Language Art, 6(3): pp.69-82, 2021, Shiraz, Iran
DOI: 10.22046/LA.2021.17 DOR:
*Article No.: 63.51.140005.6982*

## ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

# Association between Iranian EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate, Self-monitoring, and Task-based Speech

**Masoud Saeedi**[1]
Assistant Professor of English Language Teaching, Department of English Language and Literature, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

(Received: 06 March 2021; Accepted: 17 July 2021; Published: 1 September 2021)

This study sought to investigate the relationship among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' ratings of willingness to communicate (WTC) in English and their task-based speech production and self-monitoring behavior. To accomplish this objective, methodological triangulation was adopted using a questionnaire, stimulated recall data, and quantitative measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). Two questions guided the study: (1) how learners' ratings of their WTC related to the CAF of their oral output, and (2) how learners' ratings of their WTC related to the frequency and type of their self-corrections in terms of A-, D-, and E-repairs. Fifty Iranian intermediate EFL learners participated in the study. WTC scale was used to measure the participants' perception of their desire to initiate communication in English. In addition, to collect samples of their L2 speech, they were asked to perform a narrative task. Following their task performance, participants were asked to retrospectively comment on the type of error correction they engaged in while performing the task. The results showed the positive correlation coefficients among learners' perceptions of their WTC and measures of fluency, A- and D-repairs to be statistically significant. The WTC also negatively correlated with accuracy and E-repairs. In the end, the theoretical as well as practical implications of the results for instructed L2 acquisition were discussed.

***Keywords***: Accuracy, Complexity, Fluency, Self-Repair, Task, Willingness to Communicate.

[1] E-mail: saeedi.tefl@gmail.com

**Introduction**

Developing the ability to use language not only accurately but also fluently and appropriately makes speaking in an L2 demanding for many foreign language learners. For this reason, in order to develop communicatively competent L2 speakers, it is essential to investigate factors contributing to speaking proficiency, its underlying components, and specific skills and strategies employed when handling a wide range of communicative events (Shumin, 2003). From among the host of factors influencing different dimensions of L2 speech, the type of communicative task language learners perform, along with its implementation conditions and design features, have been documented to exert differential effects on complexity, accuracy, and fluency, with the effects for task condition being more significant and consistent (Skehan, 2016). It has also been demonstrated that such individual characteristics as working memory capacity and speaking style (i.e., fluency-centered vs. accuracy-centered styles) differentially impact language learners' speech production and monitoring behavior (Ahmadian, 2012; Kormos, 1999). To contribute to available research evidence regarding the relationship between individual variables and linguistic quality of L2 speech, the present research aimed to examine the way individual differences related to willingness to communicate in an L2 could correlate with the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of Iranian EFL learners' oral output. Below, the variables of the study are briefly introduced with reference to the related theoretical framework and research findings.

**Literature Review**

*1. Willingness to Communicate*

Developed by McCroskey and Baer (1985), the construct of Willingness to Communicate (WTC) was originally an attempt to capture variation in first language. The term was conceived of as the probability of initiating communication when the speaker is given the choice (McCroskey and Richmond, 1982). It was later applied to L2 contexts in Canada (MacIntyre and Charos, 1996). In this context, WTC refers to a readiness to initiate discourse with specific person(s) at a particular time, using an L2 (MacIntyre et al., 1998). WTC has been an important issue in the field of second language acquisition (SLA). This importance is due to the centrality of interaction and communication in the communicative approach to language teaching. An approach which, according to Gass (2003), is premised upon the assumption that L2 learners' active and meaningful interaction is key to developing proficiency. The importance of interactive language use has also been echoed by Skehan (1989) who highlighted the necessity of talking in an L2 as the key to successful learning.WTC is shown to be an important predictor of the amount of interaction in L2 (Clément, Baker, and MacIntyre, 2003). It is argued that raising learners' WTC can make them more active and more likely to engage in authentic use of L2. A high level of WTC contributes to autonomous learning in that it galvanizes them to use the target language both inside and outside the classroom (Kang, 2005).

According to Dornyei (2005), WTC in L2 is understood as both a personality trait and a situational construct. The trait-like view conceptualizes WTC as one's intention to begin communication when having the choice to do so. From this

perspective, WTC is a personality-based tendency which does not vary in diverse situations (McCroskey and Baer, 1985; McCroskey and Richmond, 1982). The view of WTC as a trait has inspired some studies on the effect of individual variables on this construct. The findings have indicated that such individual differences as self-perceived communication competence and communication apprehension strongly correlate with WTC. Researchers have also shown that WTC is impacted by factors such as immersion experience, motivation, self-confidence, international posture, gender, and age (see Zarrinanbadi and Tanbakooei, 2016, for a full review).

