Scientific Research Publishing

Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 2026, 16(6), 762-777
https://www.scirp.org/journal/ojml
ISSN Online: 2164-2834
ISSN Print: 2164-2818

Classroom Environment and Willingness to Communicate in Chinese College English Classes: An Ecological Perspective

Xiaoping Mai

School of Foreign Studies, Lingnan Normal University, Zhanjiang, China
Email: 1125323123@qq.com

How to cite this paper: Mai, X. P. (2026). Classroom Environment and Willingness to Communicate in Chinese College English Classes: An Ecological Perspective. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 16,* 762-777.
https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2026.166043

Received: October 23, 2026
Accepted: November 23, 2026
Published: November 26, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Open Access

Abstract

Questionnaire responses from 713 college students provided the basis for examining willingness to communicate (WTC) in relation to classroom experience. The students attended a university in Guangdong, China; 458 were English majors and 255 studied other subjects. Each completed eight items on WTC and eight on each of three environmental dimensions: student cohesiveness, teacher support, and task orientation. Analyses were conducted separately for the two cohorts. All three environmental scores correlated positively with WTC ($r = .611$ - $.719$, all $p < .001$). Entered together in a regression, the scores accounted for 60.5% of WTC variance among English majors and 62.0% among non-English majors. Student cohesiveness had the largest standardized coefficient in each model. Non-English majors reported higher mean WTC, teacher support, and task orientation, while English majors reported higher cohesiveness. These numerical contrasts were not subjected to formal tests of group differences. The common pattern across the two cohorts connects reported communicative readiness with students' experience of peer relationships, teacher assistance, and classroom work. Interpretation depends on the measures: several WTC items describe participation or peer assistance, and some environmental items cover similar behavior. Cross-sectional self-reports, differences in cohort composition, and unresolved measurement and classroom-reference issues limit causal and population inference.

Keywords

Classroom Environment, Willingness to Communicate, Ecological Perspective, English Majors, Non-English Majors

1. Introduction

A student may know how to answer a question in English yet hesitate when invited to speak. Willingness to communicate (WTC) addresses this gap between having the ability to communicate and being ready to use it. MacIntyre et al. (1998) define L2 WTC as readiness to communicate with particular interlocutors at a particular moment. Lee (2022) places this readiness immediately before language use. For classroom research, the question is therefore how students come to regard an opportunity to communicate as one they are willing to take.

An ecological perspective approaches this question through the relationships among learners, other people, activities, and their setting (van Lier, 2004). A communicative contribution is addressed to someone and serves a task; access to help may affect how a student approaches it. Cao (2011) and Peng (2012) examined learners' interpretations of these conditions as classroom situations unfolded. Survey studies in Chinese EFL settings linked perceived classroom environment with WTC (Peng & Woodrow, 2010; Peng, 2019). Together, these approaches make students' experience of classroom relationships and tasks a relevant focus of inquiry.

Environmental perceptions form only part of the account of classroom WTC. Dewaele and Dewaele (2018) examine predictors within learners and in their surroundings; Lee (2022) focuses on perseverance of effort and classroom enjoyment. These personal and emotional resources inform the background to our study. Our analysis concerns student cohesiveness, teacher support, and task orientation, with neither grit nor enjoyment included as an explanatory variable.

We examine English majors and non-English majors separately, distinguishing their average score profiles from their environment-WTC associations. A group with higher reported WTC need not show stronger correlations with classroom perceptions. Course demands, opportunities to use English, and expectations about participation could differ between the cohorts, although their major labels do not establish these differences. Within each group, the three environmental scores enter the regression together, so each coefficient describes an association conditional on the other two. The ecological interpretation concerns students' individual reports: the data contain no observations of interaction and cannot estimate classroom-level processes.

2. Literature Review

2.1. WTC as Situated Communicative Readiness

MacIntyre and Charos (1996) examined personality and language-related affect in relation to L2 WTC. The model developed by MacIntyre et al. (1998) combines relatively stable influences with conditions specific to an interaction to explain immediate readiness. In Japanese EFL learning, Yashima (2002) linked WTC to communicative self-confidence and international posture. These accounts accommodate both enduring learner differences and changes within interactions, locating willingness in a broader set of conditions than linguistic ability alone.

