

Comparison of Communication Apprehension in L1 and Communication Apprehension in L2 among MA Students with Different Ages Majoring in English in an International Program in Bangkok

Sucharat Rimkeeratikul

Language Institute
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand

Abstract

The current study investigates and compares communication apprehension (CA) of the first-year MA students majoring in English in an international program in Bangkok of the academic year 2017. The research questions are: a) Is there any difference between CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) among the students in the study, b) Is there any difference in CA in L1 among the students in terms of their ages, and c) Is there any difference in CA in L2 among the students in terms of their ages. Quantitative approach is employed by making use of the Personal Report Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24). T-test is used to analyze the data. The participants are 32 students divided into 2 groups according to their ages. The results indicate that the students' CA in L1 is lower than their CA in L2 across contexts. Students who are 30 years old or older are found to be with higher CA in L1 in meetings and public speaking contexts. However, for CA in L2, there is no difference among the students regarding their age difference. Benefits from this research for the students may occur when their instructors get the insight into their students' communication traits when using L1 and L2 and they may select appropriate methods when teaching in the classroom and choose effective ways of communication when giving advice for writing a thesis or an independent study to the students of this MA program.

Keywords: communication apprehension, L1 (Thai), L2 (English), students' ages, Thai context

Cite as: Rimkeeratikul, S. (2018). Comparison of Communication Apprehension in L1 and Communication Apprehension in L2 among MA Students with Different Ages Majoring in English in an International Program in Bangkok. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (3), 33- 44
DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no3.1>

Introduction

Education at the graduate level is still in demand in Thai society. Most students enjoy studying, attain success and make many good friends during their graduate study while some are unable to finish their degree or struggle unnecessarily before graduating. Communication in L1 (Thai) and L2 (English) seems to be a significant factor influencing the happiness and success of MA students majoring in English in an international program in Bangkok.

Even though the program in this study is an international one, L1 (Thai) is frequently used among the students themselves and with the instructors, especially when getting advice from teachers who serve as advisers for the MA thesis or the independent study (IS) project. In addition, L1 (Thai) is used between the students and the officials providing general and academic support in the graduate office. Meanwhile, L2 (English) is used as the medium of instruction in the classroom. Instructors, both Thai and non-Thai, teach all subjects in English. Also, all activities in the classroom are conducted in English. As a result, the communication traits of students when using L1 (Thai) and L2 (English) are considered important factors for success. Goldhaber (2002) suggests that educators should be concerned with facilitating learning and removing the barriers to students' achievement. Therefore, if instructors understand students' problems such as communication apprehension (CA), they should be able to be more helpful to students.

Students in the MA program are more diverse when compared to those in the BA program in terms of demographics, e.g. ages. Thus, in this study the concentration is on communication apprehension (CA) in L1 (Thai), CA in L2 (English), and CA in L1 and CA in L2 with age taken into account.

Purposes of the Current Study

This study aims to (1) examine the communication apprehension (CA) across contexts and trait like CA when using L1 (Thai) of the MA students in this study; (2) examine the communication apprehension (CA) across contexts and traitlike CA when using L2 (English) of the MA students in this study; (3) investigate the difference between CA in L1 and CA in L2 among the MA students in this study; (4) investigate the difference in communication apprehension (CA) across contexts and traitlike CA when using L1 (Thai) of the MA students in this study with regard to age; (5) investigate the difference in communication apprehension (CA) across contexts and traitlike CA when using L2 (English) of the MA students with regard to age.

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study are as follows:

1. What is the score and level of CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA students of the program in this study?
2. What is the score and level of CA in L2 (English) of the MA students of the program in this study?
3. Is there any difference between CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) among the MA students in this study?
4. Is there any difference in communication apprehension (CA) in L1 (Thai) among the MA students in this study when considering their ages?

5. Is there any difference in communication apprehension (CA) in L2 (English) among the MA students in this study when considering their ages?