On the other hand, WTC as a situational construct suggests that an individual's WTC is not stable and varies in accordance with situational factors. In this connection, MacIntyre et al. (1998, 547) define WTC as "a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with specific person or persons, using an L2". MacIntyre et al. developed the concept of WTC into a framework incorporating a set of variables. In this scheme, WTC in an L2 is an outcome of the interaction between diverse enduring (trait) and situated (state) individual variables. In general terms, the model was proposed to account for the observation that despite their low level of proficiency, some learners willingly communicate in L2 while some more proficient ones avoid doing so. Research guided by this framework focused on those situation-specific variables that may exert an influence on WTC in L2. It is argued that the trait-like and situational views of WTC are complementary such that trait-like WTC prompts learners to place themselves in communicative situations and their decision as to initiate communication is influenced by situational WTC (Cao, 2011; MacIntyre, Babin, and Clément, 1999, cited in Zarrinabadi, 2014).

As was briefly alluded to above, past research has investigated WTC from different perspectives, identifying various psychological variables which interrelate and influence the learners' stable or trait-like tendency to communicate in an L2, as well as the situated nature of WTC. Yet, to date no published work has addressed the possible contribution this variable might make to learners' performance in the context of meaningful language use.

*2. Dimensions of task-based second language production*

Over the last few decades, L2 learners' task-based performance has been examined from different perspectives. An increasing amount of research has studied the influence of task implementation options (e.g., Bygate, 2001; Stroud, 2019; Saeedi, 2020; Yuan and Ellis, 2003), task design options (Tavakoli, 2009, Tavakoli and Foster, 2008), and individual variables (e.g., Kormos, 1999; Mojavezi and Ahmadian, 2014) on the linguistic quality of performance with respect to measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (see Suzuki and Kormos, 2019, for an updated review). In task-based literature, complexity broadly refers to the degree to which learners' language knowledge is elaborated while accuracy has to do with how compatible the language use is with some norms and fluency implies how automatic the user is in language use. The operational definitions of these aspects of L2 speech will be provided in the related section below.

Examining the effects of the above mentioned variables on the CAF triad has been mostly motivated by and accounted for in terms of two prevalent vantage points, namely, Skehan's (1998) Trade-off Hypothesis and Robinson's (2001)

Cognition Hypothesis. Based on the limited-capacity view of attentional resources, Skehan argues that it is not possible to simultaneously channel learners' attention towards aspects of form and meaning. Accordingly, Skehan argues that "trade-off" is involved whereby focusing on aspects of form, e.g., accuracy, brings about detrimental effects on meaning-based facets of L2 production like fluency. Contrary to Skehan, Robinson maintains that as human's attentional capacity comprises multiple pools, cognitive demands of L2 tasks can be manipulated in such a way as to channel attention to both meaning and form. For example, he assumes, by providing planning time before performing a task which involves context supported recounting of events referring to here and now (as opposed to there and then), task designers can foster an optimum condition where learners' attention is simultaneously allocated to complexity as well as accuracy of L2 output.

Though investigating task-based performance in terms of aspects of linguistic products has been a lively line of work and has yielded valuable findings, issues regarding the validity of such outcomes have been raised. To address such concerns, some task-based studies have coupled quantitative analyses of speech with qualitative methods (e.g., analyzing self-monitoring behavior) to examine not only the product but also the process of task-based L2 speech mechanism. In the following section, self-correction behavior as the psycholinguistic process underlying speech production is elaborated.

*3. Self-repairs in Second Language*

A frequently observed feature of L2 learners' speech production is a sudden pause in their speech segment in order to change or repair the content of the output. This manifestation of the speech monitoring process has been defined as "problem-solving mechanisms related to perceived deficiencies in one's own production" (Gilabert 2007, 219). On the basis of qualitative analysis of language learners' retrospective comments, Kormos (1999) developed a comprehensive taxonomy of self-repairs incorporating the following (illustrative examples are the English translations of participants' retrospective comments [RC] in Persian regarding their self-corrections):

- Different information (D-) repair: involves speakers' changing the inappropriate information, the order, or totally abandoning the message.

Example: **Two children are getting ready**, eh…, well, **in the morning** two children are getting ready**.**

RC (translated into English): Here I wanted to begin the story by saying what the kids were doing but then I realized that they were doing so in the morning because I saw they were preparing breakfast.

- Appropriacy (A-) repair: is effectuated when the speaker produces the originally intended idea in a modified form for perceived inaccuracy and information ambiguity, incoherent terminology, unsophisticated language, and pragmatically inappropriate language.

Example: The boy and a girl are getting ready to go to **park**, emmm, **a picnic**

RC: What happened here was that I thought they were going on a picnic not the park, because I saw cows in the picture.