Interactional studies show what a situational account adds. Kang (2005) followed the development of willingness during interaction. Cao and Philp (2006) compared whole-class, small-group, and paired interaction, examining group size and familiarity with interlocutors and topics. Cao (2011) and Peng (2012) examined the interdependence of learner and contextual conditions. Zhang et al.'s (2018) review of 35 studies distinguished situational features from learners' perceptions. Survey reports can summarize tendencies across classroom experiences, but tracing a particular decision to speak requires evidence of the interaction in which it occurs.

MacIntyre et al. (2001) found that, among French immersion students, support from friends was more closely associated with WTC outside the classroom than within it. The same resource therefore had different relevance across settings. Dewaele (2019) examined classroom emotions and teacher behavior, reporting a negative association between anxiety and WTC. Enjoyment and teachers' frequency of foreign-language use showed positive associations with WTC. These classroom correlates should be distinguished from the friend-support relationship observed across communication settings.

In Lee's (2022) study of Korean middle-school, high-school, and university learners, perseverance of effort and classroom enjoyment predicted WTC, but consistency of interests did not. Distinctions among resources are accompanied by differences in what WTC measures ask students to report. Our eight-item composite includes peer assistance and other participation content, giving it a broader readiness and participation focus. Comparisons with measures asking explicitly about willingness to speak English in specified situations must take this content into account when interpreting environment-WTC associations.

2.2. Perceived Classroom Environment

From an ecological perspective, an opportunity for communication matters through the way a learner perceives and uses it (van Lier, 2004). Students sharing a classroom may consequently report different experiences of its relationships and activities. Here, the environmental scores summarize individual students' perceptions of classroom relationships and work, while enjoyment describes an emotional experience that may accompany them; the questionnaire does not test how one becomes the other.

Student cohesiveness refers to familiarity, friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance among classmates. Teacher support concerns the attention and help students perceive from a teacher, including responses to learning difficulties and interest in their progress. Task orientation covers clarity about classroom goals and work, together with attention to and completion of activities. These dimensions belong to the measurement tradition of the What Is Happening In this Class questionnaire. Dorman (2003) reported structural evidence for the broader instrument across educational settings; the measurement properties of each adaptation still need to be established.

Some environmental items ask students about their own actions. Cohesiveness includes helping classmates, and task orientation includes punctuality, attention, and effort. The scores therefore combine perceptions of classroom conditions with reports of participation. This shared participation content could contribute to their associations with WTC alongside the relationships and tasks of interest. We retain the established dimension labels to relate our findings to earlier work, while interpreting the scores as reports of students' classroom involvement rather than independent assessments of conditions external to them.

2.3. Environment and WTC across Learner Groups

The present questionnaire follows Mai and Fan (2021), who examined student cohesiveness, teacher support, task orientation, and WTC through questionnaires and interviews with Chinese college students. Their measurement approach sits within a wider body of Chinese EFL research. Peng and Woodrow (2010) included classroom environment in a WTC model, while Peng (2019) examined communicative readiness in relation to perceptions of multimodal instructional resources and classroom environment. This line of work supports examining the three dimensions jointly while attending to variation across samples and instructional settings.

More recent evidence shows why an overall WTC score needs to be interpreted alongside the activities it represents. Among 932 Chinese undergraduates, Han and Li (2025) found that teacher-student relationships, peer relationships, and cooperation positively predicted overall WTC, but the association patterns differed between meaning-focused and form-focused activities. Relationships that appear similar at the level of an overall score may therefore have different relevance to particular classroom tasks.

Other studies examine processes that might connect classroom experience with communicative readiness. Joe et al. (2017) modeled classroom social climate, basic psychological need satisfaction, self-determined motivation, and WTC in Korean secondary education. In a sample of 619 Chinese university students, Yang et al. (2024) reported an indirect teacher-support-WTC association through foreign language enjoyment, with a nonsignificant direct path. Han and Ganapathy (2026), studying 643 university students in Northeast China, found a positive teacher-support-WTC relationship with partial mediation through growth language mindset. The current regressions cannot distinguish these proposed explanations: enjoyment, grit, and mindset are not included, and no motivational pathway is tested. They estimate the environment-WTC associations to be explained.

