeting than regular meeting. It occurs because the student V has the tendency to seek and approach success or in contrast to avoid failure in the test (exam meeting) (Atkinson, 1964; Atkinson & Feather, 1966 in Zeidner, 1998:283-284), so the

student V prepares the exam well to get good score. Thus, it is normal if the student V has preparation for conversation before the test, so that the student V is ready having conversation in the test, and the student V feel more comfortable. However, the student V also feel anxious. It is proven by some gestures that the student V produces when doing conversation. The gestures exist in order for reducing the student's V own anxiety, so the student V can focus on the test.

Based on the behavior descriptions of the 6 students, it shows that there is fluctuation in the relationship between CA and WTC in learning process of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014. The level of CA and WTC may increase or decrease based on several factors. CA may increase or decrease because of the *personality him/herself, interlocutor* (classmates or lecturer) and *situation* (activities for 4 times meetings). There are differently various behaviors, when talking to a classmate or lecturer, and when doing several activities. In other case, willingness to communicate may increase or decrease because of *personality him/herself, social situation* (inside or outside of classroom based on the purpose, the topic, and the participants of communication), *self-confidence* (enduring personal characteristics because of self-perceived communication competence, how an individual believes his/her communication based on self awareness rather than the actual communication competence, and lack of anxiety or confident), *state communicative self confidence* (a momentary feeling of confidence because of situation), and *second language use* (the tendency to seek out communication opportunities using the second language), for examples; a student (student S) rejects when the student is being asked for presentation because the student is not ready and nervous (influenced by personality and state communicative self confident), but in contrast, the student is ready for the second time of being asked for presentation by the lecturer (influenced by self confident); the students show different behaviors when they listen to teacher, do presentation, prepare a conversation, or have conversation (influenced by situation); two students (student S and student C) decide to take an opportunity to practice of having conversation in front of classroom (influenced by second language use); the students tend to say "excuse me" after the lecturer (influenced by second language use), but a student (student T) is just silent (influenced by situation); Student V is more comfortable having communication with friend than lecturer (influenced by social situation and interlocutor). Therefore, the level of CA and WTC do not always determine that a student can be silent or communicative because there are some complex factors that affect the increase or decrease of CA and WTC level, especially when the individual differences also include (Cooper, 2002 in Dörnyei, 2005:7) and (De Raad, 2000:41 & Revelle, 2000:249 cited in Dörnyei, 2005:7), for other examples: a student (student Q, the student with the highest score of WTC) tend to be less communicative; a student (student Y, low WTC) tend to be a volunteer for asking or answering question from the lecturer); a student (student Q, moderate CA) is absent because the student have a problem with his

motorcycle in the first observation, and the student is also absent without any reason in the second observation; perhaps, the student have something happened.

Conclusions and Suggestion

This study concludes that there is a moderate downhill linear relationship between CA and WTC in learning process of the freshmen's group A of speaking class of Faculty of Letters, Jember University, in the first semester of academic year of 2013/2014 in which personality, interlocutor, situation, social situation, self-confidence, state communicative self-confidence, and second language use influence the fluctuation of CA and WTC levels, and gestures have a role to reduce apprehension or to be a thinking process.

Furthermore, there are 4 additional points that give more information of the students' behavior. The points show that, first, where a student chooses to take a seat does not always determine the level of CA and WTC; second, how long a student speaks does not always determine the level of CA and WTC of the students; third, absence in class does not always determine that a student has certain CA level; and fourth, how many the gestures produce does not always determine that a student has certain level of CA and WTC.

Lastly, after finishing this study, it is expected that this study gives contribution to better understanding for second language learner and second language teacher in the relationship between CA and WTC. Moreover, I hope that this study is also helpful for others as a reference of their studies in SLA which focus on CA and WTC, and it is especially helpful for further study. Furthermore, I suggest that further study should put interview method for collecting data in order for clearer and deeper exploring of learner's behavior.

Acknowledgments

References

Arabski, Janusz and Wojtaszek, Adam. 2010. *Neurolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Perspectives on SLA*. Great Britain. Short Run Press Ltd.

Castillo, Joan Joseph. 2009. *Quota Sampling*. http://explorable.com/quota-sampling [accessed on June 18th, 2013]

Chaudron, Craig. 1988. *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2005. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. New Jersey. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCroskey, James C *et al*. 1984. *Chapter 11: Communication Apprehension and Shyness*.

McCroskey, James C *et al*. 1985. *The Content Validity of the PRCA-24 as a Measure of Communication Apprehension across Communication Contexts*. Communication Quarterly Vol. 33, No.3, pages 160-173

Morreale, Sherwin P. 2007.*Assessing Motivation to Communicate: Willingness to Communicate and Personal Report of Communication Apprehension*. Colorado Springs. University of Colorado.