- Error (E-) repair: consists of lexical repair, grammatical repair, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

Example: The dog actually **eat**,…er, **eats** their food

RC: Here I realized that it is incorrect to use the word eat for the dog, because there was only one dog in the basket.

The issue of self-corrections has often been discussed along with Levelt's (1989) speech production model which depicts the process in terms of three processes of conceptualization, formulization, and articulation. In brief, the conceptualization stage involves generating and encoding the intended message into a conceptual plan. In the formulation stage, the required linguistic form for the expression of the intended preverbal message is encoded. Finally, the articulation results in actual production of the encoded message in stream of speech. Levelt also assumes that the linguistic output is monitored at conceptual, pre-articulatory, and post-articulatory levels (Levelt, 1989). The conceptual loop checks the match between pre-verbal message and communicative intentions. The pre-articulatory loop identifies encoding errors before articulating the message, and the external loop monitors overt speech for communicative appropriateness and grammaticality.

As was pointed out earlier, due to limitations in their cognitive resources, learners cannot simultaneously focus their attention to aspects of form and meaning with the result that focusing on form (i.e., accuracy) makes for negative effects on the meaning-based dimension (i.e., fluency). To provide a psycholinguistically valid account of the nature of trade-offs involved in the process of L2 speech production, Ahmadian, Abdolrezapour, and Ketabi (2012) built on Skehan's (1998) Trade-off Hypothesis and proposed their "Extended trade-off" Hypothesis. Based on this hypothesis, the nature of L2 performance trade-offs involves not only the linguistic measures of complexity, accuracy, and fluency, but also the conceptual, pre-articulatory, and external loops of monitoring. In addition, they hypothesize, trade-off involves the amount of attention devoted to using E-repairs on the one hand, and D- and A-repairs on the other.

In the light of the issues alluded to above, this research sought to examine whether and how L2 learners' ratings of their WTC is related to the linguistic quality of their speech and its underlying psycholinguistic mechanism of self-corrections. The study was guided by the following research questions:

RQ1: Is there any relationship between EFL learners' ratings of WTC and their task-based performance as measured by its complexity, accuracy, and fluency?

RQ2: Is there any relationship between EFL learners' ratings of WTC and the frequency and type of self-repairs they make?

**Method**

**1. Participants**

The study involved 50 EFL learners from a language Institute in Isfahan, Iran. The sample included both male and female intermediate learners with the age range of 16 to 24. The learners were fairly homogenous in terms of their educational background. To make sure of their homogeneity regarding their English proficiency, they were given the grammar section of the Oxford placement test (OPT). The

participants volunteered to take part in the study and were required to sign the written consent form.

**2. Procedure**

To elicit their speech samples, the participants were asked to carry out a narrative task which involved retelling a story based on a sequenced set of pictures. The picture story used was fairly easy to unravel and understand displaying an interesting episode. The researcher met each participant in a room, told him/her what the purpose of the task was, and gave him/her 50 seconds to look at the picture series before telling the story in three to four minutes. These measures were taken to control for the possible effects of planning time on their output. The participants were notified that their production would be recorded.

To analyze their performance in terms of the CAF, each learner's speech was transcribed by the researcher. To ensure reliability, 10% of the total transcriptions were rated by an experienced assistant yielding an inter-rater reliability coefficient of 0.92 which confirms the reliable transcription procedure followed. The complexity, accuracy, and fluency measures were operationally defined as follows:

*Complexity.* Syntactic complexity (amount of subordination): the ratio of clauses to AS units in participants' production. Foster et al. (2000, 365) define an AS unit as "a single speaker's utterance consisting of an independent clause, or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with either". The following examples, cited from Foster et al. (2000, 366), exemplify AS units and associated clauses:

[I have no opportunity to visit] (one clause, one AS unit)

[It is my hope / to study crop protection] (two clauses, one AS unit)

*Accuracy.* Percentage of error-free clauses was employed to evaluate global accuracy. As such, all syntactic, morphological, and lexical errors were taken into account.

*Fluency.* To measure the oral fluency, the number of syllables produced per minute of speech was considered. That is, the number of syllables within each narrative was calculated and divided by the total number of seconds to complete the task and multiplied by 60.

As was mentioned above, in order to obtain more valid data, the researcher used methodological triangulation to complement quantitative analysis with qualitative protocol analysis. In doing so, having performed the task, each participant attended a retrospective interview in her L1 (Persian) with a five-minute time interval during which she was provided with instructions on how to perform verbal reports. The interview involved asking learners to listen to their recorded speech, try to recall, and indicate the problems they had encountered while performing the task. The researcher paused participants' audio-recorded speech, and whenever he noticed an instance of self-repairs asked them to vocalize what they were thinking or why they stopped speaking at that particular moment.

