The Interplay of Motivation and Willingness to Communicate in Four Skills: The Iranian Perspective

[1]Afsaneh Saeedakhtar*
[2]Saeede Hamidizare

IJEAP- 1810-1291

[3]Reza Abdi

Abstract

The present study examined the relationship between willingness to communicate (WTC) and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation among Iranian intermediate learners of English. It also attempted to identify the motivational orientations which best predicted learners' WTC. Moreover, it measured Iranian intermediate learners' willingness to read (WTR), willingness to listen (WTL), and willingness to write (WTW). To this end, 133 university intermediate English majors filled out a questionnaire based on which their L2 WTC and language learning motivation level were measured. All participants were then interviewed individually to elicit their attitudes towards L2 WTC and motivation in learning English. The results indicated that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were significantly correlated with L2 WTC. However, only intrinsic motivation predicted L2 WTC significantly, and extrinsic motivation was more dominant among Iranian learners. Results of the 7-item structured interview indicated that teacher immediacy, the teachers' and peers' judgment, and scoring, ranked in descending order, were as the top impetus to influence the participants' WTC. Results also demonstrated that participants represented higher degrees of WTL and WTW than WTR. In light of the findings of the study, teachers are recommended to improve learners' L2 WTC by recognizing individual and situational factors affecting WTC, strengthening their motivation and self-confidence, and decreasing their anxiety.

Keywords: EFL Context, Extrinsic Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, Willingness to Communicate

1. Introduction

WTC in L2 is the construct that accounts for the differences in learners' communicative inclinations. MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1998) define it as "readiness to enter into the discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2" (p. 547). It seems to serve as the very first step in L2 development since "without WTC, students are less likely to engage in communicative activities and less likely to benefit from the advantages of L2 interaction such as increased input, negotiation of meaning, focus on form, and so on" (Vongsila & Rainders, 2016, p. 2). WTC provides opportunities for exposure to rich input (Lockley, 2013) and can foster L2 learning. Mehrgan (2013) asserts that developing learners' WTC should be one component of all language learning programs. In spite of the importance associated with WTC in fostering L2 (Yu, 2009), Asian L2 learners are regarded as reticent learners (e.g., Alrabai, 2014; Cheng, 2000; Liu & Jackson, 2011). Even when they are offered to use L2, they do not appear to take advantage of such an opportunity equally, primarily due to differing degrees of WTC. Some of them who possess high WTC grasp every opportunity to speak in the classroom, while those who suffer from low WTC keep silent (Fallah, 2014).

---

[1] Corresponding author; Assistant professor in TEFL, a.saeedakhtar@ut.ac.ir; Department of English Language, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

2 MA in TEFL, sa93hamidizareh@gmail.com; Department of English Language, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

3 Associate professor in TEFL, reabdi@uma.ac.ir; Department of English Language, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

WTC might vary because of different variables including learners' personality as well as environmental factors that fall under teachers' sway (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). High levels of anxiety (e.g., De Waele & Al-Saraj, 2015; Liu, 2018; Liu & Jackson, 2011; Matsuda & Gobel, 2004), gender and age (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; MacIntyre, Baker, Clement, & Donovan, 2002), low communicative confidence (e.g., Mady & Arnott, 2010; Peng & Woodrow, 2010), and motivation (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Hashimoto, 2002; Hüseyin, Demirezen, & Pourfeiz, 2015; Khajavy, Ghonsooli, Hosseini, & Choi, 2016; Peng, 2007, 2015; Vatankhah & Tanbakooei, 2014; Zarrinabadi & Abdi, 2011) are instances of learner-related variables that can impact WTC. On the other hand, lower group size (e.g., Cao, 2011; Cao & Philp, 2006; De Leger & Storch, 2009; Fushino, 2010), familiarity with group members (e.g., Cao & Philp, 2006), familiarity with the topic (e.g., Riasati, 2014), providing "non-threatening volunteer opportunities" (e.g., Reid & Trofimovich, 2018), teachers' wait-time (e.g., Zarrinabadi, 2014; Zarrinabadi & Tanbakooei, 2016), and peer interaction (e.g., Philp, Adams, & Iwashite, 2014; Zhong, 2013) fall under environmental factors that affect WTC.

A look into previous studies demonstrates that there are five-fold deficiencies associated with previous studies done on WTC. Firstly, most L2 WTC studies have been conducted in English as a second language (ESL) settings (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2000; Clément, Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre, Babin & Clément, 1999; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément & Conrod, 2001; MacIntyre et al., 2002; MacIntyre, Burns & Jessome, 2011; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996) and only a few of them have been carried out in EFL context (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; Fallah, 2014; Halupka-Rešetar, Knežević, & Topalov, 2018; Kim, 2004; Yashima, 2002). The studies conducted in EFL contexts have been primarily limited to Japanese (e.g., Yashima, 2002), Korean (e.g., Kim, 2004), Turkish (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005), Chinese (e.g., Yu, 2009), Serbian (e.g., Halupka-Rešetar et al., 2018), and Iranian (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Ghonsooly, Khajavi, & Asadpour, 2012; Jamalifar & Salehi, 2017; Zarrinabadi, Ketabi, & Tavakoli, 2017) contexts. However, most of the questionnaires used in previous studies for measuring L2 WTC are more appropriate for ESL contexts in which participants are asked about the situations that they experience in their everyday lives (e.g., talking with a friend while standing in line or in the elevator) (e.g., Cao & Philp, 2006; Peng & Woodrow, 2010). Since such experiences are very rare for EFL learners, asking them to respond to such a questionnaire would not be logical. The present study intends to use a questionnaire which is more appropriate for EFL settings and focuses on learners' L2 WTC in an EFL classroom context.

Secondly, although a good number of studies have examined the relationship between L2 WTC and motivation in ESL (e.g., Hashimoto, 2002; MacIntyre et al., 2002; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996) and EFL (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009) contexts, the relationship between WTC and extrinsic/intrinsic motivation in EFL contexts especially in Iran has been left unexplored. The current study has set out to fill in this gap along with addressing some other concerns. Thirdly, most of the studies conducted in EFL settings have utilized Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model as the motivational framework, while this model proves useful for multilingual settings failing to enjoy the required exploratory power for investigating motivation in EFL classrooms (Dörnyei, 2005). Khajavy et al. (2016) downplay the application of socio-educational model to foreign language settings like Iran since formation of attitudes towards the target language community does not occur in these contexts due to the lack of interaction with foreigners. Contrary to the Gardner's (1985) model, Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory (SDT), which can be applied in EFL classrooms, focuses on cognitive and humanistic aspects of motivation and deals with extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of it. A few studies (e.g., Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng & Woodrow, 2010) have resorted to SDT in order to measure motivation. The present study employs MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) model, as WTC framework, and SDT as the motivational framework to investigate the interplay of WTC and extrinsic/intrinsic motivation in the Iranian classroom context.

Fourthly, most of the previous studies have adopted quantitative research methods (e.g., Hashimoto, 2002; Peng, 2007; Yu, 2009), while this study employs a mixed-methods design to

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

examine L2 WTC model. Fifthly, an ever-growing body of WTC studies (e.g., Hashimoto, 2002; Peng, 2015; Peng & Woodrow, 2010) have measured only desire to speech, while the current study examines learners' L2 WTC in both oral and written modes through running a structured interview to measure not only learners' L2 WTC in speaking but also WTR, WTL, and WTW.

