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ABSTRACT

Taiwanese Willingness to Communicate in English: Can Watching American Television programs help?

By

Yu-Ting Chien

Dr. Paul Traudt, Examination Committee Chair
Assistant Director of Journalism and Media Studies
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This study explored the relationship between Taiwanese audiences’ use of American television programs and their willingness to communicate in English. Taiwanese participants filled out an online survey consisted of questions from uses and gratifications constructs and willingness to communicate constructs. In addition, different subtitle settings were also examined.

Results indicated that participants with high integrative motivation consuming information from American television programs, in addition, the setting of subtitles were associated with perceived communication competence, integrative motivation, language anxiety and social interaction motivation.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

English has become a mandatory subject in many non-native English-speaking countries and is an increasingly international language. In Taiwan, for example, English is such an important subject that it is tested on entrance examinations for higher education (Chern, 2002). Though this is the case, Chinese students are widely recognized for their exceptional written English but are very often poor at speaking it. As a result they are often designated as reticent learners who lack the willingness to communicate (Tsui, 1996). Due to the great importance placed on higher education in their culture, Chinese students are placed under a lot of pressure when it comes to entrance examinations that focus on grammar/translation skills. Many students are so preoccupied with preparing for these examinations and raising their test scores by memorizing vocabulary and idiomatic expressions and practicing sentence translation that practicing communicating orally often takes a backseat. After several years of examination oriented English learning, most of the people that have never communicated in English outside of the classroom will face difficulties when trying to communicate orally with a native English speaker. They typically understand what is being said to them but are unable to deliver a proper response and so at times they may just remain silent and wait or travel with someone that has more fluency.

Willingness to communicate is dependent both on prior experiences in social situations as well as a wide variety of personality characteristics, such as anxiety or perceived competence (McCroskey and Richmond, 1991; MacIntyre, Babin and Cement,
Since English as Foreign Language (EFL) students lack opportunity to have contact with native English speakers, is it possible for these students, or others learning a language, to use foreign language television as an adequate substitute for these missing oral communication experiences?

In many non-English speaking countries, when Hollywood movies are exported, they are either dubbed over with their official languages or simply have subtitles added along with the original English voices. Thanks to the use of dubbing and subtitles, these movies suddenly become very useful educational tools for EFL students and provide them not only with an entertaining way to learn conversational English but also a glimpse of American culture. For example, my high school history teacher used movies such as *Forrest Gump* (1994) to introduce American history and *Cinema Paradiso* (1988) to explain the changing of the movie industry in Italy. These entertainment-oriented movies or television programs can easily capture students’ attention and arouse their interest in a foreign country's history through vivid imagery instead of just words on a page, transforming the abstract “word” picture into a real object that they can actually see. It is especially beneficial for EFL learners to have a glimpse of the target language and its associated culture and to be constantly and repeatedly exposed to the target language being used in real situations.

The history of the Taiwanese being able to freely access American programs is relatively short, because the implementation of Martial Law since 1947. It denied the right of assembly, free speech and publication. Before the lifting of Martial Law in 1987, the Taiwanese didn’t have much choice in what they were able to watch. There were only three television stations then, until the Government of Information Office announced the
new rule of cable TV in 1993. After which ESPN, CNN, the Discovery Channels and so forth acquired their broadcasting permits in Taiwan, the Taiwanese who subscribed to cable channels could now enjoy these programs instead of being limited to just three local network television stations (Wang, 2002). Later, the popular use of the Internet also changes Taiwanese watching behavior. The Taiwanese can now watch foreign programs through download or live streaming to their computer. The accessibility of American television programs becomes even easier than before.

Therefore, this study will examine the relationship between the use of media and foreign language’s willingness to communicate.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to address the relationship between a Taiwanese audience's use of American television programs and their willingness to communicate in English. The purpose of this research was twofold: first, to determine what gratifications Taiwanese audiences are seeking while they are consuming American television and the second is to determine the relationship between individuals who frequently watch American television programs and their level of willingness to communicate. My informal personal observation without research has shown that individuals who frequently watch foreign language programs were more willing to communicate in a foreign language when they had the opportunity to do so.

A few previous studies about the relationship between media and second language acquisition focus on vocabulary acquisition through subtitles (Koolstra & Beentjes, 1999; Danan, 1992; d’Ydewalle & Gielen, 1992; Borrás and Lafayette, 1994; d'Ydewalle &
Pavakanun, 1997) and rarely investigated foreign language willingness to communicate. Moreover, media effects research sought to identify audiences’ motivation and gratification through media consumption in audiences that were mostly native speakers (Levy and Windahl, 1984; Rubin and Perse, 1987; Rubin, 1983) instead of EFL audiences.

**Definition of Terms**

This next section will address and define a few key terms that will be used throughout this study: the distinction between second language and foreign language; uses and gratifications and willingness to communicate.

**The distinction between second language and foreign language.** Cohen (1998) distinguished the difference between second language (L2) and foreign language: “A second language means that the language being learned is that which is spoken in the community in which it is being learned, while a foreign language is not spoken in the local community” (p. 4). In other words, the term second language learners refers to those people that speak a minority language in the country or area in which they live and are learning the majority language, while foreign language learners refers to those people that learn a language that is not spoken in their country or local area. An example of this would be Spanish-speaking students in America learning English (second language learners) and students in Taiwan learning English (foreign language learners). Compared to a second language learner, foreign language learners have less opportunity to communicate orally in the target language because they are surrounded by their own native language and typically mainly only receive input from a classroom setting and
therefore must search elsewhere for stimulation in the target language. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) found that, if foreign language learners lack the opportunity for constant interaction in the target language, they were less likely to increase their perceived competence, willingness to communicate and frequency of communication.

**Uses and gratifications.** Uses and gratifications media theory explains how people use media, to understand motives for media behavior, and to identify functions that follow from audience needs, motives and behaviors (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch, 1974). The theory assumes audience activity plays an essential role in media effects (Blumler, 1979). Levy and Windahl (1985) suggested “media use is motivated by needs and goals that are defined by audience members themselves, and that active participation in the communication process may facilitate, limit, or otherwise influence the gratifications and effects associated with exposure.” There have been a few key studies that identified and categorized the reasons and motivations behind why a person may watch television: Blumler (1979) identified three orientations of gratification (i.e., cognitive, diversion and personal identity); Bantz (1982) found five main reasons for why people watch television (i.e., companionship, surveillance, entertainment, voyeurism and social resources); and Rubin (1983) categorized five viewing motivations (i.e., pass time/habit, information, entertainment, companionship and escape). Scholars associated the above gratifications with age, types of programs and specific media behavior (Rubin, 1981; Rubin, 1983; Bantz, 1982). More specific research findings about uses and gratifications are outlined in chapter two.

**Willingness to communicate.** Willingness to communicate (WTC) is defined as: “the intention to initiate communication, given a choice” (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément and
Conrad, 2001, p. 369) and was originally investigated in first or native language communication. WTC is a complex construct, influenced by other individual difference factors such as communication apprehension, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation, introversion versus extroversion and so forth. There are so many factors that can influence WTC; however there are numerous studies that have established the importance of the following variables: communication apprehension; perceived communication competence; integrative motivation and introversion versus extroversion (McCroskey and Richmond, 1987; MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; MacIntyre, Babin and Clément, 1999; MacIntyre, Clément, Dornyei and Noels, 1998; Baker and MacIntyre, 2000; Liu and Jackson, 2008).

Communication apprehension is defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with others and seen as having a trait-like quality” (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). MacIntyre’s (1994) model examined several individual difference variables as predictors of WTC in native language and concluded that the combination of communication apprehension and perceived communication competence directly influenced WTC. The model postulates “higher levels of willingness to communicate are based on a combination of greater perceived communicative competence and a relative lack of communication apprehension” (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996, p. 7). Language anxiety has become the preferred term when discussing communication apprehension in second language learning (Horwitz & Young, 1991).

Perceived communication competence was researched in the area of reticence (Phillips, 1968, 1977), which is identified as a reluctance to speak. Communication
competence can be defined as “the individual’s ability to properly process information in such a way that communicative behaviors occur in some orderly, rule-governed way” (Sellers and Stacks, 1990, p. 46). It is believed that lack of communication skills as the primary reason why some people are less willing to communicate than others. “Since the choice of whether to communicate is a cognitive one, it is likely to be more influenced by one’s perceptions of competence (of which one is usually aware) than one’s actual competence (of which one may be totally unaware)” (McCroskey and Richmond, 1990, p. 27).

Integrative motivation associates with components such as interest in foreign languages, desire to learn the target language, attitudes toward learning the target language, attitudes toward the learning situation, desire to interact with the target language community and attitudes toward the target language community (Gardner, 1982). According to Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model, integrative motivation embodies three major elements: integrativeness; attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation. Integrativeness refers to “an individual’s desire to interact with the target language group” (MacIntyre et al., 2002). Attitudes toward the learning situation are measured by an evaluation of the L2 teacher and L2 course. The motivation is made up of the desire to learn the L2, motivational intensity, and attitudes toward learning the L2. MacIntyre (2002) pointed out that “the student who endorses integrative attitudes, or more simply an integrative orientation or goal, but who does not show effort or engagement with the language, is simply not a motivated learner” (p. 48). Integrative motivation influences the activity level of the learner in learning situations, including both formal and informal type of learning.
Personality can be defined as those characteristics of a person that “account for consistent patterns of feeling, thinking and behaving” (Pervin and John 2001, p. 4). The two main personality types of extroversion and introversion attracted the most attention in second language studies. “Extroverts are sociable, like parties, have many friends and need excitement; they are sensation-seekers and risk-takers, like practical jokes and are lively and active. Conversely introverts are quiet, prefer reading to meeting people, have few but close friends and usually avoid excitement” (Eysenck and Chan, 1982, p. 154).

Organization of Thesis

Chapter one provided the general purpose of the study as well as the distinction of second language and foreign language, definition of uses and gratifications theory and willingness to communicate. Chapter two will further reveal previous research in uses and gratification and willingness to communicate and summarize what we know about the previous studies and what we do not know. Chapter three will consist of the methodology for this study, which will include a description of the research process and how the survey was conducted. Chapter four will conclude the results and findings from the survey and the final chapter will include the discussion of the findings, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the research and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between English as Foreign Language (EFL) audiences watching American television programs and whether their gratifications can be fulfilled and further enhance their L2 willingness to communicate (WTC). Therefore, the first part of this review addresses audience activity in uses and gratifications (U&G) theory and it will help to explain media effects. The second portion will explore foreign language willingness to communicate and will also address individual difference factors from language anxiety, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation and personality. The third section addresses the media production factors of subtitles and dubbing, which are widely used when foreign programs are exported to other countries. The final section of the literature review will summarize this prior body of work in terms of strengths and weaknesses and finally the wider implications for this study.