Khajavy et al. (2018) used multilevel analysis with 1528 secondary-school learners in 65 Iranian classrooms to examine positive classroom environment and WTC. Their design distinguishes an individual's perception from conditions shared within a class. That distinction also matters in Chinese university education, despite the different setting. The present datasets lack classroom identifiers, restricting the analysis to student-level scores.

The present comparison concerns the two cohorts' reported score profiles and

the associations within each group. English majors and non-English majors differ in year of study and gender composition, while their course experiences and the equivalence of the scales remain unresolved. Group-specific descriptives, correlations, and simultaneous regressions characterize these patterns and the relationships of the three environmental scores with WTC. Contrasts between means or separately estimated coefficients remain descriptive; they do not establish statistically tested differences between the major groups.

2.4. Research Questions

The exploratory reanalysis addressed three questions:

RQ1. What are the mean levels of student cohesiveness, teacher support, task orientation, and WTC in the English-major and non-English-major samples, and how do the two descriptive profiles compare?

RQ2. What is the direction and strength of the correlation between each environmental dimension and WTC within each major group?

RQ3. In each group, how much WTC variance do the three environmental dimensions account for together, and how is each dimension associated with WTC after the other two are taken into account?

Prior findings supported an expectation of positive environment-WTC associations, but did not justify predicting which major group would score higher or show stronger associations. The research questions and analysis decisions were formulated for this reanalysis and were not preregistered before data collection.

3. Method

3.1. Participants

Responses were collected in June 2025 at Lingnan Normal University in Zhanjiang, Guangdong Province, China. The two questionnaire exports represented non-overlapping groups of 458 English majors and 255 non-English majors, totaling 713 students. These students were a different cohort from the participants in Mai and Fan (2021). This analysis was designed to compare the available cohorts; it was not an independent replication of that study.

Classes accessible to the research team were recruited with the school's approval for survey administration. Recruitment was conducted at the class level, with the team contacting instructors for permission to administer the questionnaire during class time. The surveyed classes were intensive reading courses involving listening, speaking, reading, and writing activities. Most English majors were freshmen, whereas non-English majors were mainly sophomores in subjects such as business administration, computer science, Chinese language, and education. Because the cohorts differed in year of study and gender composition, major served as a descriptive grouping variable rather than an isolated explanatory factor.

The exports contained no respondent or classroom identifiers, so responses could not be linked to individual classes. The models therefore could not account for possible dependence among classmates. Appendix A presents the question-

naire wording and scoring used in the analysis.

3.2. Measures and Scoring

Both exports contained the same 32 Chinese items relevant to this analysis, organized into four blocks following the classroom environment and WTC questionnaire used by Mai and Fan (2021). Responses were coded as 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = uncertain, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Scoring followed the wording and codebook in the exports. Appendix A provides the Chinese items alongside English glosses, making the content of each score available for inspection.

The WTC score was calculated from all eight available items, which address answering and asking questions, expressing opinions, group discussion and planning, and giving or seeking help. This content represents participation and communication broadly. Answering when called upon or helping a classmate may occur without a voluntary decision to speak English. The score therefore has a wider scope than Lee's (2022) five-item measure of willingness to communicate in English in specified situations and was interpreted accordingly.

Each of the three environmental dimensions was measured with eight items. Student cohesiveness concerns familiarity, friendship, cooperation, and mutual help. Teacher support covers attention to students' difficulties, feelings, and progress, as well as access to assistance. Task orientation includes completion of work, effort, lesson goals, punctuality, and attention. All selected items were positively keyed, and each score was calculated as the arithmetic mean of its eight items. Scores thus remained on the original 1 - 5 scale; neither reverse scoring nor imputation was required.

The regression models treated student cohesiveness, teacher support, and task orientation as separate predictors; no higher-order environment score was constructed. Cronbach's alpha was calculated separately for each of the four scores in each group to assess consistency among item responses. These analyses did not establish construct separation or measurement equivalence between majors. The reported comparisons therefore concern observed composite scores.