Significance of the Study

In learner-centered education, the anxiety of learners should not be ignored by instructors, especially English language ones. Thus, the research results can be beneficial for the MA students in this study as well as the teachers teaching the MA students as follows:

1. Teachers in the MA program in this study should be able to increase their understanding of their students with a variety of ages. This may enable the teachers to opt for appropriate teaching pedagogy for the benefit of their students.
2. MA students in this study should be able to gain a better understand of themselves and their classmates with different ages.
3. The research results of this study can be compared with the results of previous research conducted with different batches of MA students in the same program to get a clearer understanding of the communication traits of the MA students in this program. This will ultimately enrich the literature, which will be useful for students or scholars who might be interested in the construct of communication apprehension (CA).
4. In the future, some scholars might be stimulated to develop a similar instrument that could be used to investigate the feelings of Thai students when communicating in Thai or another foreign language.

Review of literature

What is communication apprehension (CA)?

Communication apprehension (CA) has received the most attention among the theoretical constructs explaining individuals' predispositions to avoid or engage in communication with others. McCroskey (1977) defines communication apprehension (CA) as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (p. 78). CA can be divided into many types or categories such as situational, singing, writing, intercultural, and traitlike. The most studied CA is traitlike CA. This study focuses on traitlike CA and it is conducted in terms of a contextual approach across group discussions, interpersonal conversations, meetings, and public speaking.

How is CA measured?

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1982) has been widely used to investigate the level of CA of individuals. The PRCA-24 is a measurement with 24 items using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It determines CA in the areas of group discussions, interpersonal conversations, meetings, and public speaking. The scores of CA across those dimensions are calculated and summarized to measure traitlike CA, which range from 24 -120; any score exceeding 80 indicates a high level of CA, 51-79 represents a moderate level of CA, and below 50 is considered a low level of CA (Richmond & McCroskey, 1989).

What are the factors causing people to have different degrees of CA?

Beatty, McCroskey and Heisel (1998) emphasize that CA, which is a communication trait, is determined by genetic factors while Horwitz (1996) claims that fear of making mistakes and errors

causes communication anxiety. In addition, Daly, Caughlin, and Stafford (1998) found that self-esteem within a classroom context was negatively correlated with CA.

In terms of culture, people from collectivistic cultures are more likely to avoid communication than members from individualistic cultures since collectivist cultures place more emphasis on harmony while individualist cultures stress individuals' needs and goals (Triandis, 1994).

What are the effects of CA?

In general, CA is considered a barrier to communication, especially speaking. Russ (2013) states that people with traitlike CA feel uncomfortable when communicating with others across four different contexts while context CA refers to a person feeling discomfort when communicating in diverse environments. Moreover, Blume et al. (2013) conclude that anxiety in communication might be a barrier to success in educational and work settings in today's global context.

The indirect effect of CA might be silence of individuals. According to Perlow and Williams (2003), silence can take a heavy toll on individuals, as it leads to anger, resentment, and feelings of humiliation.

Relevant previous studies

In terms of CA in L1 compared with CA in L2, some research studies are relevant to the current study. For instance, students in Puerto Rico are found to be less apprehensive when using L1 (Spanish) than when using L2 (English) (McCroskey, Fayer, & Richmond, 1985); on the contrary, their other communication traits such as the willingness to communicate, self-perceived communication competence, assertiveness, and responsiveness are higher for L1 (Spanish) than L2 (English). Also, Rimkeeratikul (2017b) finds that the CA in L1 of students in a graduate diploma program in English is lower than their CA in L2 (English) with statistical significance as measured by dependent *t*-test.

Various studies have examined CA with respect to demographic variables. Booncherd and Rimkeeratikul (2017) find that CA in L2 (English) of personnel in a public healthcare organization in a suburb of Bangkok, Thailand is affected by the number of years working in the organization. Rimkeeratikul (2017a) reports that the number of years that monks have been in the monkhood significantly affects their CA in L2 (English). Moreover, Amiri and Puteh (2018) investigate communication apprehension through the qualitative method via observation and interviews among international doctoral students communicating with an examination panel during proposal defenses. The research results reveal that the main factors increasing doctoral students' CA during academic presentations are linguistic issues and deficiencies in research knowledge despite their years of working experience as lecturers.