2. Literature Review

2.1. WTC

WTC was originally used in first language (L1) verbal communication. It was introduced by McCroskey and Richmond (1987) based on Burgoon's (1976) work on unwillingness to communicate, Mortensen, Arnston, and Lustig's (1977) work on predisposition toward verbal behavior, and McCroskey and Richmond's (1982) work on shyness. WTC initially referred to individual's inclination towards talking (McCroskey & Richmond, 1987). McCroskey and his associates considered WTC as a personality trait and suggested that WTC reflected a stable inclination to talk, which was relatively consistent across different contexts.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) argued that "it is highly unlikely that WTC in the second language is a simple manifestation of WTC in the L1" (p. 546). They developed a model of L2 WTC by combining linguistic, communicative, and social-psychological variables to present WTC in L2. However, they did not take WTC in L2 as a personality trait but as a situational variable.

To represent the WTC model, they used a pyramid to reflect the causes of WTC in L2. On the top of the pyramid, there is the moment of L2 communication, followed by WTC, which represents actual communication behavior. The communicative self-confidence and desire to communicate with a specific person are situational factors that follow WTC. At the bottom of the pyramid, intergroup climate and personality are taken as enduring influences. Intermediate layers include motivational propensities and affective-cognitive context, which include motivation, intergroup attitudes, communicative competence, L2 self-confidence, and social situation. It is likely that the top layers of the pyramid have more influence on WTC than the bottom layers.

WTC is not limited to speaking, rather it encompasses other skills too (e.g., Khajavy & Ghonsooly, 2017; MacIntyre et al., 1998; MacIntyre et al., 2001). MacIntyre et al. (1998) "propose to extend WTC to influence other modes of production, such as writing and comprehension of both spoken and written language" (p. 546). Khajavy and Ghonsooly (2017) define WTR as "readiness to read a text given the choice and opportunity" (p. 873). They argued that there is no positive correlation between WTC and WTR, WTL, and WTW; for instance, one might be eager to read but not speak and write, and vice versa.

2.2. Motivation and its Role in L2 WTC

Studies on motivation in L2 began with Gardner and Lambert's research in Canada in the 1960s. They believed that language learning was influenced by sociocultural factors. Later on, Gardner (1985) advanced his socio-educational model of L2 acquisition. In this model, two sociocultural constructs including integrativness and attitudes towards learning situation are regarded as main factors that affect individuals' motivation in L2 learning. Integrativeness is composed of integrative orientation, attitudes towards foreign language society, and being interested in learning a foreign language. Attitudes towards the learning situation reflect learners' perception of language teacher, language course, and learning materials. According to Gardner (1985), integrativness and attitudes towards the learning situation strongly influence learners' level of motivation.

Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model has been extensively utilized in previous studies. However, results of early research are controversial. MacIntyre and Charos (1996), for instance, found indirect relationship between L2 WTC and motivation. Hashimoto (2002) conducted a partial replication of MacIntyre and Charos's (1996) study with Japanese ESL students to examine the influences of WTC and motivation on actual L2 use. In contrast to MacInyre and Charos's (1996)

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

study, findings revealed a significant correlation between motivation and L2 WTC. In the same year, Yashima (2002) examined her structural model, that was also hypothesized based on socio-educational and L2 WTC models in Japan. Unlike previous studies, Yashima (2002) applied the WTC model in EFL setting and concluded that motivation indirectly influenced L2 WTC.

Although Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model has been a dominant theory of motivation, it is not without its challenges in EFL contexts like Iran (Khajavy et al., 2016) and China (Peng & Woodrow, 2010). In fact, this criticism concerns the role of integrativness in the EFL learning context, where learners do not interact with the target language community but learn EFL in an academic setting. This concern has been reflected by Dörnyei (1990) that "foreign language learners often have not had enough contact with the target language community to form attitudes about them" (p. 69).

Following these criticisms, motivational studies focused on humanistic and cognitive aspects of motivation during the 1990s. One of the most dominant theories of this period was SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985) which assumed three innate psychological needs for human beings including autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy represents the sense of unpressured willingness to do an action, competence is the need for showing one's capacities, and relatedness is the need that a person feels he or she is connected with others. It is suggested that the degree of satisfaction with these needs leads to different types of motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

SDT was applied to L2 research by Noels, Pelletier, Clement, and Vallerand (2000). They examined the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in L2 learning. Intrinsic motivation refers to the desire to do something since it is interesting and pleasing. When learning itself is a goal, and students see the task interesting and challenging, they are intrinsically motivated. Extrinsic motivation refers to external factors, i.e., learning for instrumental aims (such as earning reward or avoiding punishment).

Previous studies (e.g., Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng & Woodrow, 2010) have used SDT as the motivational framework and concluded that motivation indirectly correlates with WTC. To date, several studies (e.g., Ghonsooly et al., 2012; MacIntyre & Charos, 1996; Peng, 2007) have investigated the effect of individual, affective, and situational factors on L2 WTC in ESL or EFL learning contexts, however, no study, to the best of our knowledge, has explored the relationship between L2 WTC and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation in Iranian EFL setting.

This study used L2 WTC model of MacIntyre et al. (1998) and SDT of Deci and Ryan (1985) as motivational framework and utilized a mixed-methods design to investigate the relationship between extrinsic/intrinsic motivation and L2 WTC in four skills among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. To this end, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Is there any correlation between Iranian EFL learners' extrinsic/intrinsic motivation and their reported WTC?

2. Do extrinsic and intrinsic motivation predict WTC differently?

3. Are Iranian learners of English driven more by extrinsic or intrinsic motivation?

4. Which factors influence Iranian intermediate learners' motivation and WTC in English as a foreign language?

5. To what extent are Iranian intermediate learners willing to read, listen, and write in English?

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

A total of 164 undergraduate Iranian university EFL learners in Ardabil, Urmia, and Astara participated in the present study including 72 females (43.90%), 87 male (53.04%) and five learners (3.04%) who did not disclose their gender. Their age ranged from 19 to 44 years ($M = 21.98$, $SD =$

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

2.89). Non–English major university learners were excluded because as it is asserted by Khajavy et al. (2016) "they do not develop a functional English proficiency, they do not have the chance to speak English in classrooms, and their English class time is limited to reading and vocabulary. Therefore, asking them about situations in which they speak English in the classroom would be irrelevant" (p. 162).

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Questionnaire

For the present study a 57-item questionnaire was developed by the second author. The questionnaire consisted of two sections including 38 items for measuring learners' L2 WTC and 19 items for measuring their extrinsic/intrinsic motivation. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability index yielded on the basis of the responses of the participants of the current study to the WTC and motivation sections were .89 and .82, respectively. Each section of the questionnaire is explained in detail below.

As noted earlier, most of the previous studies (e.g., Fallah, 2014; Yu, 2009) have employed questionnaires designed for ESL contexts but in this study, the items of L2 WTC questionnaire were on a par with EFL context. The questionnaire which was a 5-point Likert scale included 38 items. It consisted of 24 items adapted from Gol, Zand-Moghadam and Karrabi (2014), two items from MacIntyre et al. (2001), and two items from Weaver (2005). The items addressed seven underlying constructs of L2 WTC including classroom atmosphere, group size, topic of discussion, external pressure, teacher immediacy, learners' perceived self-efficiency, and learners' self-perceived communicative competence (Gol et al., 2014). Moreover, 10 items were developed by the authors to encompass another construct, i.e., communicative behavior, inclination to interact with specific people, the degree of the familiarity of interlocutors, the number of interlocutors, the level of formality, etc. (e.g., Khatibi & Zakeri, 2014; MacIntyre et al., 1998).

The second section of the questionnaire included 19 items to measure the subcomponents of intrinsic (i.e., knowledge, accomplishment, and stimulation) motivation (Vallerand, Blais, Briere, & Pelletier, 1989) and extrinsic (i.e., external, introjected, and identified regulation) motivation (Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, & Ryan, 1991) on a Likert scale. Totally, 13 items were adapted from Noels et al.'s (2000) questionnaire, and six items were added by the authors. Items encompassed three constructs: amotivation, extrinsic motivation, and intrinsic motivation (Noels, Clement, & Pelletier, 2001).