3.3. Data Screening and Statistical Analysis

Screening found complete responses for all 713 records, with integers between 1 and 5 on the 32 selected items. Fifty-six English-major records and 34 non-English-major records contained the same response throughout these items. These records were retained: all items were positively worded, and the exports included neither response times nor attention checks with which to distinguish uniform endorsement from invalid responding. Identical profiles could not establish duplicate participation either, because respondent identifiers were unavailable. The same screening criteria were applied to both groups.

SPSS was used to calculate descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, Pearson correlations, and simultaneous multiple linear regressions. Means, standard devia-

tions, skewness, and excess kurtosis were summarized separately by major group. Within each group, WTC was regressed on student cohesiveness, teacher support, and task orientation, with all three predictors entered in one step using the enter method. The reported model statistics include R^2, adjusted R^2, and the overall F test. Predictor estimates are presented as standardized coefficients with conventional standard errors, 95% confidence intervals, t statistics, and p values.

Tests were two-tailed with a significance threshold of .05. Group comparisons were limited to descriptive contrasts; no tests of differences between group means or regression coefficients were conducted. A coefficient estimates the association of one environmental score with WTC conditional on the other two scores. It does not estimate the effect of changing a classroom practice. Conventional regression inference also assumes independent errors and an adequately specified linear model. Because class membership was unavailable, the confidence intervals and significance tests could not be adjusted for classroom clustering.

3.4. Ethics and Consent

Before the survey, informed consent was obtained from students' legal guardians, and students received information about the study. Participation was voluntary and responses were collected anonymously. Students were told that their responses would be used for research.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Internal consistency was high for all four scores: alpha ranged from .870 to .941 among English majors and from .868 to .941 among non-English majors (Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency by major group.

Variable	Items	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	α
English majors (n = 458)						
Student cohesiveness	8	3.865	.547	−.575	3.564	.924
Teacher support	8	3.525	.626	−.387	1.721	.941
Task orientation	8	3.889	.525	−.700	4.170	.925
WTC	8	3.597	.599	−.359	1.981	.870
Non-English majors (n = 255)						
Student cohesiveness	8	3.755	.562	.072	0.571	.892
Teacher support	8	3.876	.587	−.327	1.473	.941
Task orientation	8	4.033	.552	−.330	1.135	.911
WTC	8	3.748	.569	−.221	1.227	.868

Note. Items = number of retained items; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha. All composite scores are eight-item means on a 1 - 5 scale. Skewness and excess kurtosis use sample-size corrections. The two panels describe separate samples.

On the five-point scale, non-English majors reported higher mean WTC (3.748 versus 3.597), teacher support (3.876 versus 3.525), and task orientation (4.033 versus 3.889). English majors reported higher cohesiveness (3.865 versus 3.755). Teacher support showed the largest raw mean difference, at 0.351 points. These values describe the two samples; they do not establish statistically significant differences between majors.

4.2. Correlations among Classroom Environment and WTC

The environment-WTC correlations were positive in both groups (all $p < .001$; Table 2). Among English majors, WTC correlated .717 with cohesiveness, .690 with teacher support, and .611 with task orientation. The corresponding correlations among non-English majors were .719, .655, and .663. Cohesiveness had the largest observed correlation in both samples. The environmental scores were also positively intercorrelated, making it useful to consider them together in the regression models.

Table 2. Correlations among classroom environment dimensions and WTC.

Variable	1	2	3	4
English majors (n = 458)				
1. Student cohesiveness	—			
2. Teacher support	.650***	—		
3. Task orientation	.683***	.628***	—	
4. WTC	.717***	.690***	.611***	—
Non-English majors (n = 255)				
1. Student cohesiveness	—			
2. Teacher support	.608***	—		
3. Task orientation	.632***	.658***	—	
4. WTC	.719***	.655***	.663***	—

Note. Pearson correlations are shown separately for English majors and non-English majors. WTC = willingness to communicate. ***$p < .001$, two-tailed. The diagonal is marked with a dash and the upper triangle is omitted. Stars indicate within-group correlations, not differences between groups.

4.3. Simultaneous Prediction of WTC

The three-predictor model accounted for 60.5% of WTC variance among English majors ($R^2 = .605$, adjusted $R^2 = .603$), $F(3, 454) = 232.27$, $p < .001$. Among non-English majors, the corresponding proportion was 62.0% ($R^2 = .620$, adjusted $R^2 = .615$), $F(3, 251) = 136.26$, $p < .001$. These are estimates for the observed samples, not assessments of prediction in new students.