Research Design

This study was conducted in a quantitative manner guided by the five research questions stated above. The instrument used was a questionnaire to measure the CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) of students in the first semester of the first academic year of an MA program in September of calendar year 2017. This is a two-year international program, which means that the English language (L2) is used in the classroom. However, outside of the class, Thai (L1) is usually used among students and between the instructors and the students.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were first-year MA students in an English major program in the year 2017. The total number of first-year students of this batch was 39. They were part-time students who came to classes only on weekends. Naturally, they were different in terms of ages. The students were divided by age into two categories: (1) lower than or equal to 30 years of age; (2) over 30 years of age.

Research Instrument

The instrument used in the current study was a questionnaire composed of three parts: (1) this part asked for the respondents' demographic information, including their ages; (2) the PRCA-24 (McCroskey, 1982) was used to ask about the feelings of the respondents when using L1 (Thai); and (3) the PRCA-24 (McCroskey, 1982) was used to ask about the feelings of the respondents when using L2 (English).

Procedures

The questionnaires were distributed to 39 first-year MA students with the help of the instructors of a compulsory course in this MA program. The number of questionnaires returned by the respondents was 32, equating to a return rate of 82.05%, which was deemed acceptable. According to Dommeyer et al. (2004), an acceptable return rate for paper-based questionnaires is 75%.

Data Analysis

The data analysis of this current study was done to answer the five research questions as stated above. It was divided into five stages as follows: (1) the scores from the PRCA-24 when using L1 (Thai) of the MA students were computed to obtain the mean scores; (2) the scores from the PRCA-24 when using L2 (English) of the MA students were computed to obtain the mean scores; (3) a dependent *t*-test analysis was conducted to compare CA in L1 and CA in L2 of the MA students; (4) an independent *t*-test was applied to investigate the differences between CA in L1 (Thai) among the MA students with different ages; (5) an independent *t*-test was applied to investigate the differences between CA in L2 (English) among the MA students with different ages.

Research Results

RQ1: What is the score and level of CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA students in the program in this study?

Stage One: The scores from the PRCA-24 when using L1 (Thai) of the MA students were computed to obtain the mean scores. According to Table 1, from the research results, it is obvious that this batch of MA students in the study were found to have a moderate level of CA across contexts. Also, the traitlike CA of students in this batch was found to be moderate ($\bar{X} = 62.97$).

Table 1

Scores and Levels of CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA Students in this Study

	n	Mean	Level of CA	SD
Group				
Discussions	32	14.69	Moderate	4.36

Meetings	32	15.50	Moderate	5.16
Interpersonal				
Conversations	32	14.88	Moderate	4.38
Public Speaking	32	17.91	Moderate	4.93
Total	32	62.97	Moderate	16.65

RQ2: What is the score and level of CA in L2 (English) of the MA students of the program in this study?

Stage Two: The scores from the PRCA-24 when using L2 (English) of the MA students were computed to obtain the mean scores. As seen from Table 2, the research results revealed that this batch of MA students in the study have a moderate level of CA across contexts. In addition, the traitlike CA when using L2 (English) of the students in this batch was found to be moderate ($\bar{X} = 71.34$).

Table 2

Scores and Levels of CA in L2 (English) of the MA Students in this Study

	n	Mean	Level of CA	SD
Group				
Discussions	32	17.13	Moderate	3.53
Meetings	32	17.41	Moderate	4.43
Interpersonal				
Conversations	32	17.28	Moderate	4.24
Public Speaking	32	19.53	Moderate	4.39
Total	32	71.34	Moderate	14.42

RQ3: Is there any difference between CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) among the MA students in this study?

Stage 3: The mean scores of CA in L1 and CA in L2 across contexts and the total CA were compared through by employing a dependent *t*-test. Table 3 indicates that there is a significant difference in the scores for traitlike CA in L1 (Thai) ($M = 62.97$, $SD = 12.74$) and traitlike CA in L2 (English) ($M = 71.34$, $SD = 12.74$) conditions; $t(31) = 3.72$, $p = 0.001$. The results suggest that the students have less anxiety when they use L1 (Thai) than when they use L2 (English). Specifically, the results suggest that the MA students in this program have more anxiety when they are involved in English oral communication in every context: group discussions, interpersonal conversations, meetings, and speaking in front of a group of people.