Nisfiannoor, Muhammad. 2009. *PENDEKATAN STATISTIKA MODERN: untuk Ilmu Sosial*. Jakarta. Salemba Humanika. http://books.google.co.id/books?id=1j_O7aHTZD8C&pg=PA10&lpg=PA10&dq=perbedaan+one+tailed+and+two+tailed&source=bl&ots=zXgZiD1pjU&sig=mQpHIrtrLIC1S0HoiHq1Msc_vWs&hl=en&sa=X&ei=1LfcUv3jIe6KiQf47ICIDQ#v=onepage&q=perbedaan%20one%20tailed%20and%20two%20tailed&f=false [accessed on January 20th, 2014]

Noname. 2005. *Analyzing Data in SPSS 13.0 Using Correlation*. Indiana State university. http://www.indstate.edu/cirt/ittrain/resources/tutorials/research/spss/spss13_correlation.pdf [accessed on February 4th, 2013]

Noname. 2012. *How Do I Interpret Data in SPSS for Pearson's r and Scatterplots?*. http://statistics-help-for-students.com/How_do_I_interpret_data_in_SPSS_for_Pearsons_r_and_scatterplots.htm#.Uc0SRayyr6Y [accessed on February 6th, 2013]

Noname. 2012. *First-Year Transition*. http://www.newschool.edu/lang/subpage.aspx?id=400 [accessed on March 20th, 2013]).

Resnick, Jeffrey Charles. 1980. *A Thesis: Communication Apprehension in Interview Setting*. The Ohio State University.

Riwidikdo, Handoko. 2008. *STATISTIKA KESEHATAN: Belajar mudah teknik analisis data dalam Penelitian Kesehatan (Plus Aplikasi Software SPSS.* Jogjakarta. Mitra Cendikia Press.

Yu, Miao. 2008. *Willingness to Communicate of Foreign Language Learners in a Chinese Setting*. Florida State University

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION (PRCA-24)
(Modified Instrument)

Directions: This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement.

__1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
__2. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
__3. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
__4. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
__5. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
__6. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
__7. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
__8. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
__9. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
__10. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable
__11. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.
__12. While giving a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know.
__13. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in a group discussion.
__14. Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
__15. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations
__16. I have no fear of giving a speech.
__17. I like to get involved in group discussions.
__18. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
__19. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
__20. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
__21. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
__22. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
__23. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
__24. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

Scoring:
Group = 18 – (item 1) + (item 13) - (item 21) + (item 17) - (item 9) + (item 5)
Meeting = 18 – (item 2) + (item 14) + (item 18) - (item 22) - (item 10) + (item 6)
Interpersonal = 18 – (item 3) + (item 15) - (item 23) + (item 19) + (item 7) - (item 11)
Public Speaking = 18 + (item 16) - (item 4) + (item 20) - (item 24) + (item 8) - (item 12)
Overall PRCA-24 = Group + Meeting + Interpersonal + Public

The score between 59 and 79 refers to "normal" range of communication apprehension; the score below 59 refers to "low communication apprehension"; and the score above 79 refer to "high communication apprehension" (McCroskey *et al.*, 1985:166; McCroskey, 2005 in Morreale, 2007:10). Thus, the higher the score, the more apprehension is experienced about communicating with other people (McCroskey, 1984:137-138)

APPENDIX B

WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE
(Modified Instrument)

Directions: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of times you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left of the item what percent of the time you would choose to communicate.
(0 = Never to 100 = Always)

__ 1. Talk with a lecturer.
__ 2. Talk with the dean.
__ 3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
__ 4. Talk with an acquaintance.
__ 5. Talk with the head of English Department.
__ 6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
__ 7. Talk with an academic officer.
__ 8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
__ 9. Talk with a friend.
__ 10. Talk with a vice-dean.
__ 11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
__ 12. Talk with a stranger.
__ 13. Talk with the secretary of the dean.
__ 14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
__ 15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
__ 16. Talk with the secretary of English Department.
__ 17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
__ 18. Talk with a service officer of classes.
__ 19. Talk in a small group of friends.
__ 20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Scoring: (Receiver-type sub-scores)
Friend   = [(item 6) + (item 9) + (item 14) + (item 19)]: 4
Acquaintance   = [(item 4) + (item 11) + (item 15) + (item 20)]: 4
Stranger   = [(item 3) + (item 8) + (item 12) + (item 17)]: 4
Total WTC score   = (Friend + Acquaintance + Stranger): 3
The score above 82 refers to high willingness to communicate; the score between 52 up to 82 refers to average willingness to communicate; the score below 52 refers to low willingness to communicate.
McCroskey, 2005 in Morreale, 2007:10). Thus, the higher the score means that the more willingness to initiate communication is.

APPENDIX C

RECORDING FORMS

Recording Form I

Date:	Activities	Behaviors and Gestures	Comments
Record #1-4			
Duration:			
Setting: Classroom			
Attendance:			
Seat:			

Recording Form II

Date:

G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	G7

Note: G1 (looking away), G2 (stroking chin/cocking head), G3 (rubbing/touching nose lightly), G4 (tapping finger), G5 (turning down the corner of the mouth), G6 (tight-lipped), G7 (shifting eyes) (*see table 1*)