All three predictors retained positive coefficients (Table 3). Cohesiveness had the largest standardized coefficient in both groups: $\beta = .415$ for English majors

and .423 for non-English majors. Teacher support followed at .353 and .243, respectively. Task orientation had coefficients of .106 and .236. For English majors, the task-orientation test gave p = .014; all other predictor tests gave $p < .001$. Thus, each association met the .05 criterion. No tests compared the coefficients with one another, either within a model or across the two groups.

Table 3. Simultaneous multiple regression of WTC by major group.

Predictor	β	SE	95% CI for β	t	p
English majors (n = 458)					
Student cohesiveness	.415	.044	[.329, .501]	9.46	<.001
Teacher support	.353	.041	[.273, .434]	8.59	<.001
Task orientation	.106	.043	[.022, .190]	2.47	.014
Non-English majors (n = 255)					
Student cohesiveness	.423	.053	[.318, .527]	7.94	<.001
Teacher support	.243	.055	[.136, .351]	4.45	<.001
Task orientation	.236	.056	[.125, .346]	4.20	<.001

Note. Each model regresses WTC on all three environmental scores. β denotes the standardized coefficient calculated within the relevant group; SE is its conventional standard error, and CI is its confidence interval. English majors: $R^2 = .605$, adjusted $R^2 = .603$, $F(3, 454) = 232.27$, $p < .001$. Non-English majors: $R^2 = .620$, adjusted $R^2 = .615$, $F(3, 251) = 136.26$, $p < .001$. Confidence intervals and nominal two-tailed p values use conventional OLS assumptions. No between-group coefficient tests are reported.

5. Discussion

5.1. Environmental Perceptions and Communicative Participation

All three environmental scores remained positively associated with WTC when considered together. The same result occurred in each cohort, despite differences in their mean scores. Earlier Chinese EFL surveys also found relationships between classroom perceptions and WTC (Peng & Woodrow, 2010; Peng, 2019). Our results extend that comparison to English-major and non-English-major cohorts measured with the same questionnaire. They are compatible with the attention to learners' classroom experiences in Cao (2011) and Peng (2012), although questionnaire associations offer less detail about an individual decision to speak than those classroom accounts.

The prominence of cohesiveness requires attention to both peer relationships and item wording. Cao and Philp (2006) identified interlocutor familiarity as relevant to WTC, making it plausible that students would find it easier to contribute among familiar classmates. Our questionnaire, however, also connects the two scores through their content. SC6 concerns helping classmates with their studies and SC8 receiving help; WTC3 and WTC4 concern readiness to help and seeking help. These items may register related aspects of participation, contributing to the association between the composites. Direction is unresolved as well: participation

could strengthen friendships, rather than simply follow from them. The largest coefficient therefore identifies a relationship to investigate, without establishing peer cohesiveness as the most effective target for intervention.

Teacher support had a positive coefficient in both models, even after the other environmental scores were included. Access to assistance may make it easier to attempt a contribution, but this possible explanation was not measured. Studies of emotion and social climate offer grounds for investigating it (Dewaele, 2019; Joe et al., 2017). Task orientation presents a different statistical profile. For English majors, its correlation with WTC was .611, whereas its standardized coefficient in the simultaneous model was .106. The two estimates answer different questions: the latter describes task orientation conditional on cohesiveness and support, with which it shares variance. A small conditional coefficient cannot show that clearer tasks or greater attention would be of little practical value.

Lee (2022) links WTC with enjoyment and perseverance of effort. Collecting those measures alongside classroom perceptions could help explain why students reporting similar conditions differ in their readiness to participate. Our data contain neither measure, so the environmental coefficients cannot identify an emotional or motivational pathway.

5.2. Interpreting the Comparison by Academic Major

The mean scores and the within-group correlations tell different parts of the story. English majors reported greater cohesiveness but lower WTC than non-English majors. Within each cohort, however, students with higher cohesiveness scores also tended to have higher WTC scores. The positive within-group association does not require the group averages to have the same ordering. Non-English majors also reported greater support and task orientation, which further complicates an explanation based only on academic major. These profiles describe how the available cohorts differed; they do not identify why they differed.