Table 3

Dependent T-Test and Mean Scores of CA in L1 (Thai) and L2 (English) among the MA Students in this Study

		Mean	Mean Difference	SD	df	<i>t</i>	Sig (2-tailed)
Group	Thai	14.69					
Discussions	English	17.13	2.44	3.70	31	3.73	.001*
Meetings	Thai	15.50					

	English	17.41	1.91	3.71	31	2.91	.007*
Interpersonal	Thai	14.88					
Conversations	English	17.28	2.41	3.99	31	3.41	.002*
Public	Thai	17.91					
Speaking	English	19.53	1.63	3.52	31	2.61	.014*
Total CA	Thai	62.97					
	English	71.34	8.37	12.74	31	3.72	.001*

($p \leq 0.05$)

RQ 4: Is there any difference in communication apprehension (CA) in L1 (Thai) among the MA students in this study when considering their ages?

Stage 4: The detailed information regarding the ages of the MA students in the study is shown in table 4.

Table 4

Detailed Information regarding the Ages of the MA Students in the Study

Ages	Frequency	Percent
22	1	3.1
23	2	6.2
24	7	21.9
25	2	6.2
26	4	12.5
28	2	6.2
29	1	3.1
30	2	6.2
31	1	3.1
32	2	6.2
33	1	3.1
36	1	3.1
37	2	6.2
38	1	3.1
40	1	3.1
43	2	6.2
Total	32	100.0

The information below shows that among the 32 students in the MA program that are included in the study, there are 21 people whose ages are at or below 30 years of age and 11 people who are older than 30 years of age.

Table 5

Information regarding the Ages of the MA Students in the Study

	Number of Students	Percent
Students \leq 30 years old	21	65.6
Students $>$ 30 years old	11	34.4
Total	32	100.0

At this stage, the CA scores were divided according to their ages. That is, the MA students were divided into two categories: (1) those who are 30 years of age or younger; (2) those who are older than 30 years of age. Then, the mean CA scores in L1 across the four contexts and also total CA were compared. An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare CA in L1 in the MA students who are 30 years of age or younger and those who are older than 30 years of age. Table 6 reveals that there is a significant difference in the scores for traitlike CA in L1 in the MA students who are 30 years of age or younger ($M = 58.33$, $SD = 16.41$) and traitlike CA in L1 in the MA students who are older than 30 years of age ($M = 71.82$, $SD = 13.75$); $t(30) = -2.33$, $p = .027$. The results suggest that age really does have an effect on CA in L1 (Thai). Specifically, the results indicate that students who are older have higher CA when using Thai, especially in the contexts of meetings and public speaking.

Table 6

Independent T-Test and Mean Scores of CA in L1 (Thai) among the MA Students in this Study when Considering Their Ages

	MA Students	Mean	SD	df	<i>t</i>	Sig (2-tailed)
Group	≤ 30 years old	13.81	4.06	30	-1.62	.117
	> 30 years old	16.36	4.61			
Discussions	≤ 30 years old	14.10	5.00	30	-2.26	.031*
	> 30 years old	18.18	4.53			
Meetings	≤ 30 years old	13.81	4.38	30	-2.00	.056
	> 30 years old	16.91	3.75			
Interpersonal Conversations	≤ 30 years old	16.62	4.86	30	-2.16	.039*
	> 30 years old	20.36	4.23			
Public Speaking	≤ 30 years old	58.33	16.41	30	-2.33	.027*
	> 30 years old	71.82	13.75			
Total CA	≤ 30 years old					
	> 30 years old					

($p \leq 0.05$)

RQ5: Is there any difference in communication apprehension (CA) in L2 (English) among the MA students in this study when considering their ages?

Stage 5: An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare CA in L2 in the MA students who are 30 years of age or younger and those who are older than 30 years of age. Table 7 shows that there is no significant difference in the scores for traitlike CA in L2 in MA students who are 30 years of age or younger ($M = 68.15$, $SD = 14.07$) and traitlike CA in L2 in MA students who are older than 30 years of age ($M = 77.45$, $SD = 13.66$); $t(30) = -1.80$, $p = .083$. The results suggest that age does not have any effect on CA in L2 (English). Specifically, the results reveal that students of different ages do not have different CA when using English across contexts.