3.2.2. Interview

A seven-item structured open-ended interview was also designed to collect the qualitative data on learners' WTC and their motivation. Four questions were designed following Cetinkaya's (2005) study. The rest three researcher-developed interview questions were designed on the basis of the findings of previous studies (e.g., Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng & Woodrow, 2010) that addressed situational factors (e.g., teacher immediacy and classroom environment) as the most important factors that influence L2 WTC. The interview was run in L1 to remove any stress and anxiety. Learners' responses (i.e., their voices) were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed to identify the dominant type of motivation, to determine the degree of their L2 WTC, and to identify factors that affect their L2 WTC.

3.3. Pilot Study

To ensure reliability, the questionnaire and interview questions were piloted prior to the study by an expert in TEFL. Also, 15 intermediate TEFL learners, who were similar to the main group in terms of level of proficiency and the classroom atmosphere, were required to answer the questionnaire. Results of the pilot study showed that learners had no problem in understanding and answering both the interview and questionnaire items.

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

3.4. Procedure

Since learners' L2 WTC is contingent upon their level of proficiency (MacIntyre et al., 1998), prior to the study, a standard proficiency test appropriate for the intermediate level, i.e., Preliminary English Test (PET), was administered to assure their homogeneity. The test was comprised of reading, writing, listening, and speaking sections. The listening section was excluded due to practicality concerns. Therefore, the cut-off score was 52.50 and as such, the learners who got 45-55 were taken as intermediate learners and were recruited in this study.

A total of 133 learners (out of 164) passed the proficiency test. One week later, they received a 57-item questionnaire. The participants were ensured that their participation was entirely voluntary and their responses would be kept confidential. They answered the questionnaire in 10–15 min. Upon delivering the questionnaire, learners were interviewed individually in 5–10 min and their responses were audio recorded.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data collected from the questionnaire were entered into SPSS Version 22.0. Pearson correlation coefficient was run to find any possible significant correlation between learners' intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and their L2 WTC. In addition, a standard multiple regression was conducted to examine how well intrinsic and extrinsic motivation could predict L2 WTC, and how much variance in L2 WTC could be explained by them. Moreover, the qualitative data of the interview were analyzed following the procedure used by Cetinkaya (2005). She used the conventions of qualitative data (e.g., Miles & Huberman, 1994) in general and the meaning condensation method (Kvale, 1996) in particular to analyze the results of the interview. In the first step the interview data went through structuring, i.e., transcription, followed by omitting repetition and digression. In the second step, meaning condensation method was adopted to shorten the statements. Doing so "the lengthy interview transcript was reduced into briefer and concise formulations that were used to formulate assertions for each theme" (Cetinkaya, 2005, p. 54).

4. Results

4.1. Quantitative Results

The first research question intended to determine to what extent learners' extrinsic/intrinsic motivation was correlated with their WTC. Results of Pearson correlation coefficient revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between motivation and WTC, $r = 0.38$; $p < 0.01$.

According to Field (2005), the rubric for measuring the strength of significant correlations (effect size) is as follows; $r = 0.10$ indicates a small effect size, $r = 0.30$ shows medium effect size, and $r = 0.50$ suggests a large effect size. Following these guidelines, the correlation of L2 WTC and intrinsic motivation was judged to enjoy medium effect size, however, the correlation of L2 WTC and extrinsic motivation had small effect size.

The second research question aimed to identify which motivational orientation (i.e., extrinsic or intrinsic) can predict L2 WTC better. To compare the degree of contribution of each factor involved (i.e., intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation) to the prediction of the dependent variable (i.e., L2 WTC), and to identify the strength of the prediction, the Beta values of the standardized coefficients were utilized.

Table 1: Model Summary of Standard Multiple Regression

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.36	0.136	0.123	15.32

As shown in Table 1, 13.6% of the variance in total reported WTC was attributed to intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. The value of the Part correlation coefficient of each motivational type (i.e., intrinsic, extrinsic) indicated the contribution of them to the total R square (see Pallant, 2007). Moreover, squaring the Part correlation coefficient of each motivational type indicated the contribution of each variable to the total R square.

Table 2: Coefficients of the Standard Multiple Regression

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	Beta	Std.Error	Beta	T	Sig.	Lower	Upper	Zero- order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	66.37	6.23		10.65	.000	54.04	78.69					
Extrinsic	.18	.19	.085	.98	.325	-.18	.56	.19	.08	.080	.88	1.12
Intrinsic	1.52	.39	.331	3.83	.000	.73	2.30	.36	.31	.312	.88	1.12

Results (Table 2) showed that intrinsic motivation (Beta = .331) had a stronger contribution to predict and explain L2 WTC in comparison with extrinsic motivation (Beta = .085). As displayed in Table 2, intrinsic motivation made a statistically significant unique contribution to the prediction of L2 WTC, p = .000, while extrinsic motivation was identified as a variable that did not contribute to the prediction of L2 WTC, p = .325. Results of squaring this value revealed that intrinsic motivation uniquely explained 9.73% of the total variance in the reported L2 WTC. In fact, 9.73% of R2 would drop if intrinsic motivation was not included in the L2 WTC model. For extrinsic motivation, the Part correlation coefficient was 0.080, and turned into .0064 when it was squared which meant a unique contribution of 0.64% to the explanation of variance in L2 WTC. The third research question attempted to identify the dominant orientation of motivation among Iranian intermediate learners. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for L2 WTC, intrinsic, and extrinsic motivation. The mean and standard deviation of L2 WTC were found to be 92.54 and 16.36, respectively. Moreover, the mean and standard deviation of the intrinsic and extrinsic variables were M = 19.93, SD = 4.74 and M = 29.03, SD = 7.98, respectively.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for L2 WTC and Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation

Variables	N	M	SD
L2 WTC	133	92.54	16.36
Intrinsic Motivation	133	19.93	4.74
Extrinsic Motivation	133	29.03	7.98

As indicated in Table 3, the mean of extrinsic motivation was greater than intrinsic motivation. In order to identify whether the differences between the mean of the intrinsic group and extrinsic group were statistically significant, a paired-samples t-test was computed.

Table 4: Paired-samples *t*-test Results for Extrinsic/Intrinsic Motivation

	N	df	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Extrinsic/Intrinsic	133	29	5.395	.000

Results (Table 4) indicated that there was a significant difference between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, t = 5.39, p = .000, and extrinsic motivation was the dominant type of motivation among Iranian learners.

4.2. Interview Results

The fourth research question intended to elicit learners' perceptions of factors that influenced their L2 WTC and motivation. The first interview question (What is your main reason for learning English?) intended to identify the type of their motivation in learning English.

Table 5: The Responses of Learners to the First Question of the Interview

What is your main reason to learn English?	Number of Responses	%
I am interested in learning English.	40	30.07
It is an international language.	14	10.52
Since I am interested in English and it is also an international language.	22	16.54
Because of interest and for getting a better job or to teach English.	31	23.30
Because of both interest and having a good talent in learning English.	6	4.51
In order to get more familiar with foreign communities' culture.	10	7.51
For some other reasons such as being compelled by parents or my failure in being accepted in the desired field.	10	7.51

The results (Table 5) showed that participants had different reasons for learning English including personal interest (30.07%), considering it as a lingua franca (10.57%), both interest and considering it as a lingua franca (16.54%), and both interest and occupation opportunities (23.30%). About 4.51% pointed out that they were both interested and talented enough in learning English. Moreover, 7.51% of them reported that they learned English in order to get more familiar with foreign communities' culture. Last but not least, 7.51% stated that they learned English because they had not got a better choice.

An instance of the translation of demotivated learners' responses is provided below:

"This major was my last preference on the basis of my rank in the entrance examination."