Several explanations remain possible. Students may have encountered different forms of support, or they may have evaluated similar support against different course expectations. Almost all non-English majors were sophomores, whereas most English majors were freshmen; gender composition also differed. The current models do not separate major from these characteristics or from unmeasured course experiences. The descriptive differences consequently provide questions for a more closely matched comparison, rather than evidence that one major group has better teaching or greater communicative ability.

The regression profiles were more alike than the mean profiles might suggest. Cohesiveness had the largest standardized coefficient in each group, and teacher support and task orientation both retained positive associations. Teacher support was numerically more prominent than task orientation among English majors; among non-English majors their coefficients were close. These estimates offer no formal test of different mechanisms by major. For teaching, the shared positive pattern is a stronger basis for further inquiry than the small numerical differences

between coefficients.

5.3. Implications for an Ecological Account of Classroom WTC

An ecological interpretation places these associations within students' experience of the classroom. Peer relationships, access to help, and understanding of classroom work may affect how an opportunity to communicate is perceived. The present scores capture students' broad reports of those experiences. They do not follow the changes during interaction described by Kang (2005), or directly separate situational cues from the interpretations emphasized by Zhang et al. (2018).

A further distinction concerns the unit of analysis. Khajavy et al. (2018) used multilevel data to examine individual and classroom conditions separately. Here, there is no way to identify which respondents shared a classroom. The environmental coefficients therefore describe differences among students' reports; they cannot establish an effect of a classroom-level condition. Observations of the same activity, combined with students' accounts of why they spoke or stayed silent, would make the ecological explanation more directly testable.

5.4. Limitations and Directions for Research

The cross-sectional design leaves the direction of the associations unresolved. Participation may influence perceptions of peers and teachers as well as respond to them. All four scores also come from positively worded self-reports collected together, so common response tendencies may contribute to their covariance. Retaining the invariant response profiles preserves the full available sample, but the absence of independent response-quality indicators limits what can be concluded about those profiles.

Measurement is another constraint. The WTC items combine willingness, reported participation, and peer assistance, while some environmental items include students' own behavior. High alpha values do not resolve that overlap or establish measurement equivalence across majors. Although recruitment took place in intensive reading classes, the item wording does not specify which course or teacher students should consider. The responses cannot establish whether everyone used the same reference. Specifying a course and teacher in future administrations, then examining construct separation and cross-group measurement equivalence, would give group comparisons a clearer basis.

The sample came from accessible classes at one university. Its two major groups differed in composition, and the absence of class codes prevented adjustment for dependence among classmates. The reported intervals consequently rely on conventional regression assumptions without evidence that classroom dependence was negligible. Further data collection should retain nonidentifying class codes and recruit more comparable cohorts across institutions. Repeated surveys accompanied by observations of classroom participation would address a separate question left open here: whether a student's reported readiness corresponds to subsequent English use.

6. Pedagogical Implications

A teacher deciding how to encourage participation needs more detail than an overall questionnaire score provides. Students could be asked which aspects of discussion make it easy or difficult to contribute, whether help is available, and whether they understand what an activity is intended to achieve. One practice worth evaluating is to allow preparation and paired discussion before inviting contributions to the whole class. Enjoyment and teacher behavior are relevant to that evaluation in view of Dewaele and Dewaele (2018) and Lee (2022). These are proposals for classroom inquiry; the survey did not test the effectiveness of such a sequence.

For teacher support, feedback should focus on concrete experiences: whether explanations are useful, questions receive a response, and assistance is available during group work. Teachers could then respond to the difficulties identified in their own classes. The difference between the two cohorts' average support scores gives no basis for prescribing one approach for English majors and another for non-English majors.

A task can be completed with little voluntary communication. This matters because the task-orientation score includes attention and punctuality, while the WTC score includes responding when called upon. Teachers could therefore examine who initiates a contribution as well as who completes the work. Clarifying the reason for exchanging ideas during an activity is one possible adjustment to assess. Combining students' reports with observations of their contributions would allow that assessment to address communication more directly than the present questionnaire alone.