Table 7

Independent T-Test and Mean Scores of CA in L2 (English) among the MA Students in this Study when Considering Their Ages

	MA Students	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Group	≤ 30 years old	16.33	3.35	30	-1.82	.079
	> 30 years old	18.64	3.50			
Discussions	≤ 30 years old	16.48	4.21	30	-1.69	.102
	> 30 years old	19.18	4.49			
Interpersonal	≤ 30 years old	16.67	4.31	30	-1.14	.265
	> 30 years old	18.45	4.06			
Conversations	≤ 30 years old	18.67	4.07	30	-1.58	.126
	> 30 years old	21.18	4.71			
Public	≤ 30 years old	18.67	4.07	30	-1.58	.126
	> 30 years old	21.18	4.71			
Speaking	≤ 30 years old	18.67	4.07	30	-1.58	.126
	> 30 years old	21.18	4.71			
Total CA	≤ 30 years old	68.15	14.07	30	-1.80	.083
	> 30 years old	77.45	13.66			

($p \leq 0.05$)

Summary and Discussion

This part is organized according to the research questions of this current research study. The summary and discussion are as the following.

First of all, the results for the first and second research questions from this study show that the CA in L1 (Thai) and the CA in L2 (English) across contexts and total CA of the MA students in this study in academic year 2017 are found to be moderate. In other words, the results can be interpreted that MA students in this study can communicate without the barrier of anxiety when using L2 (English) in the classroom. Moreover, they do not have high communication anxiety when dealing with the officials in the graduate office who provide support to them using L1 (Thai). They can also use L1 (Thai) to get advice concerning their theses or independent studies from their Thai advisers effectively without experiencing significant communication anxiety. The research results also reveal that the students of this batch share the same communication trait with the MA students majoring in English at a public university (academic year 2016) in the study of Rimkeeratikul (2017b).

Next, the results regarding the third research question reveal that CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA students in this study is lower than their CA in L2 (English) across contexts, leading to their traitlike CA in L1 (Thai) being lower than their traitlike CA in L2 (English). The difference between CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) among the MA students in this study confirm those of previous studies. Many scholars including McCroskey et al. (1985) have found that CA in L2 was higher than CA in L1. In addition, during the process of learning a foreign language (L2), learners might experience difficulty in their L2 speaking (Ellis, 2005).

For the fourth research question, in terms of students' ages in the context of using L1 (Thai) in meetings and public speaking, students who are older than 30 years old are found to be more apprehensive when compared to those students who are 30 or younger than 30 years old. Thus, if instructors realize this tendency, they may understand their advisees better and use a more appropriate approach when giving advice to them.

Finally, regarding the last research question, the research results reveal that there is no difference in CA in L2 (English) among MA students in this study in terms of their age difference. This indicates that in terms of the communication trait among the MA students in this study, age does not affect their feelings of anxiety when using L2 (English) to have conversations, join group discussions, share their ideas in meetings, or give a presentation in front of people. Therefore, it may be safe to assume that the MA students in the study are ready to learn English using English as the medium, as they do not have a barrier from this communication trait. All in all, students of different ages in the program of this study are rather homogeneous in terms of the communication trait in question when involved in L2 (English) communication, especially speaking.

Conclusion

According to the results achieved in this study, the conclusion is as the following.

1. CA in L1 (Thai) across contexts and traitlike CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA students in the study are found at the level of moderate.
2. CA in L2 (English) across contexts and traitlike CA in L2 (English) of the MA students in the study are found at the level of moderate.
3. CA in L1 (Thai) across contexts and their traitlike CA in L1 (Thai) of the MA students in this study are found to be lower than their CA in L2 (English).
4. Regarding the age difference, among the MA students in this study, the research results reveal that, when using L1 (Thai) students who are over 30 years old are found to be more apprehensive when compared to those students who are 30 years old or younger than 30 years old when they are in meetings and when they are involved with public speaking.
5. Regarding the age difference, among the MA students in this study, the research results indicate that there is no difference in communication apprehension (CA) in L2 (English).