Results indicated that most of the learners (92.49%) were motivated to learn English. However, few of them (7.51%) could be taken as demotivated learners. Scrutinizing learners' motivational tendencies demonstrated that 37.58% of the participants learned English because of some intrinsic motivation, 10.5% because of extrinsic motivation, and 44.35% for both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Meanwhile, 7.51% of the participants were identified as demotivated learners who learned English for some other reasons such as parents' pressure.

The second question asked learners' opinion about the role of the teachers' behavior in their L2 WTC. Around 71.42% of the learners believed that teacher immediacy had the main role in arousing their L2 WTC, and decreasing their anxiety. Moreover, 16.54% of the learners asserted

that teachers' supportive behavior and encouragement helped them feel more confident. An instance of the individuals' responses is provided below:

"The teacher's good behavior towards us and his/her insistence on the involvement of all learners are very interesting to me. But when he/she discriminates between class members, I get disappointed."

In addition, 6.76% of the learners considered teachers' behavior as a factor that partially influenced their L2 WTC. Furthermore, 5.26% of the participants believed that the teachers' behavior had little effect on their L2 WTC.

"In my opinion, attractive and up to date topics arouse more interest in students and urge them to participate."

In sum, the majority of the learners (87.96%) reported that teacher immediacy had too much influence on their L2 WTC, while only 12.02% believed that it didn't exert any influence on their L2 WTC.

The third interview question aimed to identify the factors that hinder learners' involvement and interaction. Results represented that being afraid of uttering ill-formed sentences, inaccurate pronunciation, as well as the teacher's and peers' judgment on their knowledge were among the most common reasons expressed by the learners (41.35%).

"I panic most of the time and worry about the teacher's feedback and classmates' judgments. Once I made a terrible error at the beginning of the semester and got embarrassed in front of my classmates. I decided not to talk anymore."

Moreover, 24.81% of the learners stated that there was no convenient atmosphere in the classroom.

"Sometimes the teacher pays attention to just highly proficient students who are the dominant group of the class."

In addition, some learners (14.28%) mentioned "not being prepared for the class discussion or unfamiliarity with the topic" as the important factors in decreasing their L2 WTC. Interestingly enough, 9.77% of the learners asserted that their silence is not due to poor proficiency in English, rather it is because they have no idea to share.

Meanwhile, 6.01% of the learners reported that usually when the topic is not interesting, they show no inclination to participate in class discussion. Furthermore, co-educational environment was identified as the least determining factor by the learners and only 3.75% of them claimed that it influenced their WTC.

"The co-ed classes make me feel stressed out and sensitive to the attitudes of the opposite sex towards me."

It was concluded that losing face in front of peers and teachers and their judgment were among the environmental factors that prevented communication. This factor is regarded as a combination of personal-trait and environment-oriented factors. In fact, low self-confidence and low proficiency level make learners worry more about the teacher's or classmates' feedback. The teacher's reluctance to involve reticent learners in communication, co-ed classes per se, boring topics and tasks, and not being prepared for the pre-determined topics of discussion in the class, are among the factors that can be detrimental to WTC. However, only a few number of the participants claimed that they did not have any problem in being involved in the class discussions, and the only reason of their silence was having no idea to share with the class.

The fourth interview question examined the influence of scoring on learners' L2 WTC. About 10.52% of the participants believed that scoring influenced their L2 WTC. One example of their utterances is:

"To be honest, scores are very important. Unfortunately, the score-centered system to which we are accustomed have urged us to study only for the sake of the exam and getting a good mark."

Furthermore, around 42.10% believed that scoring would influence their cooperation radically. Meanwhile, 24.06% of the learners rated it as a partially effective element. In addition, 23.30% of the participants took scoring as a less influential factor. Findings showed that more than half of the learners (52.62%) took scoring as an effective factor in their L2 WTC. It implies that more than half of the participants are extrinsically motivated learners who were under the influence of scoring. On the other hand, less than half of the learners (47.38%) downplayed the role of scoring in their studies.

Interestingly enough, 77.45% of the participants reported that they would communicate in the class even in the absence of scoring. However, just 22.55% of them claimed that they would give up their involvement as soon as they ensured that their taciturnity would not influence their score.

The last three interview questions examined learners' L2 WTC not only through oral communication but also through other modes of communication including WTW, WTR, and WTL. The fifth interview question addressed learners' WTR and WTL by asking about extensive reading or watching movies in their leisure time. Around 15.78% reported that they preferred just watching movies and 10.52% just listening to music, while 17.29% of the participants were eager to read stories, newspapers, and online news. In addition, 22.55% of the learners were involved in both watching movies and reading stories, newspapers, etc. Meanwhile, 24.81% of the learners preferred both watching movies and listening to music. Furthermore, a few learners (5.26%) stated that they were involved in all those activities. However, 3.75 % of the learners expressed that they didn't benefit from any extra-curricular activity.

In sum, the results indicated that half of the learners (51.11%) were more interested in listening activities. Among the remaining learners, 45.1% were willing to be engaged in both listening and reading activities. Almost all learners had positive attitudes towards using different media in developing L2.

The sixth question explored learners' communication in English with their friends either in face to face interaction (WTC) or texting in daily life (WTW) (e.g., via Short Message Service (SMS)). About 8.27% of the learners stated that they often used English as a medium of communication.

"Yes, my friends and I write in English. It has been a long time that I haven't used Persian in my writings."

About half of the participants (54.13%) claimed that sometimes they tended to use English for speaking or sending SMS, or chatting with their classmates via social networks such as Telegram. Nevertheless, most of them complained about the current communication condition and nagged that most of the time they did not have an appropriate partner to speak with or write for.

Moreover, 22.55% of the learners revealed that they rarely used English for communication. Furthermore, 15.03% of the participants stated that they never used English in their speech or writing. In fact, this question gauged learner's willingness to use two output-based skills including speaking and writing. Totally, results revealed that although more than half of the learners (62.40%) often used speaking or writing skills, less than half (37.58%) rarely or never were willing to deal with these output-based skills. It is worth noting that almost all of the participants (96.25%) were engaged in input-based skills.

The seventh question elicited learners' WTC and WTW in English with native-speakers (NSs). Almost all learners (95.50%) were eager to communicate with NSs or people whose L2 is English. Only few learners (4.50%) did not show WTC with them, and some of them argued that:

"I don't like that since it is really time-consuming."

"I have never been in such a situation and prefer to communicate with highly proficient EFL learners rather than NSs."

Just 51.96% of the learners who were eager to communicate with NSs or ESL communities had such an experience. On the other hand, 48.03% of them reported that they had not such an experience at all. Only 7.57% of the eager learners always had interacted with NSs or people whose L2 is English via chat or e-mail. Moreover, 27.27% of the eager participants had already experienced it.

"I used to keep in touch with some foreigners via chatting. I learned more about their culture, way of living, and even their spoken language."

The remaining percent (65.15%) were rarely engaged in these sorts of interaction. Findings of the last interview question demonstrated that while Iranian intermediate EFL learners were highly willing to communicate with NSs, the minority of them had already experienced it.

5. Discussion

The first research question examined the relationship between learners' L2 WTC and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation. Results revealed that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were positively correlated with the participants' L2 WTC, however, intrinsic motivation showed higher correlation with L2 WTC. In other words, the correlation of L2 WTC and intrinsic motivation had medium effect size, while that of L2 WTC and extrinsic motivation had small effect size.