7. Conclusion

Peer cohesiveness, teacher support, and task orientation each retained a positive association with WTC in the two cohorts. The simultaneous models accounted for 60.5% of observed WTC variance among English majors and 62.0% among non-English majors. Cohesiveness had the largest standardized coefficient in both, although peer-help content in the measures may contribute to its prominence. The group means showed a different profile: non-English majors reported higher WTC, support, and task orientation; English majors reported higher cohesiveness. Formal tests of these group differences were not conducted. The results connect students' reported participation and readiness with their classroom perceptions, but cannot establish what a change in the environment would cause. Observing participation alongside repeated measures of those perceptions is needed to examine how this relationship develops during English learning.

Funding

This paper and the study are funded by: Fund Project 1: An investigation and research on affective factors and English learning engagement of primary and secondary school students in western Guangdong (Project No.: Lingshi Teaching Af-

fairs 2023 No. 93); Fund Project 2: A study on English classroom learning engagement and teaching intervention of junior middle school students from the perspective of activity theory (U-G-S Project: No.7).

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Cao, Y. (2011). Investigating Situational Willingness to Communicate within Second Language Classrooms from an Ecological Perspective. *System, 39,* 468-479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.016

Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional Context and Willingness to Communicate: A Comparison of Behavior in Whole Class, Group and Dyadic Interaction. *System, 34,* 480-493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.05.002

Dewaele, J. (2019). The Effect of Classroom Emotions, Attitudes toward English, and Teacher Behavior on Willingness to Communicate among English Foreign Language Learners. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 38,* 523-535. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x19864996

Dewaele, J. M., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Learner-Internal and Learner-External Predictors of Willingness to Communicate in the FL Classroom. *Journal of the European Second Language Association, 2,* 24-37. https://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.37

Dorman, J. P. (2003). Cross-National Validation of the What Is Happening in This Class? (WIHIC) Questionnaire Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *Learning Environments Research, 6,* 231-245. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1027355123577

Han, D., & Ganapathy, M. (2026). Teacher Support in Enhancing Willingness to Communicate: The Mediating Effect of Growth Language Mindset. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 36,* 1414-1424. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12864

Han, H., & Li, B. (2025). Perceptions of Social Interactions and Second Language Willingness to Communicate in Different Activities. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 10,* Article No. 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00312-x

Joe, H. K., Hiver, P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2017). Classroom Social Climate, Self-Determined Motivation, Willingness to Communicate, and Achievement: A Study of Structural Relationships in Instructed Second Language Settings. *Learning and Individual Differences, 53,* 133-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.11.005

Kang, S. J. (2005). Dynamic Emergence of Situational Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language. *System, 33,* 277-292. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.10.004

Khajavy, G. H., MacIntyre, P. D., & Barabadi, E. (2018). Role of the Emotions and Classroom Environment in Willingness to Communicate: Applying Doubly Latent Multilevel Analysis in Second Language Acquisition Research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 40,* 605-624. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263117000304

Lee, J. S. (2022). The Role of Grit and Classroom Enjoyment in EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 43,* 452-468. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2020.1746319

MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, Attitudes, and Affect as Predictors of Second Language Communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15,* 3-26. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x960151001

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,* 369-388. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263101003035

Macintyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal, 82,* 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Mai, X., & Fan, Y. (2021). An Empirical Study of the Willingness to Communicate in College English Classes from an Ecological Perspective. *Creative Education, 12,* 2056-2065. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.129157

Peng, J. E. (2012). Towards an Ecological Understanding of Willingness to Communicate in EFL Classrooms in China. *System, 40,* 203-213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.02.002

Peng, J. E.(2019). The Roles of Multimodal Pedagogic Effects and Classroom Environment in Willingness to Communicate in English. *System, 82,* 161-173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.006

Peng, J. E., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to Communicate in English: A Model in the Chinese EFL Classroom Context. *Language Learning, 60,* 834-876. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00576.x

van Lier, L. (2004). *The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning: A Sociocultural Perspective*. Springer.