Uses and Gratifications

Uses and gratifications (U&G) researchers have long been opposed to the old concept of audiences passively absorbing information and therefore argued that audience members select media contents actively and consciously to satisfy their gratifications (Palmgreen, Wenner, Rosengren 1985, p. 23). The focus of media effects shifted from what media do to people to what people do with the media. To better understand this audience-centered theory, the researchers proceeded with their research branching out from two basic premises: a) media audiences are variably active communicators; and b)
audience motivation and behavior help to understand media effects (Rubin, 1993). The basic assumptions of this theory are that audiences are active, media use is used to satisfy a conscious goal and an individual's interests or desires, and that social and psychological factors mediate communication behavior, such as an individual’s personality, social categories and the potential for interpersonal interaction (Palmgreen et al., 1985, p. 14).

Audience activity is the core concept of the U&G theory and it suggests that “media use is motivated by needs and goals that are defined by audience members themselves, and that active participation in the communication process may facilitate, limit, or otherwise influence the gratifications and effects associated with exposure” (Levy and Windahl, 1985). Blumler (1979) divided the concept of audience activity into the following parts: a) utility, mass communication has uses for people; b) intentionality, people’s motivations for media consumption; c) selectivity, people’s interests or desires affect their choice of media; and finally d) imperviousness to influence, people’s obstinate nature, which might result in them avoiding certain types of media influence (p. 13).

Levy and Windahl (1984) attempted to conceptualize and investigate audience activity empirically, and constructed it with two dimensions: audience orientations (i.e., selectivity, involvement and utility); and temporal dimensions of media exposure (i.e., before, during and after television watching) in television news consumption. Selectivity suggests the time prior to exposure. Audience members make decisions about a given set of communications, and that such goal-oriented choices are the result of the interplay between the audience’s desire to fulfill certain social and psychological needs (p. 54). Activity during is the process that audience members attempt to associate messages with
meanings. Moreover, “an active individual may find him- or herself thinking about those messages or talking about them with others who are present” (p. 55). Post-exposure reflects on a willingness to discuss and integrate information gained into psychological processes and social behavior, for example, audience members consciously seek out and use their exposure to provide them with items for “small talk” or “chit-chat” (Levy, 1977). From a theoretical standpoint, Levy and Windahl’s (1984) finding indicated that the more audience members were motivated in their use of television news and the more they perceived various types of gratification, the more active they were in their television news consumption. Therefore, the audience’s gratification directly influenced their level of activity in media consumption.

Earlier studies of viewing motives investigated the relationship between age and the type of programs viewed. For example, Himmelweit, Oppenheim, Vince, Blumenthal and Hetherington (1962) and Schramm (1961) found that younger children prefer cartoons, animal entertainment shows and western because they do not require understanding of complex motives. Adolescents, on the other hand, are less interested in stereotyped plots and straightforward action and prefer more varied action and more complex motivations, such as situational comedies and crime dramas. Lyle and Hoffman (1972) reported that first graders are more likely to use television content as a model for social play, to dream about what they see on television and to be frightened by television content. However, it is not age per se that determines media content selection and use. Rubin (1985) explained that individual, family, and social factors along with the desire to fulfill gratification-seeking motives also played a role in media selection (p. 197).
Blumler (1979) identified three orientations of gratification that individuals may fall under when consuming media. They are cognitive orientation, diversion orientation and personal identity orientation. Cognitive orientation includes “surveillance” and “reality exploration” functions, which reflect general information seeking. Blumler postulated that cognitive motivation would facilitate information gain, because “the person who is more strongly and more exclusively moved to consume media materials for their informational contents is more likely to acquire knowledge from them” (p. 18). Diversion orientation includes “escape”, “entertainment” and “arousal” functions. Blumler concluded that the purpose of diversion and escape using media consumption would favor an audience’s acceptance of the viewed perceptions of social situations, because “when a person’s perceptual guard has been lowered, he will be more open to influence by the frames of reference embedded in the materials he has been attending” (p. 19). Personal identity function helps individuals seeking something that reminds them important events in their own life, something relatable. This orientation is more likely to promote the audience’s reinforcement effects, because “when people throw their identities into mass communication offerings, more often than not they will probably seek a reinforcement of what they personally appreciate, stand for and value” (p. 20).

Bantz (1982) examined uses of television and the uses of favorite programs and found that there are no clear differences between medium-specific and program type-specific motives for using television. In his sample that watched either television in general or the favorite programs he found that they were watched for the following reasons: companionship; surveillance; entertainment; voyeurism and social resources.
Rubin (1981) examined age, viewing motives and specific media behavior and found that younger persons were more likely than older persons to watch television for reason of escape, to pass time, out of habit, arousal, or for social interaction. The motives of passing time, habit, companionship, and entertainment were strongly and positively correlated with the amount of television viewing. While arousal, passing time, habit, and the escape motives were most strongly and positively correlated with television affinity. Information and arousal motives were most strongly and positively correlated with perceived realism of television.

Rubin (1983) investigated audience’s choices of programs associated with their specific viewing motivation for these programs. The five viewing motivation factors examined were: pass time/habit; information; entertainment; companionship and escape. The results indicated that the viewers with a habitual/pass time or entertainment motivation watched greater amounts of television and felt that television played an important role in one’s life. It revealed substantial affinity with the medium but no obvious program preferences (p. 46-48). Viewers seeking information watched a fairly high level of talk shows, news, and game show programs and the results indicated a heightened sense of the realism of television's portrayals of life. These viewers are actively seeking messages from the content of a communication media and to learn about people, places, and events and to instrumentally use this information in interpersonal interaction (p. 50). However, escapist or non-informational viewers provide a direct contrast to informational viewing. Viewers watching to escape use television to forget about personal problems and to get away from other people or tasks and this resulted in reduced viewing levels. Rubin explained escape to indicate a desire, not only for social
isolation, but also for televised excitement and may be gratified from other social activities that fulfill the escapist’s needs. Palmgreen et al. (1985) support Rubin’s finding. They explained that audiences perceive television is an accurate reflection of life should also be those most likely to seek information about life from the medium. Content perceived as true to life should hold little attraction for those seeking escape from their daily cares.

The above empirical studies of uses and gratifications in television viewing motivations primarily used native speakers as subjects and rarely explored foreign language groups. Hwang and He (1999) on the other hand examined Chinese immigrants’ and their acculturation in relationship to their patterns of television viewing.

Uses and Gratifications in Foreign Language Audiences

Hwang and He (1999) explored media consumption and the acculturation process among Chinese immigrants in the U.S. In the acculturation process, the main key variables are language competence, acculturation motivation and accessibility to host communication channels. Chinese immigrant’s needs in the acculturation process are language skills, information about their host country in addition to knowledge about its culture. Their findings showed a clear pattern of subjects heavily using Chinese-language media for information and entertainment and only some English-language media for entertainment and language-learning purposes. The reason why they live in the U.S. but still use Chinese-language media heavily is because all of the host country information, customs and habits can be seen in local Chinese media. For instance: Chinese media provide information about lifestyle, how-to tips and survival advice on life in America (p.
13). The reason for them using some English-language media is their desire to consume professional field information or improve their language skills. For example, subjects read English-language magazines heavily because the information in them cannot be obtained from Chinese-language media (p. 17). From a language learning aspect, most subjects claimed that watching television or listening to the radio enhanced their ability to comprehend and therefore the authors speculated that broadcast media appeared to be a passive, one-way process of learning English, which assisted only in the training of listening comprehension (p. 13). Other factors associated with motivation for the acculturation process are a subject’s age when they arrived in the U.S., years of education in the U.S., workplace environment, and their desire to stay in the host country.

Ding (2007) interviewed Chinese people that were successful at learning English fluently and who went on to win prizes in nationwide English speaking competitions and debate tournaments in China who were also asked to share their methods for learning English so well. Besides formal school training the interviewees stated that their use of outside resources, such as watching English movies and television series helped them. Their intentions when watching were not for entertainment and instead picked one movie that they liked and proceeded to repeatedly watch that same movie. One interviewee said: “Most students watch movies for the plot, but this does not serve the purpose. ... you may watch a lot of movies, but once you find a movie you like, you should repeatedly watch it until you really have everything in it at your tongue’s end” (p. 5).

The above paragraphs summarized multiple studies exploring the reasons for why people watch television. The findings of these studies explained the correlations between these reasons and age, perceived realism, affinity and viewing frequency. Very little
research has demonstrated why audiences watch the programs from other countries. What gratifications are audiences looking for while watching American television? Is a result of this viewing potentially that it helps to raise their willingness to communicate in English when given the opportunity?

**Willingness to Communicate in a Foreign Language**

McCroskey and Richmond (1990) viewed willingness to communicate (WTC) in the native language (L1) setting and found that based on samples of speaking situations in which communicative competence is fairly high, that WTC is best predicted by communication apprehension. MacIntyre, Babin, and Clément (1999) found both prior experiences in communication situations and personality characteristics such as anxiety, perceived competence, and a host of other social psychological characteristics influenced student’s L1 communication behavior. These factors have been shown to affect WTC in the second language (L2) (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996; MacIntyre and Clément, 1999; MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels, 1998), extending from the original L1 framework.

Changing the language of communication affects the entire communication setting because it has the potential to affect many attributes that affect the WTC. Charos (1994) found a negative correlation between WTC in L1 and L2 language students. MacIntyre et al. (1998) explained “the differences between L1 and L2 WTC may be due to the uncertainty inherent in L2 use that interacts in a more complex manner with those variables that influence L1 WTC” (p. 546). For instance, adult L1 speakers have achieved a great deal of competence with that language, their L2 competent level can range from
no L2 competence to full L2 competence because L2 use carries a number of inter-group issues, with social and political implications, that are usually irrelevant to L1 use (MacIntyre et al., 1998, p. 546).

The willingness to communicate focus on L2 communication is defined as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2” (MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels, 1998, p. 547). The following section introduces four factors that influence people’s foreign language willingness to communicate.

**Language anxiety.** Anxiety can be categorized into three sub-categories: trait anxiety, state anxiety and situation-specific anxiety. Scovel (1987) defined trait anxiety as “a more permanent predisposition to be anxious.” State anxiety is defined as apprehension that is experienced at a particular moment in time as a response to a definite situation (Spielberger, 1983). It is a combination of trait and situation-specific anxiety. Situation-specific anxiety is aroused by a specific type of situation or event, such as public speaking, examinations, or class participation. Language anxiety is considered to be a situation-specific anxiety.

Language anxiety has been found to have a negative effect on learning. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) examined anxiety in foreign language classrooms and discovered a negative correlation between language anxiety and second language course grades. Language anxiety could prevent a student's learning, such as “postpone required foreign language courses until the last possible moment or change their major to avoid foreign language study” (p. 131). Young (1985) found anxiety correlated significantly
and negatively with oral proficiency in a group of prospective language teachers. MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) also found that the arousal of anxiety can interfere with the ability to take in, process, and produce an L2. When anxiety does arise relating to the use of the L2, it seems to be restricted mainly to speaking and listening, reflecting the learner's apprehension at having to communicate spontaneously in the L2. However, anxiety was not always seen as a negative influence. For example, Chastain (1975) found that measures of anxiety in American university students were positively related to marks achieved by one group of audio-lingual French learners, indicating that the learners with higher levels of anxiety did best.