Therefore, it can be argued that intrinsically motivated learners were more willing to communicate in English than extrinsically motivated ones. Results of previous studies (e.g., Cetinkaya, 2005; Ghonsooly et al., 2012; Khajavy et al., 2016; Peng & Woodrow, 2010; Yashima, 2002) have indicated that motivated learners were more competent and felt less anxious to communicate in English. According to Khajavy et al. (2016), "developing intrinsic motivation in language learners can increase their self-confidence, which in turn increases their willingness to communicate in English" (p. 175). Motivation and L2 WTC are intertwined variables in second language acquisition. Highly motivated learners do their best to learn which in turn results in improving their proficiency, increasing their confidence, and improving their WTC (Yashima, 2002).

These findings are in line with the results of Hashimoto (2002) and Fallah (2014) that concluded a positive relationship between motivation and L2 WTC in ESL/EFL contexts. However, they are contrary to that of MacIntyre and Charos (1996) and Mohammadian (2013) that found no relationship between motivation and L2 WTC. According to Peng (2007), "in an EFL context, motivation is an important impetus in stimulating learners to preserve in both L2 learning and possibly L2 communication" (p. 48). As presented in MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) model, motivational propensities included in the fourth layer influence WTC to a great extent. Therefore, there is a correlation between extrinsic/intrinsic motivation and L2 WTC.

The second research question investigated the prediction power of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on learners' L2 WTC. Results revealed that only intrinsic motivation predicted L2 WTC significantly. The findings lend support to the results of previous studies (e.g., Dörnyei & Csizer, 1998; Noels et al., 2000; Wu, 2003) which supported the effect of intrinsic motivation on L2 WTC. Khajavy et al. (2016) pointed out that "many studies have shown that motivation is an indirect predictor of WTC through communication confidence (Cetinkaya, 2005; Kim, 2004; Yashima, 2002). This implies that those students who had a higher level of autonomous motivation perceived themselves more competent and felt less anxious, and in turn were more willing to communicate in English" (p. 170). As a result, intrinsically motivated learners who are more self-determined would be regarded as more willing learners. Therefore, it seems logical to take intrinsic motivation as a powerful predictor of L2 WTC.

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

Results of the current study, however, are in contrast with Kreishan and Al-Dhaimat (2013) that did not find a significant correlation between intrinsic motivation and L2 achievement. As Peng (2007) rightly asserted "inconsistent findings may be attributed to the different participants involved and varying statistical techniques employed, which mandate further empirical research" (p. 39).

The third research question aimed to identify the type of motivation which was more dominant among Iranian EFL learners. Results showed that extrinsic motivation was the dominant type of motivation among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. This finding is in line with some previous studies (e.g., Dörnyei, 1990; Khajavy et al., 2016; Khodadady & Khajavy, 2013) that concluded EFL learners are inclined towards extrinsic motivation. According to Khajavy et al., "in EFL contexts like Iran where students do not need to speak English to meet their everyday life needs, learning English for communicative purposes did not seem very important. Even for English-major students, it is mainly a matter of passing the examinations, most of which are in a written form" (p. 171). Findings of the present study revealed that a large number of Iranian EFL learners were used to studying for the sake of passing the exam and getting a better score.

The fourth research question elicited participants' attitudes towards the factors that highly influenced their L2 WTC and motivation. The first interview question elicited the degree of learners' motivation to learn English. Results demonstrated that most learners were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to learn English. In fact, this finding is somehow different from the results of the questionnaire. According to the results of the interview, neither intrinsic motivation nor extrinsic motivation was identified as the dominant type of motivation among Iranian learners.

There are two possible explanations for such contradictory findings. On the one hand, as stated by Fallah (2014), in comparison with school students who primarily learn English to get higher scores in schools or in the university entrance examination, college students might be more cognizant of the aim of their language learning (which implies that college students might be less extrinsically motivated). On the other hand, participants of the present study were English majors who studied English not only out of intrinsic motivation, but they took English as an instrument for providing job opportunities for them.

The next interview question investigated learners' opinion about the role of teacher immediacy in their L2 WTC. Teacher immediacy, grounded in approach-avoidance theory, was originally put forward by Mehrabian (1971). This theory suggests that "people approach what they like and avoid what they don't like" (Mehrabian, 1981, p. 22). Teacher immediacy includes both verbal (e.g., the use of humor, encouraging students to talk, etc.) and nonverbal behavior (e.g., eye contact, smiling, the use of gestures, etc.) of the teacher in the class. Results of the study represented that the majority of the learners believed that the teacher had the main role in arousing their L2 WTC. They pointed out that the role of the teacher was crucial since s/he could alleviate students' anxiety which in turn can trigger their WTC. The participants declared that they had developed more interest in studying English and even tried hard to succeed and become more confident when their teacher acted as a supportive one and encouraged them in the class.

As mentioned by Fallah (2014), "it seems that by exhibiting immediacy behaviors, teachers can make the classroom environment engaging, supportive, and conducive to learning, thereby drawing the EFL learners into the learning process and boosting their motivation to learn English" (p. 144). In addition, Khajavy et al. (2016) argued that "teachers play an influential role in learners' behavior in the classroom. Not only does their teaching style and immediacy affect learners' engagement in the classroom, but teachers exert a major effect on the tasks, classroom atmosphere, students' motivation, topics, and pair/group work" (p. 172). Findings of the present study are in line with some previous studies which found a significant relationship between teacher immediacy and learners' L2 WTC in English (e.g., Gol et al., 2014; Hsu, 2005). Research to date has demonstrated that the learners' low WTC is not primarily because of anxiety, perceived competence, low self-confidence, and the lack of motivation; rather it is due to a stressful and uncomfortable environment

that the teacher unintentionally creates. Tension and lack of teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy can augment the fear of losing face in front of the teacher and peers. Consequently, learners would be descending into low WTC (Wen & Clement, 2003). This finding is on a par with the last layer of MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) model in which situational-oriented variables affect WTC more than personality-oriented ones.

The third interview question explored the factors that decreased learners' WTC. About half of the learners reported that the teacher's and peers' judgment and feedback on their speech were the main reason for their low WTC. Furthermore, being afraid of using inaccurate utterances and having mispronunciation were among the reasons that decreased their WTC. Moreover, some of the learners complained that there was no convenient atmosphere in their classroom to urge learner involvement. In addition, few learners argued that when the topic was not interesting, they were reluctant to participate in class discussion. Meanwhile, some others declared that when they were not prepared for the class discussion or lacked enough knowledge about the topic, they preferred to keep silent. Finally, the embarrassment that co-educational classes bring about was identified as the least factor that hindered communication.

These findings placed premium on situational factors, and suggested that the lack of enough social support can deteriorate WTC. MacIntyre et al. (2001) proposed social support as one of the variables which can influence learners' L2 WTC, and might come from several sources such as teachers, parents, and peers. Findings are in agreement with MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) model which proposed that L2 WTC is not a personality trait rather a situational factor that results in both enduring and transient influences. Intergroup climate, embedded in the Layer VI of MacIntyre et al.'s model, provides an opportunity in which social issues directly and personality indirectly can influence L2 WTC.

These results are in line with the findings of Peng and Woodrow (2010) which showed that classroom environment including teacher support (i.e., teacher's help, friendship, trust, interest), student cohesiveness (i.e., the extent to which students know, help, and support each other), and task orientation (the importance of completing activities and staying on the subject matter and the perceived usefulness of activities) predicted learners' L2 WTC. Moreover, their findings demonstrated that classroom environment also predicted learners' motivation and communication confidence. These findings are consistent with a study done in Iranian EFL context, in which Khajavy et al. (2016) found classroom environment as the strongest direct predictor of L2 WTC.

The forth interview question evaluated the influence of scoring on learners' class cooperation. Findings showed that more than half of the participants were considered as extrinsically motivated learners who were under the influence of scoring. These findings lend support to the results of the first research question of the present study, indicating that a great number of participants were extrinsically motivated. Also, they are on a par with qualitative results of Cetinkaya's (2005) study which demonstrated that Turkish college students were more extrinsically motivated to learn English. Interestingly enough, most of the learners of the current study promised that they would communicate in the class even in the absence of scoring. However, some of them stated that they would give up their participation knowing that their taciturnity would not have any repercussion. In fact, they were highly extrinsically motivated learners.