Yang, Y., Cui, Y., & Yao, S. (2024). Teacher Support, Grit and L2 Willingness to Communicate: The Mediating Effect of Foreign Language Enjoyment. *BMC Psychology, 12,* Article No. 383. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01877-5

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language: The Japanese EFL Context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86,* 54-66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00136

Zhang, J., Beckmann, N., & Beckmann, J. F. (2018). To Talk or Not to Talk: A Review of Situational Antecedents of Willingness to Communicate in the Second Language Classroom. *System, 72,* 226-239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.01.003

Appendix A. Selected Questionnaire Items and Scoring

The following questionnaire is designed for research on Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in EFL learning. It is not a test so there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. We are interested in your personal opinion. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help.

In the following section we would like you to give your personal opinion by simply giving marks from 1 to 5.

1 = I strongly disagree with this statement. (很不同意)
2 = I disagree with this statement. (不同意)
3 = I am uncertain about this statement. (不确定)
4 = I agree with this statement. (同意)
5 = I strongly agree with this statement. (很同意)

Willingness to communicate

WTC1 中文：我自愿在课堂上回答问题。
WTC1. I volunteer to answer questions in class.
WTC2 中文：老师叫我回答时，我回答了。
WTC2. I answer when the teacher calls on me.
WTC3 中文：如果同学需要帮助，我随时准备给予帮助。
WTC3. I am ready to help my classmates when they need help.
WTC4 中文：如果我在学习上有困难，我会向我的同学求助。
WTC4. I turn to my classmates for help when I have difficulty with my studies.
WTC5 中文：我会在课堂上提出问题。
WTC5. I ask questions in class.
WTC6 中文：我喜欢参加小组讨论。
WTC6. I like participating in group discussions.
WTC7 中文：我愿意在课堂上表达我不同的想法或观点。
WTC7. I am willing to express different ideas or opinions in class.
WTC8 中文：我愿意和小组成员一起为小组项目制定计划。
WTC8. I am willing to make plans for group projects with other group members.

Student cohesiveness

SC1 中文：我和这个班的同学交朋友。
SC1. I make friends with students in this class.
SC2 中文：我认识这个班的其他同学。
SC2. I know the other students in this class.
SC3 中文：我对这个班的成员很友好。
SC3. I am friendly toward members of this class.
SC4 中文：这个班的成员是我的朋友。
SC4. Members of this class are my friends.
SC5 中文：我和其他同学合作学习得很好。
SC5. I work well with other students in this class.

SC6 中文：我帮助其他在学习上有困难的同学。
SC6. I help classmates who have difficulty with their studies.
SC7 中文：这个班的同学喜欢我。
SC7. Students in this class like me.
SC8 中文：我得到了这个班其他同学的帮助。
SC8. I receive help from other students in this class.

Teacher support

TS1 中文：老师对我学习上的问题很关注。
TS1. The teacher pays attention to difficulties I have with my studies.
TS2 中文：老师会不遗余力地帮助我。
TS2. The teacher makes every effort to help me.
TS3 中文：老师会考虑到我的感受。
TS3. The teacher considers my feelings.
TS4 中文：当我完成作业有困难时，老师会耐心帮助我。
TS4. The teacher patiently helps me when I have difficulty completing assignments.
TS5 中文：老师会和我谈心。
TS5. The teacher has personal conversations with me.
TS6 中文：老师关心我的进步。
TS6. The teacher cares about my progress.
TS7 中文：老师在课堂上巡视并和同学沟通交流。
TS7. The teacher moves around the classroom and communicates with students.
TS8 中文：老师的关切对我的学习很有帮助。
TS8. The teacher's concern is helpful to my learning.

Task orientation

TO1 中文：按质按量完成老师布置的作业对我来说很重要。
TO1. It is important to me to complete the teacher's assignments to the required standard and amount.
TO2 中文：我会尽自己的能力做到最好。
TO2. I do the best I can.
TO3 中文：我知道每次课的目标。
TO3. I know the objectives of each lesson.
TO4 中文：我会准时上课。
TO4. I attend class on time.
TO5 中文：我知道我能在这次课上达成什么目标。
TO5. I know which objectives I can achieve in this lesson.
TO6 中文：我上课认真听讲。
TO6. I pay close attention in class.
TO7 中文：我尽力掌握每次课所学内容。
TO7. I try to master what is learned in each lesson.
TO8 中文：我知道我有多少任务要完成。
TO8. I know how much work I need to complete.