Liu (2006) found that the English proficiency level affects a Chinese EFL student’s language anxiety in the classroom. The results showed that the more proficient students tended to be less anxious; and when students were responded to the teacher or were singled out to speak in English in class, they felt the most anxious. However, with increasing the exposure to spoken English, the students began to feel less and less anxious when communicating in English. Liu and Jackson (2008) found that foreign language anxiety correlated significantly with a Chinese EFL student’s unwillingness to communicate. Students did not like to risk using/speaking English in class, because their language anxiety or lack of proficiency, but they were willing to participate in interpersonal conversations. More than one-third of the students felt anxious in their English class, because they feared being negatively evaluated and were anxious about public speaking and tests. Liu and Jackson (2008) also indicated that language anxiety was significantly correlated with the students’ personal perception of their English proficiency and access to English (p. 82).
Language anxiety biased the perception of competence in the L2, for example, anxious language learners tended to underestimate while their relaxed counterparts tended to overestimate, their ability to speak and comprehend the second language as evaluated by a neutral observer (MacIntyre and Noels, 1994; MacIntyre, Noels, and Clément, 1997). Language anxiety reduces perceived communicative competence, and both of these variables influence willingness to communicate (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996, p.10).

**Perceived communication competence.** As stated in chapter one, communication competence is defined as “the individual’s ability to properly process information in such a way that communicative behaviors occur in some orderly, rule-governed way” (Sellers and Stacks, 1990, p. 46). Phillips’ (1968, 1977) work on communication skills training with reticent individuals suggests that for some people WTC in some context and/or with some receiver is reduced as a function of not knowing how to communicate. McCroskey and Richmond (1990) explained the perception of one’s own skill level may be more important than the actual skill level, because there are many incompetent communicators in the world who think they are competent and proceed to communicate much more willingly than those around them would prefer and there are also those who have quite adequate communication skills who see themselves as incompetent and less willing to communicate (p. 27). Self-perceptions of competence may have a strong influence on an individual's WTC.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) examined self-perceived communication competence and WTC in U.S. college students; the results indicated that self-perceived communication competence may be more associated with WTC than actual
communication skill. MacIntyre and Charos (1996) found that perceived competence was more strongly related to L2 WTC than was language anxiety among novice adult learners. Baker and MacIntyre (2000) found that perceived competence and L2 WTC were strongly correlated among less advanced high school language learners, but among those of similar age with more L2 experience, WTC was better predicted by language anxiety.

A foreign language is “one that is learned in a place where that language is not typically used as the medium of ordinary communication” (Oxford and Shearin, 1994, p. 14). Foreign language learners are at a disadvantage compared to second language learners who constantly received stimulation from the target language, because they are surrounded by their own native language speakers and must search for stimulation in the target language. This stimulation can be seen as integrative motivation.

**Integrative motivation.** McDonough (1981) pointed out that the traditional integrative concept includes two separate aspects: a general desire for wider social contact and a desire to belong to a certain community by acquiring the psychological characteristic of the group. Gardner (1982) associates integrative motivation with interest in foreign languages, a desire to learn the target language, attitudes toward learning the target language, attitudes toward the learning situation, desire to interact with the target language community, and their attitudes toward the target language community.

Integrative motivation does not affect language learning directly; rather its effect is mediated by the learning behaviors that it instigates. Ramage (1990) investigated the factors causing U.S. high-school students of French and Spanish to drop out and the
results indicated that students who chose to continue their studies beyond the second year reported an interest in the target-language culture instead of the importance to fulfill curriculum requirements, which suggests an integrative orientation and the desire to attain proficiency in all language skills. Clément, Smythe and Gardner (1978) investigated what factors caused Canadian students to drop out of a French program. The results indicated that motivation proved a more powerful predictor than language aptitude, classroom anxiety and L2 achievement.

Gardner’s (1985) socio-educational model: integrative motivation includes three major elements: integrativeness, attitudes toward the learning situation and motivation. Yashima, Zenuk-Nishide, and Shimizu (2004) found that students with a higher level of integrativeness and stronger L2 learning motivation will more readily interact with an L2 language group than those with a lower level of integrativeness and motivation (p. 123). Research has shown that motivation influences the reported frequency of L2 use but might operate somewhat independently from the influence of L2 WTC (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996). MacIntyre and Clément (1996) showed that in a monolingual context in Canada, motivation influenced WTC in the L2 and resulted in increased frequency of L2 communication.

Yashima et al. (2004) pointed out that the learner’s attitude toward American and other English-speaking cultures are surely created through education and exposure to media (p. 124). Yashima proposed “international posture”, which is defined as the students’ interests in foreign or international affairs, their willingness to go overseas, to stay or work, and a readiness to interact with intercultural partners (p. 125). His previous study (Yashima, 2002) investigated the WTC model in the context of Japanese as a
foreign language. The results indicated that motivation appeared to affect self-confidence, which was formed by language anxiety and perceived communication competence (Clément and Kruidenier, 1985), in L2 communication, which led to L2 WTC. It also indicated that students who find international/intercultural communication goals personally relevant would have the behavioral intention to communicate in the L2 and would interact with a stranger using the L2 more frequently (Yashima et al., 2004).

**Personality - introversion vs. extroversion.** Introversion versus extroversion has been the trait duo of primary interest in communication. The construct postulates a continuum between extreme extroversion and extreme introversion. The work of Eysenck (1970, 1971) suggests that people’s level of introversion may substantially impact their communication behavior. It was speculated that people who are highly introverted would be likely to have lower evaluations of their communication competence. Borg and Tupes (1958) found introverts were significantly less likely to engage in the communication behaviors than were extroverts to exercise leadership in small groups. Carment, Miles, and Cervin (1965) found introverts participated significantly less than extroverts in a small group discussion and tended to speak when spoken to rather than initiating interaction. McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) found extroversion and WTC to be significantly correlated.

Strong (1983) reviewed the results of twelve studies, which had investigated extroversion or similar traits (sociability, empathy, outgoing nature, and popularity), half of them showed that extroversion was an advantage for interpersonal communication. However, not all studies have shown that extroversion is positively related to a learners’ oral communication performance. Dörnyei and Kormos (2000) failed to find any
relationship between measures of social cohesiveness or of sociometric interrelationships in forty-six Hungarian, and they are English as foreign language students and measures of engagement in an oral argumentative task. Furthermore, extroversion does not imply their foreign language accuracy, as Dewaele and Furnham (1999) explained “Extroverts were found to be generally more fluent than introverts in both the L1 and L2. They were not necessarily more accurate in their L2, which reinforced the view that fluency and accuracy are separate dimensions in second language proficiency” (p. 32).

All these different factors above influence WTC. However, there is no research between watching television program and WTC. Whether viewing motivations can influence these variables and lead to better WTC in general?

Foreign program broadcasting is normally accompanied with translated subtitles or dubbing over so that the audiences who do not know the foreign language can still watch and understand those programs. The next section addresses subtitles and its influence on language acquisition.

**Media Production Factors**

Subtitles are widely used when broadcasting other countries’ productions. One reason for the use of subtitles is that American TV shows or films are popular around the world. For example, more than eighty-five percent of the films playing in German theaters are Hollywood films. American television shows air on German channels either dubbed into German or as German remakes of American originals. About three-quarters of the music heard on German radio and played on MTV Europe is either American or English (Sayre and King, 2010, p. 337). The numbers show how American entertainment
penetrates to other non-English speaking countries. All of this exportation serves as a great resource for foreign language students. Two types of translations are provided when movies or shows are exported to non-English speaking countries and those are: dubbed or subtitled.

**Dubbed or subtitled.** In large European countries such as Germany and France, foreign-language programs are mostly dubbed, but in smaller countries, subtitling is common practice. The reason that small countries prefer subtitling is because it is much cheaper than other techniques (Koolstra & Beentjes, 1999). Aesthetic arguments are often raised in addition to economic ones regarding the difference between subtitling and dubbing (Kilborn, 1993). From an aesthetic point of view, an advantage of subtitling is that the original voice of the actors is maintained. Replacing the original voice detracts from the actor’s performance. On the other hand, subtitles may distract the viewer from watching the visual images because the titles partly cover the visuals, and the reading of subtitles makes the viewer look away from the target image. Koolstra & Beentjes (1999) examined Dutch children in fourth and sixth grades that were watching subtitled television programs to learn English. The authors concluded that “the reading of subtitles on television may enhance the development of children’s decoding skills, because reading subtitles provides extensive practice in decoding words. A second possible learning effect of subtitled television is the acquisition of languages” (p. 52).

Many European viewers claim that their English language skills have improved as a result of watching subtitled programs regularly and, unlike many American viewers, do not perceive subtitles as a hindrance (Danan, 1992). One good reason was that a video program providing visual reference and story line could supply some nonverbal support.
An experiment that compared the memory for the exact subtitles with spoken text found that the subtitles were correctly identified ninety-three percent as opposed to forty-three percent correct identification for sentences without titles (d’Ydewalle & Gielen, 1992). These findings suggested that “if subtitles are used in foreign language learning, they should logically contain the information to be retained, namely the foreign utterances” (Danah, 1992, p. 500).

Research on the use of subtitled television programs has also been focused on the effect of captioning. Unlike translated subtitles, captioning is done for both soundtrack and projected subtitle in the same foreign language. In the study conducted by Borrás and Lafayette (1994), bilingual students’ English vocabulary acquisition was examined. The results showed that students who watched captioned programs learned more new words from the second language than subjects in any other conditions. However, it is not clear whether the result may be generalized to non-instructional settings, for example, watching television at home for pleasure.

Danah (1992) examined how subtitled video programs could enhance foreign language acquisition in a students’ foreign vocabulary. In this study, the author successfully used subtitling, reversed subtitling and captioning and proved the reversed subtitling to be the most beneficial condition. It can be explained by translation facilitating foreign language encoding.

d’Ydewalle & Pavakanun (1997) also revealed the potential for foreign language acquisition by simply enjoying a movie. Further than the usefulness of subtitles, the authors questioned whether a foreign language similar to the native language of the
viewer could facilitate the learning process and whether it is necessary to be interested in another culture to enhance the language acquisition. No evidence supported either hypotheses, however the subtitles did increase the viewers’ foreign vocabulary acquisition. Kuppen (2010) investigated the extent to which a child’s foreign language skills benefit from their long-term consumption of media (i.e., listening to music, playing video games and watching subtitled movies) by filling out a survey and taking English tests. The results showed significant differences in translating skills compared to subjects’ exposure themselves less in foreign language media environment.

However, the amount of a foreign language that people must know before they are capable of acquiring elements of a specific language through watching television programs remains unanswered, but in Danan’s (1992) study he suggested that for instructors “beginners benefited from the bimodal input (captioning) if the material is carefully adapted to their level and contains many already known phrases that can be activated and reinforced by the audiovisual presentation” (p. 521).