The last research question elicited the learners' WTC both in oral and written mode. The fifth interview question measured WTR and WTL by asking learners if they did extensive reading or watched movies in English in their leisure time. The results revealed that about half of the learners had zeal for listening activities (e.g., watching movies or listening to music). On the other hand, less than half preferred reading activities. It became vivid that almost all of the learners had positive attitudes toward using different media in fostering their L2.

Findings of the fifth interview question run contrary to the results of Cetinkaya (2005). This controversy might be attributed to different participants involved in two studies. Cetinkaya (2005) conducted her study on non-English major students, while participants of the current study were all

English major learners whose higher WTR or WTL in English seems quite reasonable. In WTR, anxiety, perceived confidence, and motivation are different from that of WTC (Khajavy & Ghonsooly, 2017). For instance, WTC anxiety cannot be the source of WTR anxiety (Saito, Garza, & Horwitz, 1999). Therefore, learners are expected to be high in WTR than WTC.

The sixth question elicited the degree of their WTC and WTW in English. Learners were asked how often they communicated with their friends in English either in face to face interaction or texting. About half of the learners declared that they sometimes tended to use English for sending SMS, or chatting with their classmates via social networks such as Telegram. Nevertheless, most of them complained that mostly they did not have an appropriate partner to speak with or write for. Among the other half of the learners, some of them reported that they rarely used English for communicating with others, and some others stated that they never used English in oral or written mode.

In fact, this question dealt with learner's willingness to use two output-based skills including speaking and writing, and compared it with the results of the fifth interview question which examined learners' willingness to input-based skills. It was concluded that learners preferred to be involved more in input-based skills than output-based ones. The main reason for such a finding, as asserted by most of the learners themselves, could be the lack of a proficient and cooperative partner which in turn could hinder learners' L2 WTC in the spoken or written mode.

MacIntyre et al. (2001) suggested that peer social support might be particularly helpful for language learners' authentic communication in the target language. In fact, similar to the third interview question, results of this question demonstrated that learners suffered from the lack of appropriate social support which in turn led to their reluctance to communicate in English. This finding is in line with Cetinkaya (2005) who found that Turkish learners were more willing to be involved in reading than speaking skill. She discussed that Turkish preparatory program was likely to hinder students' L2 WTC in English since it emphasized accuracy, English grammar, and reading more than oral English communication.

The last interview question addressed their WTC and WTW in English to communicate with NSs. Almost all learners were willing to communicate with NSs while just few of them preferred to interact with highly proficient EFL learners rather than NSs. However, only few of the eager learners have already been in contact with NSs via chat or e-mail. This finding is also in line with Cetinkaya (2005) who found that most of Turkish learners of English were willing to communicate with NSs. Meanwhile, the participants of the current study just like those of Cetinkaya, complained that they usually had a brief and limited exchange of information including their name, age, and nationality with NSs.

6. Conclusion and Implications

The current study investigated the relationship between L2 WTC and intrinsic/extrinsic motivation as a trait-like factor among Iranian English major learners. Results indicated that there was a positive and significant relation between motivation and L2 WTC; however, only intrinsic motivation had a significant effect on learners' L2 WTC. Results of the interview showed that situation-oriented factors such as teacher immediacy and teachers' and peers' judgment influenced learners' WTC to the great extent. This finding supports the last layer of MacIntyre et al.'s (1998) model where situational variables influence WTC more than personality factors. Furthermore, it was concluded that participants represented more WTL and WTW than WTR.

The first implication of the current study is that language teachers should enhance their students' intrinsic motivation to increase their L2 WTC in English classes. As Khodadady and Khajavy (2013) concluded, applying self-determined types of motivation can decrease their anxiety and in turn increase their WTC. Teachers should also provide learners with tasks that strengthen their intrinsic motivation (Dörnyei, 1994). For improving EFL learners' L2 WTC in English, teachers and administrators should be cognizant of individual and situational factors affecting

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

language learning especially speaking which is the most demanding of the four language skills. They should assist in enhancing EFL learners' motivation and their communication self-confidence, as well as reducing the amount of their anxiety (Fallah, 2014). Fallah suggested that contrary to face-to-face interaction, online interaction may increase EFL learners' L2 WTC by decreasing their anxiety and stress.

Furthermore, using verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy can reduce learners' anxiety in L2 communication. Some verbal teacher immediacy including praising learners' efforts, using humor in the class, encouraging students to talk, and the nonverbal behaviors such as smiling, nodding, and padding on the shoulder may increase learners' confidence in their communicative competence (Yu, 2009). The third implication of the present study is promoting cooperation among learners. Research has proposed that cooperation decreases learners' anxiety (Price, 1991) and creates the more enjoyable classroom environment (Olsen & Kagan, 1992). Like any study, the present study is not free from limitations. Since the participants were university learners, any generalization of the finding to other contexts such as private language institutes and high schools should be done with caution, so further research should be conducted in these settings.

Future studies are recommended to examine the effect of the proficiency level of EFL learners as a moderator variable on learners' L2 WTC. Besides, gender and age of the participants can also be regarded as other moderator variables. Moreover, as Fallah (2014) argued, effective variables are expected to vary not only across individuals but also through societies. Therefore, this study could be replicated in different EFL contexts among learners with different cultural, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

References

Alrabai, F. (2014). A model of foreign language anxiety in the Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching, 7*, 82–101.

Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2000). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning, 50*, 311–341.

Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). The role of gender and immersion in communication and second language orientations. *Language Learning, 53*, 65–96.

Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs, 43*, 60–69.

Cao, Y. (2011). Investigating situational willingness to communicate within second language classrooms from an ecological perspective. *System, 39*(4), 468–479.

Cao, Y., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System, 34,* 480–493.

Cetinkaya, Y. B. (2005). *Turkish college students' willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus.

Cheng, X. (2000). Asian students' reticence revisited. *System, 28,* 435–446.

Clement, R., Baker, S. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2003). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The effects of context, norms, and vitality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 22,* 190–209.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227–268.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation in education: The self-determination perspective. *The Educational Psychologist*, *26*, 352–346.

De Leger, D., & Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: Implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System, 37,* 269–285.

Dewaele, J. M., & Al-Saraj, T. M. (2015). Foreign language classroom anxiety of Arab learners of English: The effect of personality, linguistic and socio-biographical variables. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 5*, 205–208.

Dörnyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing motivation in foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 40*, 45–78.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78,* 266–272.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizer, K. (1998). Ten commandments for motivating language learners: Results of an empirical study. *Language Teaching Research, 2*(3), 203–229.

Fallah, N. (2014). Willingness to communicate in English, communication self-confidence, motivation, shyness and teacher immediacy among Iranian English-major undergraduates: A structural equation modeling approach. *Learning and Individual Differences, 30,* 140–147.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (2nd ed.).* London: SAGE Publications.

Freiermuth, M., & Jarrell, D. (2006). Willingness to communicate: Can online chat help? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 16(2),* 189–212.

Fushino, K. (2010). Causal relationships between communication confidence, beliefs about group work, and willingness to communicate in foreign language group work. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44(4),* 700–724.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The roles of attitudes and motivation.* London: Edward Arnold.

Ghonsooly, B., Khajavy, G. H., & Asadpour, S. F. (2012). Willingness to communicate in English among Iranian non–English major university students. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 31,*197–211.

Gol, M., Zand-Moghadam, A., & Karrabi, M. (2014). The construct of willingness to communicate and its relationship with EFL learners' perceived verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT), 3,* 135–160.