Implications of the Study

The research results can be beneficial for faculty members teaching the MA students of the program in the study in terms of offering insight into their students' communication traits. This may enable them to use suitable teaching and communication approaches for their students. Consequently, students may enjoy studying more while instructors can also achieve their teaching goals more readily.

Moreover, the administrative officers of the program can give assistance to students with more understanding by paying greater attention to demographic differences, such as the age of the students in the program. This may lead to increased satisfaction in the students in the program along with higher achievement.

Limitations

This research study was conducted with MA students majoring in English in a master's degree program at a public university in Bangkok. The results might not be generalizable to MA students in other programs of study, even in the same university.

Recommendations for Further Research

The recommendations for further research are as follows:

1. Future studies may investigate CA in L1 (Thai) and CA in L2 (English) among Thai people in certain areas or provinces in contexts other than educational in order to increase the understanding of their communication traits.
2. More variables might be included in future studies. For example, intercultural communication (ICA) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997) or willingness to communicate (WTC) (McCroskey, 1992) can be examined in future studies together with CA.
3. Communication Apprehension (CA) may be studied together with other variables that are relevant to communication and English language learning/teaching as well as electronic communication in the modern world.

About the Author:

Dr. Sucharat Rimkeeratikul is an associate professor teaching English courses at Language Institute of Thammasat University, Thailand. Her research interests include English language teaching and learning. She is the author of several articles related to language teaching and learning. ORCID ID is 0000-0001-6788-8460

References

- Amiri, F., & Puteh, M. (2018). Oral communication apprehension among international doctoral students. *English Language Teaching, 11*(2), 164-171.
- Beatty, M. J., McCroskey, J. C., & Heisel, A. D. (1998). Communication apprehension as temperamental expression: A communibiological paradigm. *Communication Monographs, 65*, 197-219.
- Blume, B. D., Baldwin, T. T., & Ryan, K. C. (2013). Communication apprehension: A barrier to students' leadership, adaptability, and multicultural appreciation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12*(2), 158-172.
- Booncherd, N. & Rimkeeratikul, S. (2017). Communication apprehension when speaking English (L2): A case study of personnel in an organization taking care of public health located in the suburb of Bangkok, Thailand. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 10*(1), 13-31.
- Daly, J. A., Caughlin, J. P., & Stafford, L. (1998). Correlates and consequences of social communicative anxiety. In J. Daly, J., McCroskey, J. Ayres, T. Hopf, & D. Ayres (Eds.), *Avoiding communication* (pp. 21-74). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dommeyer, C. J., Baum, P., Hanna R. W., & Chapman K. S. (2004). Gathering faculty teaching evaluations by in-class and online surveys: their effects on response rates and evaluations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 29*(5), 611–623.
- Ellis, R. (2005). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System, 33*, 467-479.
- Goldhaber, D. (2002). The mystery of good teaching. *Education Next, 2*(1), 50-55.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1996). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 559-562.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. *Communication Yearbook, 6*, (136-170). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- McCroskey, J. C., Fayer, J. M., & Richmond, V. P. (1985). Don't speak to me in English: Communication apprehension in Puerto Rico. *Communication Quarterly*, 33, 185-192.
- Neuliep, J. W. & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 385-398.
- Perlow, L., & Williams, S. (2003). Is silence killing your company? *Harvard Business Review*, 81, 52-58.
- Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1989). *Communication Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness* (5thed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Rimkeeratikul, S. (2017a). Communication apprehension among Thai monks in Bangkok. *Journal of Thonburi University*, 11(25), 28-42.
- Rimkeeratikul, S. (2017b). Graduate students of two similar programs: A comparison study of communication apprehension when speaking the English language. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 10(2), 144-154.
- Russ, T. L. (2013). The influence of communication apprehension on superiors' propensity for and practice of participative decision making. *Communication Quarterly* 61(3), 335-348.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Major cultural syndromes and emotion. In S. Kitayam & H.R. Markus (Eds), *Emotion and culture* (pp.185-306). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.