**Summary of Literature Review**

The following generalizations are noted regarding the merging of uses and gratifications theory, willingness to communicate and media production factors. Various television viewing motivations have correlated with age, types of program, amounts of television viewing, affinity and perceived realism. Cognitive/information orientation viewers associated with perceived realism and watched more talk-shows; diversion/entertainment orientation viewers showed a tendency of higher amounts of watching television; and social interaction motive viewers tend to be younger. However,
studies and research have discovered many media effects on their native audiences but so far the results do not apply to foreign language audiences, except Hwang and He (1999) who explored Chinese immigrants’ motives and media usage patterns and found that if the subjects could find gratifications from Chinese-language media, they will have relatively low desire to consume English-language media. Immigrants are similar to second language learners, who are surrounded by target language speakers. For those EFL learners, can television create a similar target language environment and further influence viewer’s willingness to communicate?

Willingness to communicate is examined both in L1 and L2. Language anxiety, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation and personality are variables that influence an individual’s behavior of WTC. Introversion affects perceived communication competence and language anxiety and results in an individual’s reduced WTC. Can the use of foreign country programs influence an individual's perception of interpersonal communication in a foreign language? Can Taiwanese lower their language anxiety, increase their perceived communication competence, and increase their integrative motivation by watching American programs? Is personality trait influencing the Taiwanese frequency of consuming American programs?

The growth of Internet accessibility enables people to stream programs across borders and oceans. It is a great resource for foreign language learners. No studies so far have investigated the potential of foreign language willingness to communicate through non-educational programs. Only a few media effects studies associated with foreign language acquisition examine the usefulness of subtitles and vocabulary acquisition and
rarely explore the audience activity and foreign language in use (Koolstra & Beentjes, 1999; Danan, 1992; d'Ydewalle & Pavakanun, 1997; Kuppen, 2010).

In chapter three, the hypotheses and underlying rationales behind them are presented. The method of data collection and examination will also be detailed.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

As stated in the previous two chapters, very little research has explored the relationship between uses and gratifications in American television programs and foreign language’s willingness to communicate. American television programs, such as dramas, situation comedies, travel programs and other program genres provide audiences with a wide variety of choices based on their interests. These programs increase an audience’s willingness to frequently assess a foreign language; especially English. This chapter details the rationale and hypotheses for this study, and will also explain the collection and examination process for the data collected for it.

Variables, Rationale, and Hypotheses

Uses and Gratifications Constructs

Uses and gratifications research provides numerous explanations why people watch television, from entertainment to companionship. Rubin (1981) identified nine motivations of television viewing: passing time/ habit; companionship; arousal/excitement; specific program content; relaxation; information/learning; escape; entertainment/enjoyment and social interaction. However, with the language barrier, motivations examined in uses and gratifications, which primarily investigate native speakers, might not entirely apply to audiences watching foreign language programs. Therefore, the three variables from the uses and gratifications research chosen for the current study are: entertainment; information and social interactions.
**Entertainment.** Hwang and He (1999) found that Chinese immigrants in the U.S. consume some English-language media for entertainment and language learning purposes. Americans distribute a great amount of films and television programs around the world. Taiwanese audiences cannot find the same entertaining contents from Taiwanese productions and as a result they choose to watch American television programs.

**Information.** Hwang and He (1999) found that Taiwanese immigrants used some English-language media in the U.S. because the information in them cannot be obtained from Chinese-language media. Furthermore, some subjects claimed that by watching television or listening to the radio that they had enhanced their listening ability. Therefore, information motivation can be seen as a reason why Taiwanese audiences consume U.S. television programs.

**Social interaction.** Although there is no research reviewed in this thesis indicating social interaction motivation to be associated with media behavior among Chinese audiences; however, Rubin (1985) suggested that individual, family and social factors along with the desire to fulfill gratification-seeking motives played a role in media selection. Moreover, popular American television programs are widely discussed in Taiwan, such as *Friends* or *Sex and the City*. Therefore, social interaction motive is included in this study.

The following section will address WTC constructs and the coinciding hypotheses.
WTC Constructs

Four WTC variables were used for the current study: language anxiety; perceived communication competence; integrative motivation and personality. Hypotheses using uses and gratifications constructs were provided for each WTC variable. Following are four variables from WTC and how they relate to the television viewing motivations.

Language anxiety. Language anxiety has been found to have a negative effect on learning (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1994). Speaking and listening in an L2 are especially affected by language anxiety (Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope, 1986; Young, 1985). Hwang and He (1999) found that American television programs helped Chinese immigrants improve their listening comprehension skills. It was unknown however whether or not the language anxiety of the Taiwanese audiences viewing American television were affected.

H1: There will be a negative linear relationship between entertainment viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and their language anxiety.

H2: There will be a negative linear relationship between information viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and language anxiety.

H3: There will be a negative linear relationship between social interaction viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and language anxiety.
**Perceived communication competence.** Perceived communication competence can be biased by language anxiety (MacIntyre and Noels, 1994; MacIntyre, Noels, and Clément, 1997) which has been seen as more important than actual communication competence itself (McCroskey and Richmond, 1990). However, it is unknown whether Taiwanese viewers of American television programs perceived themselves as having a higher level of communication competence.

H4: There will be a positive linear relationship between entertainment viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and perceived communication competence.

H5: There will be a positive linear relationship between information viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and perceived communication competence.

H6: There will be a positive linear relationship between social interaction viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and perceived communication competence.

**Integrative motivation.** Integrative motivation was explained as consisting of the following dimensions: interest in foreign languages; a desire to learn the target language; attitudes toward learning the target language; attitudes toward the learning situation; desire to interact with the target language community and attitudes toward the target language community (Gardner, 1982). It is an especially important element for English as a foreign language learner, because it determines their level of motivation to assess a foreign language environment while they are surrounded by native speakers.
H7: There will be a positive linear relationship between entertainment viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and integrative motivation.

H8: There will be a positive linear relationship between information viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and integrative motivation.

H9: There will be a positive linear relationship between social interaction viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and integrative motivation.

Personality - introversion vs. extroversion. A person’s level of introversion may substantially impact his/her communication behavior (Eysenck, 1970, 1971). McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) found extroversion and willingness to communicate to be significantly related. Borg and Tupes (1958) found introverts were less likely to engage in the communication behavior than were extroverts. However, it is unknown whether these traits of personality affect viewers’ behavior of watching television programs. Thus, the hypotheses predict that Taiwanese introverts will be positively correlated with entertainment and information television viewing motivations.

H10: There will be a positive linear relationship between entertainment viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and introversion.

H11: There will be a positive linear relationship between information viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and introversion.
H12: There will be a negative linear relationship between social interaction viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and introversion.

**Media Production Factors**

Dubbing or subtitles are commonly used when American television programs broadcast overseas. A majority English-language programs in Taiwan are subtitled and therefore the relationship between subtitles and Taiwanese audiences’ choice of viewing American television program was included in this study.

H13: Respondents differ in entertainment viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

H14: Respondents differ in information viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

H15: Respondents differ in social interaction viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

H16: Respondents differ in language anxiety based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

H17: Respondents differ in perceived communication competence based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

H18: Respondents differ in integrative motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format.
H19: Respondents differ in personality traits based on preferred audio and subtitling format.

Method

Data was collected through an online survey, because according to Babbie (1992), a survey offers several advantages, such as lower costs and its being an excellent method for measuring attitudes and orientations in a large population. In addition, this study targets Taiwanese audiences and an online survey was substantially cheaper than actually distributing materials and then collecting the data in Taiwan. However, Babbie (1992) also revealed that survey research was generally weak on validity, because the choices of answers were restricted by the researcher, but strong on reliability because all participants were given standardized questions (p. 305).

Sample

According to Cohen (1992), the ideal target sample size of this survey was 177 participants (p. 158). The Qualtrics system recorded that 266 participants filled out the survey partially or entirely. The completed survey consisted of 183 Taiwanese undergraduate and graduate college students. They were recruited from the College of Foreign Languages at Fu-Jen University in Taipei, Taiwan. The majority of participants were from German and French language and literature departments. 68.4% of those recruited who opened the survey participated in this project. Although participants majored in different languages, Taiwanese students were mandated to take English classes since middle school and had to pass certain standards of English proficiency by way of exams in order to enroll in university programs. Moreover, the students in College
of Foreign Language at Fu-Jen University were also required to take eight credits of English classes in the first 4 semesters regardless of their major languages of choice.

**Survey Organization**

The online self-administered respondent survey was organized into the following sections: An informed consent form would be the first page followed by section one which asked questions about the Taiwanese respondents’ viewing motivations (such as entertainment, information and social interaction) while watching American television programs. Section two then consisted of questions relating to the variables under willingness to communicate: language anxiety; integrative motivation; perceived communication competence and personality traits. Finally, in section three questions about which media production factors (like dubbing, subtitles, or captions) they like/use more while watching American television programs. The survey instrument is presented as Appendix B.

**Instrumentations/Measures**

**Uses and Gratifications Measures**

Survey items for uses and gratifications measures were developed from Rubin’s (1981) scale of television viewing motivations. The instrument was shown to be internally consistent with an alpha coefficient of .72 (entertainment motive), .77 (information motive), and .48 (social interaction motive) (p. 149).

Therefore five questions were created from each motivation and worded to fit Taiwanese television viewing motives, for example: “I watched American television
programs because it entertains me” or “I watched American television programs because it gives me almost immediate information about world events.” The format used was also the same as Rubin’s (1981) scale – a five-point scale for each question ranging from “exactly” to “not at all” for the respondent’s reason for viewing American television programs. The scale was coded from one to five, with five meaning “exactly.”

**Language Anxiety Measures**

The first independent variable, language anxiety, utilized the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1982). In previous research the PRCA-24 has yielded reliability estimates above .90. The original instrumentation was designed to examine interpersonal communication skills in a native language; therefore, five statements emphasized in an English-speaking environment. For example, “I am afraid to express myself in English in a group.” A five-point scale for each statement ranging from “exactly” to “not at all” for the respondent’s language anxiety is presented, where five means “exactly.”

**Integrative Motivation Measures**

The independent variable of integrative motivation utilized questionnaires summarized by Yashima et al. (2004). The integrative motivation questions were divided into following sub-sections: motivation intensity (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$) and desire to learn English ($\alpha = .68$), both developed by Gardner and Lambert (1972); intergroup approach-avoidance tendency ($\alpha = .73$) was developed on the basis of work by Gudykunst (1991), Kim (1991) and Gouran and Nishida (1996); interest in international vocation/activities ($\alpha = .62$) items were developed based on Tanaka, Kohyama, and Fujiwara (1991) and
Yashima (2000); and frequency or amount of communication in English ($\alpha = .70$) items were adapted from MacIntyre and Charos (1996). Each section consisted of four statements and respondents rated the degree to which each statement matched their state of mind. For instance, “I want to live in an English-speaking country,” or “I often think about the words and ideas that I learn from television shows that I’ve watched.” These statements were mixed with language anxiety statements because they both used a five-point scale from “exactly” to “not at all.”