Halupka-Rešetar, S., Knežević, L., & Topalov, J. (2018). Revisiting willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language: The Serbian perspective. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, X,* XX–XX.

Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2 use: The Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies, 20,* 29–70.

Hsu, L. L. (2005). *The relationship among teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' willingness to speak in English in central Taiwanese college classrooms* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

Hüseyin, Ö, Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Willingness to communicate of EFL learners in Turkish context. *Learning and Individual Differences, 37*, 269–275.

Jamalifar, G., & Salehi, H. (2017). The effects of rehearsal and strategic task planning on L2 willingness to communicate. *The Language Learning Journal, DOI: 10.1080/09571736.*

Khajavy, G. H., & Ghonsooly, B. (2017). Predictors of willingness to read in English: Testing a model based on possible selves and self-confidence. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *38*(10), 871–885.

Khajavy, G. H., Ghonsooly, B., Hosseini Fatemi, A., & Choi, C. W. (2016). Willingness to communicate in English: A micro-system model in the Iranian EFL classroom context. *TESOL Quarterly, 50(1),* 154–180.

Khatibi, M. B., & Zakeri, J. (2014). Iranian EFL learners' WTC across different context- and receiver-types. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 932–939.

Khodadady, E., & Khajavy, G. H. (2013). Exploring the role of anxiety and motivation in foreign language achievement: A structural equation modeling approach. *Porta Linguarum, 20,* 269–286.

Kim, S. J. (2004). *Exploring willingness to communicate (WTC) in English among Korean EFL (English as a foreign language) students in Korea: WTC as a predictor of success in second language acquisition* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Kreishan, L. J., & Al-Dhaimat, Y. (2013). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, orientation and achievements in L2 of Arab learners of English, French and German: A study from Jordan. *International Education Studies, 6,* 52–63.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Liu, M. (2018). Bilingual/multilingual learners' willingness to communicate in and anxiety on speaking Chinese and their associations with self-rated proficiency in Chinese. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(1), 54–69.

Liu, M, & Jackson, J. (2011). Reticence and anxiety in oral English lessons: A case study in Mainland China. In L. Jin & M. Cortazzi (Eds.), *Researching Chinese learners: Skills, perceptions, and intercultural adaptation* (pp.119–137). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lockley, T. (2013). Exploring self-perceived communication competence in foreign language learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 3*(2), 187–212.

MacIntyre, P. D., Babin, P. A., & Clément, R. (1999). Willingness to communicate: Antecedents and consequences. *Communication Quarterly, 47,* 215–229.

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 23,* 369–388.

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. A. (2002). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students. *Language Learning, 52,* 537–564.

MacIntyre, P. D., Burns, C., & Jessome, A. (2011). Ambivalence about communicating in a second language: A qualitative study of French immersion students' willingness to communicate. *Modern Language Journal, 95,* 81–96.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Charos, C. (1996). Personality, attitudes, and affect as predictors of second language communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 15,* 3–26.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 545–562.

Mady, C. & Arnott, S. (2010). Exploring the "situation" of situational willingness to communicate: A volunteer youth exchange perspective. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 1–26.

Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System*, *32*(1), 21–36.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1982). Communication apprehension and shyness: Conceptual and operational distinctions. *Central States Speech Journal, 33*, 458–468.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate and interpersonal communication. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129–159). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Verbal and nonverbal interaction of strangers in a waiting situation. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 5,* 127–138.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitude* (2nd edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mehrgan, K. (2013). Willingness to communicate in second language acquisition: A case study from a socio-affective perspective. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture, 2*(4), 172–175.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mohammadian, T. (2013). The effect of shyness on Iranian EFL learner's language learning motivation and willingness to communicate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3(11),* 2036–2045.

Mortensen, C., Arnston, P., & Lustig, M. (1977). The measurement of verbal predispositions: Scale development and application. *Human Communication Research, 3,* 146–158.

Noels, K. A., Clement, R., & Pelletier, L. (2001). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and integrative orientations of French Canadian learners of English. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 424–442.

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes   ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

Noels, K. A., Pelletier, L. G., Clement, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (2000). Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory. *Language Learning, 50,* 57–85.

Olsen, R., & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's response book* (pp. 1–30). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual.* Hawaii: Open University Press.

Peng, J. (2007). Willingness to communicate in an L2 and integrative motivation among college students in an intensive English language program in China. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 2,* 33–59.

Peng, J. (2015). L2 motivational self-system, attitudes, and affects as predictors of L2 WTC: An imagined community perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 24*(2), 433–443.

Peng, J., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning, 60,* 834–876.

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Price, M. L. (1991). The subjective experience of foreign language anxiety: Interviews with highly anxious students. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications* (pp. 101–108). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reid, K. T., & Trofimovich, P. (2018). Exploring the influence of community volunteerism on adult L2 learners' willingness to communicate. *System, 74*, 73–86.

Riasati, M. J. (2014). Causes of reticence: Encouraging willingness to speak in language classrooms. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 3*(1), 115–122.

Saito, Y., Garza, T. J., & Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern language Journal, 83*, 202–218.

Vallerand, R. J., Blais, M. R., Briere, N. M., & Pelletier, L. G. (1989). Construction et validation de l'&helle de Motivation en fklucation [Construction and validation of the Academic Motivation Scale]. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement*, *21*, 323–349.

Vatankhah, M., & Tanbakooei, N. (2014). The role of social support on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation among Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 1912–1918.

Vongsila, V., & Reinders, H. (2016). Making Asian learners talk: Encouraging willingness to communicate. *RELC Journal, 47*(3), 331–347.

Weaver, C. (2005). Using the Rasch model to develop a measure of second language learners' willingness to communicate within a language classroom. *Journal of Applied Measurement, 6(4),* 396–415.

Wen, W. P., & Clement, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 16*, 18–38.

Wu, X. (2003). Intrinsic motivation and young language learners: The impact of the classroom environment. *System, 31*, 501–517.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal, 86,* 54–66.

Yu, M. (2009). *Willingness to communicate of foreign language learners in a Chinese setting* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Zhong, Q. M. (2013). Understanding Chinese learners' willingness to communicate in a New Zealand ESL classroom: A multiple case study drawing on the theory of planned behavior. *System, 41*(3), 740–751.

Zarrinabdi, N., & Abdi, R. (2011). Willingness to communicate and language learning orientations in Iranian EFL context. *International Education Studies, 4*(4), 206–214.

Zarrinabdi, N., Ketabi, S., & Tavakoli, M. (2017). Using a person-centered future time perspective intervention to enhance EFL Learners' willingness to communicate. *RELC Journal. DOI: org/10.1177/0033688217716536.*

Zarrinabadi, N., & Tanbakooei, N. (2016). Willingness to communicate: Rise, development and some future directions. *Language and Linguistics Compass,* 10(1), 30–45.

Appendices

Appendix A: The questionnaire

Nickname: Gender: Male □ Female □ Age: ……

در جدول زیر ۳۸ جمله گنجانده شده است که شرایطی را توصیف می‌کند که ممکن است تمایل شما به صحبت کردن به زبان انگلیسی را تحت تاثیر قرار بدهد. در مقابل هر جمله گزینه‌های ۴-۰ وجود دارد که میزان تمایل شما را نشان می‌دهد. لطفا جواب مورد نظر خود را با کشیدن علامت دایره به دور آن مشخص کنید. پاسخهای شما به این پرسش‌نامه کاملا محرمانه خواهد بود و در اختیار فرد دیگری قرار نخواهد گرفت. باتشکر

۰ = هیچ وقت، ۱ = به ندرت، ۲ = گاهی اوقات، ۳ = اغلب اوقات، ۴ = تقریبا همیشه

توجه: لطفا اگر موارد و شرایطی دیگری وجود دارد که در این پرسش‌نامه ذکرنشده است آن را درجای خالی که در پایان قسمت اول پرسش‌نامه تعیین شده است، بنویسید.