**Perceived Communication Competence Measures**

The independent variable of perceived communication competence utilized the Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC) (McCroskey et al., 1988). This instrument has generated good alpha reliability above .85 (p. 112). The scale was developed to measure respondents’ perception of their own communication competence. There were twelve situations in which participants need to communicate in English and estimate their communication competence in that situation, where zero equals completely incompetent and a hundred equals completely competent.

**Personality Trait Measures**

The last independent variable of personality utilized the Transparent Bipolar Inventory, which was developed by Goldberg (1992). This instrument has shown an alpha coefficient of .88 (p. 30). This seven-point scale showed two extreme personality traits (introversion vs. extroversion or silent vs. talkative) and on this scale a one would represent the one extreme of complete introvert, while a seven would represent the other of complete extrovert.
Procedure

Because of the majority of those who participated in the study spoke Chinese; the survey instruments were translated into Chinese in order to make the survey open and available to a wider group of participants. The survey instruments were translated from English to Chinese by researcher himself. The translated questionnaires were also proof read by two experienced Chinese-English translators to ensure accuracy. The online survey instruments, both English and Chinese version, were presented as Appendix A. The online survey utilized the Qualtrics program because the software is able to generate the survey in Chinese and is available at more than 600 universities, including the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. This system also allows researchers to remotely monitor how many respondents have already answered the survey and the ability to send reminders and notifications to potential participants. The survey distribution process was to post the survey link onto the College of Foreign Languages’ official website at Fu-Jen University in Taipei, Taiwan. A short message was also provided and posted onto bulletin boards throughout the campus. The researcher’s friends who were currently attending the university also delivered the message in their classes or via social media in order to quickly achieve target numbers.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reveals the resulting analysis from data collected. The results are offered from three television viewing motivations: entertainment; information; and social interaction, as well as the analysis of the data collected on willingness to communicate, including language anxiety, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation and personality traits.

Analysis

Item analysis was performed after survey administration to determining the internal consistency of the scale measures. Item analysis provided information on how individual items for each scale related to other items. Two items in television viewing motivation section were dropped because of Chinese translation inaccuracies. The first item was “I watch American television programs because they amuse me.” The second item was “I watch American television programs so I could learn about what could happen to me.” The remaining television viewing motivation items were divided to three categories, based on three television viewing motivations: entertainment; information; and social interaction, and along with items in language anxiety and in integrative motivation section were tested for reliability. A .40 coefficient criterion level was established a priori (Spector, 1992). The internal consistency a priori level of alpha was established via Coefficient Alpha at .70 (Cronbach, 1951). As a result, some scale items were dropped from consequent analysis, including two for the entertainment motivation construct: “I watch American television programs to cut down on entertaining spending”
and “…because I can’t find the same entertainment in local programs”. Two were also dropped for the social interaction motivations, item “…because my friend told me to watch them,” and “…because everybody is talking about them”. Two items were dropped for the language anxiety, “I have no fear of giving an English speech in public” and “I’m calm and relaxed while having English conversations with friends”. After deleting these items, reliability testing was repeated. However, the information, social interaction and integrative motivation composites did not all meet the .40 minimum criteria. Previous studies have shown alpha reliability in each categories, therefore, items were retained for consequent analysis. The remaining items for each scale were first analyzed using principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation. Factor analysis was used to reveal any sub-dimensions within each scale-item array. Exploratory factor analysis was used to determine the number of factors best represented by scale items and to allow for the interpretation of factors (Spector, 1992, p. 54-55). Once the number of factors had been determined, varimax orthogonal rotation was applied, with each item largely loading on one and only one factor as the ideal, with a minimum correlation value of .40 a priori. (Kim & Mueller, 1978a, 1978b; Spector, 1992). Following are the factors in uses and gratifications constructs and willingness to communicate constructs.

**Uses and Gratifications (Television Viewing Motivations)**

A minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 and at least three loadings were required to retain a factor. Three factors were identified that accounted for 55.9% of the total variance. Table 1 summarizes the factor analysis for uses and gratifications television viewing motivations for Taiwanese viewers.
Factor 1, information viewing motivation (eigenvalue = 4.73), explained 33.8% of the total variance after rotation. It contains five information viewing items (I watch American television programs “because they help me to learn about myself and others;” “so I can learn how to do things I haven’t done before;” “so I better understand how Americans communicate with each other;” “because they keep me up to date on current events;” and “because they give me immediate information about world events”), this five-item factor reflected Taiwanese viewers who watched American television programs to be informed and to learn new things.

Factor 2, entertainment viewing motivation (eigenvalue = 1.61), explained 11.5% of the total variance after rotation. It consisted of all three entertainment viewing items (I watch American television programs because “they entertain me;” “they are enjoyable;” and “as entertainment at home”), and one social interaction item (“because they give me something to talk about with other people”). The four-item factor reflected Taiwanese viewers who felt entertained by watching American television programs.

Factor 3, social interaction viewing motivation (eigenvalue = 1.48), explained 10.58% of the variance. This factor consisted of all four social interaction items (I watch American television programs “so I can be with other members of the family who are watching;” “because they are something to do when friends come over;” “because they give me something to talk about with other people;” and “so I can be with friends who are watching”). This factor reflected Taiwanese viewers who watched American television programs to be with friends or family members and discussed them with others.
**Language anxiety and integrative motivation.** A minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 and at least three loadings were required to retain a factor. Six factors accounting for 61.65% of the total variance were identified. Table 2 summarizes the factor analysis of language anxiety and integrative motivation.

Factor 1, language anxiety (eigenvalue = 8.51), explained 30.40% of the variance. It was comprised of six items: three language anxiety items (“I’m very tense and nervous in English conversation;” “communicating in English makes me nervous” and “I’m afraid to speak up in English conversations with new acquaintances”), two intergroup approach-avoidance tendency items (“I try to avoid talking with foreigners in English if I can;” “I like to get involved in English group discussions”), and one frequency and amount of communication in English item (“I volunteer to answer or ask questions in English class”). This factor reflected Taiwanese anxiety when communicating in English.

Factor 2, integrative motivation (eigenvalue = 3.16), explained 11.29% of the variance. This seven-item factor consisted of: all four motivation intensity items (“If English were not taught at school I would learn it on my own;” “After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve;” “Compared to my friends, I think I study English relatively hard” and “I often think about the words and ideas that I learn from television shows I have watched”), two desire to learn English items (“I read English newspapers or magazines outside of my English course;” “I find studying English more interesting than other subjects”), and one interest in international vocation/activities item (“I want to live in an English speaking country”). This factor
reflected Taiwanese who have strong integrative motivation to learn English and live in English speaking country.

Factor 3, online discussion (eigenvalue = 1.94), explained 6.94% of the variance. It was comprised of four items: all four online communication behaviors (“I participate in English discussion groups about the show I watched;” “I enjoy participating in online English discussion groups;” “I observe English discussion groups about a show I watch;” and “I enjoy observing online English discussion groups”). This factor associated with participants who communicate in English through online platform.

Factor 4, participatory (eigenvalue = 1.36), explained 4.88% of the variance. It consisted of four items: two desire to learn English items (“During English classes I’m absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies;” “I would like the number of English courses at school to increase”), and two frequency and amount of communication in English items (“I answer when I am called upon by the teacher in English class;” “I ask my English teachers questions or talked to them outside of the class”). This factor reflected Taiwanese participation in English classes.

Factor 5, ethnocentric (eigenvalue = 1.17), explained 4.20% of the variance. This four-item factor consisted of: two intergroup approach-avoidance tendency items (“I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student;” “I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door”), and two interest in international vocation /activities items (“I don’t think what is happening oversees has much to do with my daily life;” “I rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas
frequently”). This factor associated with participants who have no interest in international activities and avoid English-speaking foreigners.

Factor 6, non-ethnocentric (eigenvalue = 1.10), explained 3.92% of the variance. It was comprised of three items: one frequency and amount of communication in English (“I talk with friends or acquaintances outside of school in English”), one interest in international vocation/activities item (“I want to work in an international organization such as the United Nation”), and one intergroup approach-avoidance tendency item (“I want to make friends with international students studying in Taiwan”). This factor reflected participants are willing to interact with English speaking people and even work overseas.

**Perceived communication competence.** Twelve items were created to determine whether Taiwanese participants were competent to communicate in English in these situations. Each item was scored from zero to a hundred (zero equals complete incompetent and a hundred equals complete competent). These twelve items were computed into one variable by added twelve items together. As the result, this variable was scored from 48 to 1200 among 192 samples.

**Personality traits.** Personality traits consisted of seven items. Participants were asked to identify themselves between introverted to extroverted (1 = introverted; 7 = extroverted). The composite value of this seven-item variable was scored from 15 to 49 among 190 samples.
Media Production Factors

Among 190 respondents’ preference of media production factors, 94% of the respondents preferred “English audio with Chinese subtitles;” 57% preferred “English audio with English subtitles” and 41% preferred “English audio without any subtitles.” The three remaining items, (“Chinese audio with Chinese subtitles;” “Chinese audio with English subtitles;” and “Chinese audio without any subtitles,”) were eliminated from consequent analysis because only 11% of respondents chose any combination of these answers. Each of these items was a separate question in the survey. In order to answer hypotheses, a composite variable was created, collapsing each of the three remaining answers into one cumulative variable. The frequency distribution of this composite variable was as follows: 32.5% of respondents indicated that they used “Only English audio with Chinese subtitles”; 24.6% used either “English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with English subtitles”; 27.2% of respondents indicated that they used some combination of the previous two technical options in addition to “English audio without any subtitles; and finally, 9.4% of respondents indicated that they used “English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio without any subtitles”. These four groupings were used for hypotheses testing difference of multiple means.

Hypotheses

The first twelve hypotheses utilized correlation and factor analysis for the subset of three television viewing motivations, as well as WTC constructs. Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistics were used to determine relationships between consequent factors. Table 3 summarized the relationships that were found.
The first three hypotheses predicted that there would be a negative linear relationship between three viewing motivations (entertainment, information and social interaction) among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and their language anxiety. H1 to H3 were not supported.

H4 to H6 predicted that there would be a positive linear relationship between three viewing motivations among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and perceived communication competence. H4 to H6 were not supported.

H7 and H9 predicted that there would be a positive linear relationship between entertainment and social interaction viewing motivations among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and integrative motivation. H7 and H9 were not supported. However, H8 predicted that there would be a positive linear relationship between information viewing motivation among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and integrative motivation ($r = .23, p < .001$). H8 was supported.

H10 to H12 predicted that there would be a positive linear relationship between three viewing motivations among Taiwanese viewers of American television programs and introversion. H10 to H12 were not significant.