	I'm willing to talk in English when…	**Never**	**Rarely**	**Sometimes**	**Often**	**Almost always**
1	the class is engaged in an open discussion.	0	1	2	3	4
2	I am in a small group in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
3	the topic is interesting.	0	1	2	3	4
4	my views differ from my classmates' views.	0	1	2	3	4
5	I am sitting in the back of the class.	0	1	2	3	4
6	I am prepared for the class.	0	1	2	3	4
7	there is no final exam and the score will be given on the basis of our involvement in discussions.	0	1	2	3	4
8	the class is engaged in a heated discussion.	0	1	2	3	4
9	I am familiar with the topic.	0	1	2	3	4
10	an assignment is being discussed.	0	1	2	3	4
11	no one else is talking.	0	1	2	3	4
12	I am sitting in front of the class.	0	1	2	3	4
13	my views differ from the teacher's views.	0	1	2	3	4
14	I am angry about the topic.	0	1	2	3	4
15	I know the correct answer.	0	1	2	3	4
16	I can really help clarify the discussion.	0	1	2	3	4
17	I volunteer an answer to the teacher's question in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
18	I'm called upon by the teacher to answer a question in English.	0	1	2	3	4
19	I talk to my teacher before or after the class.	0	1	2	3	4
20	I ask the teacher a question in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
21	I ask the teacher a question in private.	0	1	2	3	4
22	I give my opinions in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
23	I participate in pair group activities in the class.	0	1	2	3	4

Chabahar Maritime University

Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes ISSN: 2476-3187
IJEAP, (2018) Vol. 7 Issue. 1   (Previously Published under the Title: Maritime English Journal)

24	I help others answer a question.	0	1	2	3	4
25	I give a lecture in the class while I can use (and look at) some prepared notes.	0	1	2	3	4
26	I chat with my classmates out of the class via some social network tools such as Skype, Telegram…	0	1	2	3	4
27	I ask the teacher to repeat her/his explanation when I do not understand it.	0	1	2	3	4
28	I am supposed to do a role-play standing in front of the class in English (e.g., ordering food in a restaurant).	0	1	2	3	4
29	I am supposed to speak English in front of the class.	0	1	2	3	4
30	a stranger attends our class.	0	1	2	3	4
31	I agree with the topic.	0	1	2	3	4
32	I talk with my friends in the class.	0	1	2	3	4
33	I talk with my friends outside the class.	0	1	2	3	4
34	I talk with my friends on the phone.	0	1	2	3	4
35	I attend in a co-educational class (i.e., both girls and boys are my classmates).	0	1	2	3	4
36	my teacher is very young since I would have less stress with such a teacher.	0	1	2	3	4
37	the teacher is of the opposite sex (i.e., gender).	0	1	2	3	4
38	classes are held in good time of the day, I mean not at 8 a.m., 2 p.m., or late in the evening.	0	1	2	3	4

I'm willing to talk in English when ………………………………….

در جدول زیر 19 جمله وجود دارد که بیانگر هدف یادگیری زبان انگلیسی می‌باشد. در مقابل هر مورد، گزینه‌های ۴-۰ وجود دارد. لطفا جواب مورد نظر خود را با کشیدن علامت دایره به دور آن مشخص کنید.

۰ = هیچ وقت،   ۱ = به ندرت، ۲ = گاهی اوقات، ۳ = اغلب اوقات، ۴ = تقریبا همیشه

توجه: لطفا اگر موارد و شرایطی دیگری وجود دارد که در این پرسش‌نامه ذکرنشده است آن را درجای خالی که در پایان این پرسش‌نامه وجود دارد بیان نمایید.

No	Item **I learn English…………**	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost always
1	for the pleasure that I experience in knowing more about the literature of the foreign language.	0	1	2	3	4
2	for the satisfaction I get in finding out new things.	0	1	2	3	4
3	because I enjoy the feeling of acquiring knowledge about the foreign language community and their way of life.	0	1	2	3	4
4	but I think I really waste my time.	0	1	2	3	4
5	but I don't know why.	0	1	2	3	4
6	because I would feel ashamed in front of my friends if I didn't know English as an international language.	0	1	2	3	4
7	to show my ability to others.	0	1	2	3	4
8	for the enjoyment I experience when I understand a difficult construct in the foreign language.	0	1	2	3	4
9	because I will feel proud if I can speak English.	0	1	2	3	4
10	for the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult exercises in the foreign language.	0	1	2	3	4
11	for the pleasure I experience when I make progress in my foreign language studies.	0	1	2	3	4
12	because I choose to be the kind of person who can speak more than one language.	0	1	2	3	4
13	because I can take a trip to every country that I like.	0	1	2	3	4
14	in order to get a more prestigious job later on.	0	1	2	3	4
15	in order to have a better salary later on.	0	1	2	3	4
16	because I think it is good for my personal development.	0	1	2	3	4
17	because it is a required course.	0	1	2	3	4
18	because it can help me search the Internet easily.	0	1	2	3	4
19	to live abroad easily.	0	1	2	3	4

I learn English……………………………………………………....................

Appendix B: Interview Question (in English)

1. What is your main reason for learning English?
2. How much does teacher's good behavior (teacher immediacy) affect your L2 WTC?
3. What factors hinder your communication? (For example, the teacher or classmates' judgment, fear of using wrong sentences or incorrect pronunciation…)

4. A) How much does assessment influence your learning and willingness to communicate in the class? B) If there was no grading and assessment, will you participate?

5. In addition to your textbooks, do you benefit from further reading or other activities to improve your English proficiency? (Such as English storybooks, watching authentic movies, reading English newspapers or magazines, reading or listening online news).

6. How much do you use English to communicate with your friends through face-to-face interaction, on the phone, or via SMS?

7. A) Would you like to use English in order to speak and chat with English native speakers or people whose second language is English? B) Have you ever had such an experience? C) How much have you been involved in such affairs?

Appendix C: Interview Questions (in Persian)

۱. دلیل اصلی‌تان برای یادگیری زبان انگلیسی چیست؟

۲. به نظر شما تا چه حد رابطه خوب معلم با شما در تمایل‌تان به بیشتر صحبت کردن در کلاس تاثیرگذار است؟

۳. به نظر شما تا چه حد رابطه خوب همکلاسی‌هایتان با شما در تمایل‌تان به بیشتر صحبت کردن در کلاس تاثیرگذار است؟

۴. چه موانعی بطور کلی مانع مشارکت و صحبت کردن شما در کلاس می‌شود؟ (مثلا قضاوت همکلاسی‌ها یا معلم، ترس از به کار بردن جملات غلط یا تلفظ غلط ...)

۵. علاوه بر کتاب‌های درسی انگلیسی مطالعه آزاد یا فعالیت‌های دیگری دارید که به ارتقا سطح زبان انگلیسی شما کمک کند؟ (مانند مطالعه‌ی داستان‌های انگلیسی، تماشای فیلم‌های زبان‌اصلی، خواندن روزنامه‌ها و مجلات انگلیسی، خواندن یا شنیدن اخبار روز به انگلیسی وبه طور آنلاین از طریق اینترنت...)

۶. آیا از زبان انگلیسی برای صحبت کردن رودر رو یا تلفنی یا اس ام اس با دوستان‌تان استفاده می‌کنید؟

۷. ایا تمایل دارید از زبان انگلیسی برای صحبت کردن و چت کردن با افراد خارجی که زبان انگلیسی زبان‌اصلی یا زبان دوم آنها محسوب می‌شود استفاده کنید؟ آیا چنین تجربه‌ای دارید؟ چه میزان به این امر مشغول بوده یا هستید؟