H13 to H19 predicted that participants would differ in three viewing motivations, in addition to four WTC constructs based on preferred audio and subtitling format. These seven hypotheses utilized analysis of variance to determine the relationships with media production factors and applied Post Hoc Tests to identify the combinations of media production factors. Table 4 summarizes the results.
H13 predicted that respondents differ in entertainment viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format. H13 was not significant.

H14 predicted that respondents differ in information viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format. H14 was not significant.

H15 predicted that respondents differ in social interaction viewing motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format, \( F(3, 177) = 4.565, p = .004 \). H15 was supported. There was a significant difference between “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles” (\( p = .002 \)).

H16 predicted that respondent differ in language anxiety based on preferred audio and subtitling format, \( F(3, 177) = 3.846, p = .011 \). H16 was supported. There was a significant difference between “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” (\( p = .020 \)).

H17 predicted that respondent differ in perceived communication competence based on preferred audio and subtitling format, \( F(3, 177) = 12.437, p = .000 \). H17 was supported. There were significant differences between “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” (\( p = .000 \)), as well as “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” (\( p = .003 \)).
H18 predicted that respondent differ in integrative motivation based on preferred audio and subtitling format, \( F(3, 177) = 18.792, p = .000 \). H18 was supported. There were significant differences between “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles” \( (p = .000) \), “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” \( (p = .000) \), as well as “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” \( (p = .007) \).

H19 predicted that respondent differ in personality traits based on preferred audio and subtitling format. H19 was not significant.

In the next and final chapter, these findings are discussed. Chapter five also reviews the strengths and limitations of this study and the implications of this research for future studies.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This present study adopted a large-scale survey to explore relationships between foreign media usage and Taiwanese willingness to communicate in English. In this chapter, discussions of the results, strengths and weaknesses and implications for future research will be presented. The following section discusses the analysis of three uses and gratifications viewing motivations and their proposed interrelationships with language anxiety, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation and personality traits.

Hypotheses

Entertainment and WTC Constructs (H1, H4, H7, H10)

The results showed no relationship between entertainment viewing motivation and four WTC constructs. An entertainment motivation neither lowered Taiwanese language anxiety nor boosted perceived communication competence.

Hwang and He (1999) found that the only reason Chinese immigrants living in the U.S. used English media was because they couldn’t find similar entertainment content in Chinese media. The study duplicated the concept and asked participants whether they watched American television programs because they couldn’t find the same or similar entertainment programs in Taiwan. Results showed 61% of participants agreed or strongly agreed to this item. However, the item was dropped because of the weak reliability, leaving only three remaining items for the entertainment construct.
One possible explanation is when participants turned to American television programs; they were looking for entertainment, watching their favorite celebrities or enjoying intriguing plots. They did not have perceptions of improving English in mind while watching these programs. Therefore, when they turned off television, they remembered what happened to the characters but not the lines they have said in the scenes, unless they watch the same episode repeatedly. According to Ding’s research (2007), repeatedly watching favorite movies did help to improve the interviewee’s language skill. In this case, the motivation of watching movies was no longer for pure entertainment, but was transforming to improve language ability or gaining information. Moreover, with the help of Chinese subtitles (94% of the participants claimed they watched American television programs in English audio with Chinese subtitles), they did not require high level of English proficiency to comprehend programs and consequently they did not pay attention to English audio.

**Information and WTC Constructs (H2, H5, H8, H11)**

Among the first twelve hypotheses, H8 was the only one to demonstrate a positive correlation between information viewing motivation and integrative motivation, suggesting that Taiwanese participants with high integrative motivation were seeking information from American television programs. No relationships were found between information motivation and language anxiety, perceived communication competence and personality traits.

Unlike Hwang and He’s (1999) findings, indicating that Chinese immigrants in the U.S. used Chinese language media to obtain information, participants in Taiwan
tended to acquire information through American television programs. The possible explanation was that immigrants in the U.S. and Taiwanese participants were looking for different information. Immigrants sought information that normally wouldn’t appear in English publications, because Chinese media specifically tailored their print content for their Chinese immigrant readers and stories might include a focus on the differences between two cultures. This type of information did not appear in English media, because they were customs and were aware by the majority; however, it was an important culture lesson for these foreign residents who live in the country. On the other hand, the participants in Taiwan were not looking for oversea-surviving tips, but were seeking information about news, city tours, exotic foods, and so on. Of course, Taiwanese media also provide this information, but the quantity and selection might far less than American television programs can provide.

**Social Interaction and WTC Constructs (H3, H6, H9, H12)**

Social interaction viewing motivation did not reveal any significant correlations with WTC constructs. This viewing motivation provided insights into the reasons why participants viewed American television programs and it was because they wanted to be with others or to discuss these shows with others. The communication between participants and family members or friends may increase; however, they communicated with each other in Chinese and not in English. Therefore, the possibility of lowered language anxiety, or boosted perceived communication competence was rare. Moreover, one hypothesis proposed that participants who watched programs for social interaction positively correlated with extroversion. No relationship was found between these two
items. Additional correlations were found that social interaction was correlated with online discussion. Details will discuss in additional findings section.

**Media Production Factors (H13, H14, H15, H16, H17, H18, H19)**

Table 4 summarizes the interrelationships between media production factors, uses and gratifications and WTC constructs.

Four groups of media production factors were tested, because these groups all consisted of English audio, therefore, the differences resided in the use of subtitles. No relationships were found between media production factors and entertainment motivation, information motivation and personality traits.

When participants watched American television programs for social interaction, there was a relationship between “only English audio with Chinese subtitles” (CH) and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles” (CH & ENG). The difference was on the use of only Chinese subtitles and some combination of Chinese subtitles and English subtitles. Participants watched American television programs because they want to discuss to them with other viewers, and rely highly on understanding program plots. Therefore, Chinese subtitles were chosen. The assumption of some English subtitles may be explained that participants interacted with others online and required some knowledge of English phrases.

The significant relationship appearing for language anxiety was between CH & ENG and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” (CH & ENG & w/o ENG). The simple
explanation was when participants watched American television programs in English audio without any subtitles, they were anxious.

Two relationships were found between media production factors and perceived communication competence. Relationships were between CH and CH & ENG & w/o ENG as well as CH and “English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio without any subtitles” (CH & w/o ENG). Participants with higher perceived communication competence might tend to watch American television programs with or without English subtitles; compared to others used only Chinese subtitles.

Three significant correlations were found between media production factors and integrative motivation. Three relationships were between CH and CH & ENG; CH and CH & ENG & w/o ENG as well as CH and CH & w/o ENG. Participants were interested in living foreign country tended to watch American television programs more than just with Chinese subtitles. They switched between English subtitles or without any subtitles.

The results suggested that participants with high level of perceived communication competence, high level of integrative motivation, intention to communicate with other in English through online platforms as well as their level of language anxiety were significantly correlated with different media production factors when they consumed American television programs. Participants used English subtitles or without subtitles were significantly differences than those who used only Chinese subtitles. However, the findings did not indicate that participants learned more words or phrases from different subtitle settings, it only suggested Taiwanese participants who wanted to go abroad or interacted with others online tended to watch programs with or
without English subtitles compared to other formats. This result did not directly concur with the conclusion of previous studies suggesting subtitles were beneficial for learning foreign language. For instance, Borras and Lafayette (1994) found that watching captioned programs learned more new words and Danan (1992) proved that reversed subtitling was the most beneficial condition. Yet, the results did explain why participants chose different than Chinese subtitles and their motivations were to improve English.

**Additional Findings**

Among twelve hypotheses, only one was significant. Therefore additional analyses were conducted in order to pursue any more nuanced relationships between major constructs in this study.

According to Blumler (1979), a person consuming media materials for their informational value is more likely to acquire knowledge from them (p. 18). Rubin (1983) also found that viewers seeking information message from media use this information in interpersonal interaction (p. 50). However, the data did not show any relationships that associated with three WTC constructs. A possible explanation was that information motivation in the survey did not specify the type of information. The concept of information could range from acquiring news to learning something. The survey did include two “improve English” items; therefore, additional tests were conducted and correlated U&G constructs and then WTC constructs. The item “I watch American television programs because they help me to improve my English in general” was positively correlated with information viewing. The item was then correlated with WTC constructs and received four positive correlation in perceived communication.
competence, integrative motivation, online discussion and participatory and a negative correlation in language anxiety. The results are summarized in Table 5.

Participants thought watching American television programs “helped them to improve their English in general” was significantly but only weakly correlated with information motivation \( (r = .18, p < .05) \). It was also correlated with five out of six factors under WTC constructs: perceived communication competence \( (r = .18, p < .01) \); language anxiety \( (r = -.16, p < .05) \); integrative motivation \( (r = .34, p < .01) \); online discussion \( (r = .20, p < .01) \); and participatory \( (r = .19, p < .01) \).

Integrative motivation and “helped them to improve their English in general” were moderately associated. It explained that participants with higher integrative motivation thought watching American television programs could improve their English in general.

“Can improve my English listening ability” was correlated with perceived communication competence \( (r = .27, p < .01) \), language anxiety \( (r = -.14, p < .05) \), integrative motivation \( (r = .30, p < .01) \), online discussion \( (r = .19, p < .01) \), participatory \( (r = .18, p < .01) \), and ethnocentric \( (r = -.20, p < .01) \).

Perceived communication competence and “can improve my English listening ability” were moderately correlated, suggesting that participants thought that they were capable in English conversation believed that watching American television programs can also help their English listening ability. These findings suggested that if participants watch American television programs for the purpose of improving English, they experienced less language anxiety, were highly interested in foreign countries, worked
hard in English lesson, participated online discussion with others and had higher perceived communication competence.

Factor analysis generated three viewing motivation and four additional WTC factors (online discussion, participatory, ethnocentric and non-ethnocentric), additional correlations were applied. Table 6 summarizes these results.

Two relationships were found between entertainment viewing motivation and participatory ($r = .20, p < .01$) and entertainment viewing motivation and ethnocentric ($r = -.17, p < .05$). Two relationship were also found between information viewing motivation and participatory ($r = .15, p < .05$) and information viewing motivation and non-ethnocentric ($r = .15, p < .05$). Participatory consisted of items examined participants’ enthusiasm about learning English. These respondents would like the number of English courses to increase and were not afraid to speak out in English classes. The possible explanation was that participants who have passion for learning and improving English tended to watch American television for entertaining and information purpose. Ethnocentric was generated by factor analysis and consisted of items, such as “I rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently,” or “I don’t think what is happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.” A negative correlation between entertainment motivation and ethnocentric and a positive correlation information motivation and non-ethnocentric were found, which suggest that participants who frequently watch American television programs for entertainment or information did not act condescending to other people from different races.
Four items were added to explore whether online platform such as Facebook or online message board enhance Taiwanese willingness to communicate. One relationship was found between social interaction and online discussion ($r = .20, p < .01$), which suggested participants discussed programs with others in Internet. According to Arnold and Ducate (2006), foreign language students engaged in a high degree of interactivity in online environments. Online message boards or other social media provides a less spontaneous way to communicate compare to the face-to-face conversation. They gave users more options to adapt his/her own pace to communicate with others, they could use the time to look up dictionary of unfamiliar vocabulary or construct their thoughts and sentences before responding to others.

**Interrelationship in WTC Constructs**

Perceived communication competence showed that participants perceived themselves more capable of communicating in English with friends and in small group of people. Participants rated their English communication competence in these twelve situations and the means of all twelve items were mostly above 60 (out of a possible 100). When they were asked to communicate in English in front of a large group of strangers, the mean value was 54.28 compared to talking with friends (Mean = 78.76). All participants were academic majors in different foreign languages and were required to take English classes in their first four semesters. Therefore, high perceived communication competence scores were expected. Five correlations were found between perceived communication competence and language anxiety ($r = -.63, p < .000$); integrative motivation ($r = .17, p < .05$); ethnocentric ($r = -.16, p < .05$); non-ethnocentric ($r = .17, p < .05$) and personality traits ($r = .37, p < .01$). Two relationships were also
found between personality traits and language anxiety ($r = -.30, p < .01$) and personality traits and participatory ($r = .15, p < .05$). Table 7 summarizes the results.

The relationships between language anxiety and perceived communication competence and language anxiety and personality traits supported previous conclusions from MacIntyre and Charos (1996) that language anxiety reduced perceived communication competence and introverts were significant less likely to engage in the communication behavior (Borg and Tuples, 1958).

The results of integrative motivation and perceived communication competence suggested that participants with higher integrative motivation perceived themselves as competent communicators in English environments. Items in integrative motivation contain motivation intensity, desire to learn English and interest in international vocation/activities, which required relative high level of English proficiency, and it makes sense that they were more competent to speak English.

A negative correlation with ethnocentric and a positive correlation with non-ethnocentric provided a consistent explanation that participants with higher perceived communication competence did not perceived themselves a superior individual toward other races.

Personality traits correlated with perceived communication competence and participatory explained that extroverted participants showed higher perceived communication competence and they were more engaging in English lesson.
Strengths of Current Study

A major strength of this study was the intention of combining two fields, media research and foreign language acquisition. Although only one relationship was found between uses and gratifications constructs and WTC constructs, the results still gave future scholars a more clear direction to explore.

Furthermore, the popularity of the high speed Internet allows Taiwanese to watch these programs just as easy as Americans. Earlier researches may constraint by lack of some electronic equipment and therefore audiences did not acquire these English programs as convenient as today. The convenience of the Internet also helped to gather nearly 200 participants in this study, and without it, the data would not be monitored and collected overseas.

The use of subtitles showed several significant correlations with WTC constructs. It provides different explanations than earlier research on subtitles and foreign language learning. Earlier research focus on vocabulary acquisition, how many words or phrases can participants retained after exposure. However, this study investigated on perceived communication competence, integrative motivation or social interaction, indicating these factors affected participants’ choices of subtitles.

Limitations

An obvious limitation of this study is the use of college students as participants. Although previous research on foreign language relies on this group, it makes the result inapplicable to all Taiwanese. Moreover, all participants were majors in different foreign languages at the Fu-Jen University: German (38%), French (30.4%) and English (10.3%)
languages were top three participants’ majors. It raised a question whether their language skills were better than the general public’s, since all students at the university were required to take English for four semesters. However, if participants were not required to take English courses currently, a definite possibility with junior or senior students, could their perceptions communicating in English differ from underclassperson students?

The uses and gratifications constructs applied in the present study showed little or no association with WTC variables. One reason may be that these constructs did not translate effectively into the Taiwanese culture. Perhaps the nature of viewing motivations do not associate with WTC or maybe wasn’t designed correctly to determine the constructs.

Another limitation was the exclusive use of survey methodology, despite the fact that an online survey was the only option for this study. Perhaps online surveys along with focus group or experiment setting could better explain media effects, such as actual evaluation of improvement of different aspect of foreign language ability.

**Future Implications**

Instead of multiple viewing motivations, future studies should focus on information motivation and break this construct down to several different aspects, for instance, what kind of information motivations are sought when people watch foreign language programs? This study found that participants interested in other cultures, acquired information from watching American television. Rubin (1983) found that viewers actively sought messages from the content of a communication media and to learn about people, places and events and to instrumentally use this information in
interpersonal interaction. Future research should further investigate whether these obtained information from foreign programs were applied on interpersonal foreign language communication.

In addition, experiments, focus groups or interviews should be considered as part of methodology. These may enhance future results. Furthermore, future study should also include different type of programs, although Bantz (1982) found no evidence between medium-specific and program type-specific motives; however, the language difficulty may vary for programs such as cartoons, crime dramas, or reality television programs.

Age difference did not include in this study; however, Rubin (1981) found age might associated with the reason of watching television programs, in addition, age also played an important role in foreign language acquisition.

This study found a significant relationship between watching foreign programs and the use of subtitles, future studies should further exam this section. Researcher should not only focus on audiences passively watching them and acquiring vocabulary but also those foreign language students who produced translated subtitles. Many foreign language students practiced their translation skill by actively translating conversation words by words through software, such as SubRip, which allows users to extract subtitles and their timings from video.

**Conclusion**

This study attempted to explore whether Taiwanese can increase their willingness to communicate in English after consuming American television program. No evidence was found that three television viewing motivations correlated with four WTC constructs;
except participants with high integrative motivation acquired their information by watching American television programs. As suggested in the future study, information sought from foreign language programs and interpersonal communication in foreign language should further examined.

In addition, perceived communication competence, integrative motivation, social interaction viewing motivation and language anxiety were associated with different setting of subtitles. It does not indicate participants acquired vocabulary by switching to different subtitle settings in the study; however, the results revealed that their perceptions affect their choice of English subtitles or without subtitles.

It has long been suggested that media somehow affect audiences and negative effects were mostly discussed, such as violence or sexually explicit media. However, positive effects also occurred from time to time. This study attempted to explore a positive influence on foreign language media and the possible of interpersonal communication. As suggested above, there is also a need to more thoroughly examine media effects and foreign language acquisition. As with all the summaries of research, the conclusions are important, and the unanswered questions and future possibilities offer fruitful ground for future research.
APPENDIX A

Table 1

*Primary Factor Loadings of Uses and Gratifications Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They help me to learn about myself and others.</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn how to do things I haven’t done before.</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understand how Americans communicate with each other.</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep me up to date on current events.</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me immediate information about world event.</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They entertain me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As entertainment at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be with other members of my family who are watching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something to do when friends come over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me something to talk about with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be with friends who are watching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

_Primary Factor Loadings of Language Anxiety and Integrative Motivation_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m very tense and nervous in English conversations.</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating in English makes me nervous.</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m afraid to speak up in English conversations with new acquaintances.</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to avoid taking with foreigners in English if I can.</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer to answer or ask questions in English class.</td>
<td>-.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to get involved in English group discussions.</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If English were not taught at school, I would learn it on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read English newspapers or magazines outside of my English course.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to my friends, I think I study English relatively hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to live in an English speaking country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find studying English more interesting than other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the words and ideas that I learn from TV shows I’ve watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Language Anxiety; 2 = Integrative Motivation; 3 = Online Discussion; 4 = Participatory; 5 = Ethnocentric; 6 = Non-ethnocentric
### Table 2 (continued)

*Primary Factor Loadings of Language Anxiety and Integrative Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate in English discussion groups about the show I watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy participating in online English discussion groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe English discussion groups about a show I watch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy observing online English discussion groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I answer when I am called upon by the teacher in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During English class I am absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask my English teachers questions or talk to them outside of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the number of English courses at school to increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think what is happening oversees has much to do with my daily life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Language Anxiety; 2 = Integrative Motivation; 3 = Online Discussion; 4 = Participatory; 5 = Ethnocentric; 6 = Non-ethnocentric
Table 2 (continued)

*Primary Factor Loadings of Language Anxiety and Integrative Motivation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to work in an international organization such as the United Nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk with friends or acquaintances outside of school in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to make friends with International students studying in Taiwan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 = Language Anxiety; 2 = Integrative Motivation; 3 = Online Discussion; 4 = Participatory; 5 = Ethnocentric; 6 = Non-ethnocentric
Table 3

*Correlations of Hypotheses - H1 thru H12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communication Competence</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>H8</td>
<td>H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$r = .24 \ (p &lt; .01)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td>H10</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td>H12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table only reports significant hypotheses.
Table 4

*Correlations of Hypotheses – H13 thru H19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Post Hoc Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CH a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (H13)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (H14)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction (H15)</td>
<td>(F(3, 177) = 4.565, p = .004)</td>
<td>I\textsubscript{b.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety (H16)</td>
<td>(F(3, 177) = 3.846, p = .011)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communication Competence (H17)</td>
<td>(F(3, 177) = 12.437, p = .000)</td>
<td>III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation (H18)</td>
<td>(F(3, 177) = 18.792, p = .000)</td>
<td>V, VI, VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits (H19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

a. CH = Only English audio with Chinese subtitles; CH & ENG = English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles; CH & ENG & w/o ENG = English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio with English subtitles and English audio without any subtitles; CH & w/o ENG = English audio with Chinese subtitles and English audio without any subtitles.

b. The matching roman characters mean that there was a relationship between two composite variables: I: \((p = .002)\); II: \((p = .020)\); III: \((p = .000)\); IV: \((p = .003)\); V: \((p = .000)\); VI: \((p = .000)\); VII: \((p = .007)\).
Table 5

*Additional Correlations – English Learning Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I watch American television programs because they help me to improve my English in general</th>
<th>I watch American television programs so I can improve my English listening ability.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communication Competence</td>
<td>$r = .18, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$r = .27, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td>$r = -.16, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>$r = -.14, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>$r = .34, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$r = .30, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Discussion</td>
<td>$r = .20, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$r = .19, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>$r = .19, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$r = .18, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$r = -.20, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

**Additional Correlations – U&G Constructs/ WTC Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>H3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Communication</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>H7</td>
<td>H8</td>
<td>H9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td>H10</td>
<td>H11</td>
<td>H12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Discussion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = .20, p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>r = .20, p &lt; .01</td>
<td>r = .15, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td>r = -.17, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ethnocentric</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = .15, p &lt; .05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*Additional Correlations – WTC Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Communication Competence</th>
<th>Personality Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td>$r = -.63, p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>$r = -.30, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Motivation</td>
<td>$r = .17, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td>$r = -.16, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Ethnocentric</td>
<td>$r = .17, p &lt; .05$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$r = .15, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td>$r = .37 p &lt; .01$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey Instrument

Informed consent
Department of Journalism and Media Studies

Title of Study: Taiwanese Willingness to Communicate in English: Can Watching American Television Programs Help?

Investigator(s): Dr. Paul Traudt, Principal Investigator; Yu-Ting Chien, Associate Investigator

For questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Dr. Paul Traudt at 702-895-3647 or via email at paul.traudt@unlv.edu; Yu-Ting Chien at 626-782-3667 or via email at chiemy@unlv.nevada.edu.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted, contact the UNLV Office of Research Integrity – Human Subjects at 702-895-2794, toll free at 877-895-2794 or via email at IRB@unlv.edu.

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to look at Taiwanese audiences whose motivation to watch American television programs correlates with individual factors of willingness to communicate in English.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because you probably watch some American television programs.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: take a single survey consisting of three (3) sections that should only take about 20 minutes.

Benefits of Participation
There may be no direct benefit to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn how certain individual factors in willingness to communicate interact with motivations for watching American television programs.

Risks of Participation
This study only includes minimal risks. You may become uncomfortable when answering some questions.

Cost/Compensation
There will be no financial cost to you to participate in this study nor will you be financially compensated. The study will take 20 minutes of your time. You will not be compensated for your time.

Confidentiality
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for 3 year after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

https://unlv.us.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/PopUp.php?PopType=SurveyPrintPreview&WID=_blank
Participant Consent: 
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age and have read this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This three part survey attempts to discover your motivations for watching American television programs. Part one will ask questions about why you watch American television programs; part two will ask questions about situations where you have to speak English; and part three will ask about setting would you prefer watching these programs.

Part I: Why Do You Watch TV?

In this section, we would like to know the reasons why you watch American television programs. Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you, from "Not at all" to "Exactly" by finishing the following statement. Please choose only ONE answer from each statement.

I watch American television programs...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Exactly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>because they entertain me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they help me to learn things about myself and others.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they help me to improve my English in general.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they amuse me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I could learn about what could happen to me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I can be with other members of the family who are watching.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I can learn how to do things which I haven't done before.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they are something to do when friends come over.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they are enjoyable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they give me something to talk about with other people.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they keep me up to date on current events.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I can't find the same entertainment in local programs.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because my friends told me to watch them.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I better understand how Americans communicate with each other.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as entertainment at home.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because everybody is talking about them.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because they give me almost immediate information about world events.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I can improve my English listening ability.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so I can be with friends who are watching.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cut down on entertaining spending.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://unlv.us.qualtrics.com/ControlPanel/PopUp.php?PopType=SurveyPrintPreview&WID=_blank
## Part II: How Do You Communicate in English?

In this section, we would like to know how you feel when communicating in English, in social situations, and how you feel about learning English in general. Please indicate how much the following statements apply to you, from "Not at all" to "Exactly." Please choose only **ONE** answer from each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Exactly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have no fear of giving an English speech in public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating in English makes me nervous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy observing online English discussion groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to live in a English-speaking country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to my friends, I think I study English relatively hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very tense and nervous in English conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think what is happening overseas has much to do with my daily life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe online English discussion groups about the show I watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am calm and relaxed while having English conversations with friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd rather avoid the kind of work that sends me overseas frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to get involved in English group discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about the words and ideas that I learn from television shows I have watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to avoid talking with foreigners in English if I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in online English discussion groups about the show I watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm afraid to speak up in English conversation with new acquaintances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I graduate from college, I will continue to study English and try to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read English newspapers or magazines outside of my English course work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to make friends with international students studying in Taiwan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk with friends or acquaintances outside of school in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to work in an international organization such as the United Nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer to answer or ask questions in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn't mind sharing an apartment or room with an international student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the number of English classes at school to increase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If English were not taught at school,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualtrics Survey Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Exactly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would study it on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find studying English more interesting than other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel somewhat uncomfortable if a foreigner moved in next door.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy participating in online English discussion groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During English classes I’m absorbed in what is taught and concentrate on my studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I answer when I am called upon by the teacher in English class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask my English teachers questions or talked to them outside of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II (continued): How Do You Describe Yourself?

Below are twelve situations in which you might need to communicate in English. People's abilities to communicate effectively vary widely, and sometimes the same person is more competent to communicate in one situation than in another. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in each of the situations described below. 0 means completely incompetent and 100 means completely competent. Please move the bar to the number that fits you the most.

(0 = completely incompetent; 100 = completely competent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an idea/speech to a group of strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with an acquaintance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a large group of friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a small group of strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a large group of acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with a stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an idea/speech to a group of friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a small group of friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Qualtrics Survey Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group of acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting of strangers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking in a small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group of friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idea/speech to a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group of acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part II (continued): How Do You Describe Yourself?**

Please indicate following personal traits that described you the best. The closer to the adjective, the stronger the degree.

| Introverted | Extroverted |
|            |            |
| Unenergetic| Energetic  |
| Silent     | Talkative  |
| Timid      | Bold       |
| Inactive   | Active     |
| Unassertive| Assertive  |
| Unadventurous| Adventurous|

**Part III: How Do You Watch American Television Programs?**

What media production factors do you normally use while watching these programs? If there is more than one answer, please indicate every options you have used.

- [ ] English audio with Chinese subtitles
- [ ] English audio with English subtitles
- [ ] English audio WITHOUT any subtitles
- [ ] Chinese audio with Chinese subtitles
- [ ] Chinese audio with English subtitles
- [ ] Chinese audio WITHOUT any subtitles

**Which department are you currently enrolling in?**

[ ]

**If you would like to receive a copy of the result, please enter your email address below.**

[ ]
Survey Instrument

同意書
新聞媒體研究所

論文題目：觀看美國電視節目是否能幫助台灣人說英文的意願

研究員：Dr. Paul Traudt（指導教授）．簡佑庭

如果有任何問題對這個研究主題，請聯繫Dr. Paul Traudt +1(702) 895-3647．traudt@unlv.edu或者簡佑庭 +1(626) 782-3667．chieny@unlv.nevada.edu

如果你有任何問題關於研究的架構或者你的權利、抱怨以及建議，請聯繫內華達州立大學賭城分校研究中心 +1(702) 895-2794，或付費專線 +1(877) 895-2794，或者電子信箱：IRB@unlv.edu

研究目的：

此研究的目的是在探討台灣觀眾觀賞美國電視節目的動機及是否影響他們用英文溝通的意願

參與者：

你或多少少觀看美國電視節目因此受邀參與此研究

過程：

如果你願意參與此研究，你會填寫接下來三部份的問卷，大致會花費你20分鐘。

參與此研究的好處：

這個研究或許對你沒有直接的益處，但是，我們希望從研究中發現或是個人使用英文的意願以及觀看美國電視節目的有直接的關係

參與此研究的風險：

此研究有些許的風險，你可能會在回答一些問題時感到不自在

費用/補償：

你不須付費參與此研究，你也不會得到任何金錢上的補償，此問卷大致花費你20分鐘，你也不會因此得到時間的補償

保密條款：

此問卷所有的資訊會完全保密，沒有任何的紙本或者口頭上的報告會連結你與此研究，所有的紀錄會存放在內華達州立大學校區在完成此研究後三年，所有的紀錄會銷毀在過了上述的存放時間

參與意願：

你是自願參與此研究，你可以拒絕參與此研究或者在研究的任何部份，你可以隨時放棄參與此研究也會因此危急與學校的關係，你可以在填寫問卷前或者寫入任何問題

參與意願：

我以閱讀上述的資訊，並且同意參與此研究，我已經滿18歲並且已閱讀此同意書
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此三部份的问卷試圖探討觀看英國電視節目的動機以及使用英文溝通的意願。第一部份問題將探討你觀看英國電視節目；第二部份問題試問你在一些使用英文的狀況下，你如何反應；第三部份試問你如何看待這些節目。

### 第一部份：你為什麼看電視？

在這部份，我們將詢問你觀看英國電視節目的動機，請閱讀以下的情境並選擇該情境是否符合你的習慣，並請您選擇一個描述。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>情境描述</th>
<th>強烈反對</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>既不反對也不同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>堅決同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以娛樂。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以學習到自己以及他人。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以提升我的英文能力。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以讓我了解到一些事情發生在我身上。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以提升我對英文能力的信心。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以讓我了解他人。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以讓我學到一些事後解決的過程。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以讓我理解英文的細節。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我觀看英國電視節目，因為這些節目可以讓我學到一些新詞彙。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 第二部份：你如何用英文溝通？
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在這個部份，我們想要了解你如何用英文溝通，在日常生活上以及你的想法在學習英文的過程中，請閱讀以下的情境並選擇該情境是否符合你的生活習慣，從完全不同意到完全同意，並請只選擇一個描述。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>強烈反对</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>既不同意也不反对</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>堅決同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我可以在大聲朗讀英文講故事且毫無異樣。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會英文課課後裏緊張。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我喜歡看電影關於英文的言語片。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我想要住在英語系國家。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我的腳商英語向外看來，我更認真學習英文字。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我英文對話課非常緊張。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我不能參加在國外的事情跟日常生活的活動。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在課堂中推薦自己學過的英文。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我常常用英文跟朋友對話，裏緊張的。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會希望任何工作會有機會到國外。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我喜歡參與英文討論的小組。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我常常用英文從電視節目上看英文的字幕。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會透過與外國人用英文交談。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會上英國節目的英文留言板與網友討論。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會用英文與朋友對話。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會慶祝後會持續學習英文以示感謝。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在課餘時間看英文新聞看報。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我想在台灣的國際學生當朋友。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會和英文朋友，新朋友在課餘交談。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在時間間工作，像是聯合國職業。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在英文課上發發表自己意見。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在課餘時間跟隔壁的學生或同行。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我希望學校增加英文課程的數量。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我認爲英文課比其他課程有趣。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會在課餘時間和同學討論英文的問題。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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第二部份：你如何用英文溝通？（接鍵）

接下來的部份有十二個情境需要你用英文溝通。每個人對於有效的溝通有不同的認知，而且在不同的情境下也會有不同的溝通能力。例如在朋友或者在陌生人面前，在一大群人或者少數人面前，請閱讀以下的情境後並向右移動指標顯示你的溝通能力。

“0”代表完全無法溝通，“100”代表完全有能力溝通。請移動指標選擇符合你的分數。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>在一群陌生人面前做英文演報。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一位新朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在一群朋友面前用英文交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個陌生交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個新朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>與一個陌生人用英文交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在一群朋友面前做英文演報。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個新朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個新朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一群陌生人交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文與一個朋友交談。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>用英文在一群新朋友面前演講。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

第二部份：你如何形容你自己？（接鍵）

請選出以下最符合你的個性特徵，越靠近該形容詞表示程度越強烈。

內向的 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ 外向的
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第三部分：你如何观看美国电视节目？

当你看美国电视节目时，下面哪些制作模式你较常使用？如果你有超过一个以上的选项，请把你常用的每个设定都选择出来。（多选）

- 英文发音中文字幕
- 英文发音英文字幕
- 英文发音没有字幕
- 中文发音中文字幕
- 中文发音英文字幕
- 中文发音没有字幕

目前就读的科系是？

如果想获得此研究的成果摘要，请留下你的电子信箱。
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