To date, quantitative, qualitative, and mixed analytical methods have been applied to investigate L2 WTC. Given the correlational design of the study, it was decided to measure participants' WTC by means of a quantitative approach using a questionnaire which enables us to examine the association among WTC and other

variables (Zarrinabadi and Tanbakooei, 2016). In doing so, a modified version of the Likert-type questionnaire developed by MacIntyre, et al. (2001) was employed. The scale comprised 27 items ranging from 1 to 5 (1 indicating almost never willing, 2 indicating sometimes willing, 3 indicating willing half of the time, 4 indicating usually willing, and 5 indicating almost always willing). The items elicited participants' ratings regarding their tendency to communicate during the class tasks in all four skills. MacIntyre et al. (2001) established the reliability and validity of this scale. The estimated alpha reliability index in the present study was .82.

**3 Data Analysis**

Having collected the data, the SPSS was used to calculate descriptive statistics. Also, Pearson correlation was run to estimate and establish the statistical significance of the correlation coefficients among WTC, complexity, accuracy, fluency, E-, D-, and A-repairs. The results of the analyses are presented below.

**Results**

This study explored the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' WTC, their task-based performance, and self-monitoring. The descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients concerning the variables of the study are reported in tables 1 and 2.

**Table1**. *Descriptive statistics: WTC, complexity, accuracy, fluency, E-repairs, A-repairs, D-repairs*

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Complexity** | 1.01 | 1.09 | 1.054 | 0.025 |
| **Accuracy** | 24.33 | 31.44 | 27.88 | 1.72 |
| **Fluency** | 41.89 | 46.77 | 44.12 | 1.46 |
| **E-repairs** | 2 | 7 | 4.08 | 1.42 |
| **A-repairs** | 4 | 9 | 6.52 | 1.55 |
| **D-repairs** | 2 | 9 | 6.28 | 1.80 |
| **WTC** | 54 | 133 | 90.72 | 25.17 |

**Table 2**. *Correlation coefficients among the variables*

| | Complexity | Accuracy | Fluency | E-repairs | A-repairs | D-repairs | WTC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **WTC** | **-.348*** | **-.439**** | **.508**** | **-.293*** | **.312*** | **.404**** | **1** |
| **Complexity** | 1 | .134 | .029 | .188 | -.100 | -.149 | **-.348*** |
| **Accuracy** | .134 | 1 | -.298* | .215 | -.211 | -.267 | **-.439**** |
| **Fluency** | .029 | -.298* | 1 | -.154 | .242 | .344* | **.508**** |
| **E-repairs** | .188 | .215 | -.154 | 1 | -.341* | -.421** | **-.293*** |
| **A-repairs** | -.100 | .211 | .242 | -.341* | 1 | .557** | **-.293*** |
| **D-repairs** | -.149 | -.267 | .344* | -.421** | .557** | 1 | **.404**** |

*Correlation is significant at the.05 level (2-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the.01 level (2-tailed).

The first research question addressed the relationship between EFL learners' ratings of WTC and the complexity, accuracy, and fluency measures of their task-based speech. As the results shown in Table 2 reveal, WTC significantly correlates with all aspects of L2 oral performance. Regarding the measure of complexity, the statistical analysis pointed to a negative association between WTC and this dimension of performance at .05 level of significance ($p$< .05 and r = -.348). Likewise, Pearson correlation coefficient results suggested a negative relationship between participants' ratings of their WTC and the accuracy of their speech at .01 level of significance ($p$ <.01 and r = -.439) (see Table 2). Regarding the measure of fluency, the results reported in Table 2 indicated that participants' ratings of WTC positively correlated with the fluency of their L2 speech. The correlation coefficient was found to be statistically significant ($p$< .01 and r = .508). Thus, there is a positive relationship between WTC and EFL learners' speaking fluency. Overall, in response to the first research question, the outcomes depicted that whereas WTC is negatively related to the complexity and accuracy of task-based speech, the association between WTC and fluency of L2 oral production is positive.

The second research question was posed to explore the possible association between EFL learners' ratings of their WTC and the frequency and type of error-corrections performing a task would prompt them to make. The results displayed in Table 2 show a significant linkage between WTC and self-monitoring behavior. Considering the first type of self-correction, i.e., E-repairs, the matrix of correlations shows a reverse connection between learners' WTC and the frequency of error corrections ($p$< .05 and r = -.293). In other words, the more willing participants are to communicate in English, the less likely they are to correct their speech for errors. Findings regarding the frequency of appropriacy repairs, however, showed a different picture. Here, the statistical analyses confirmed the existence of a significant positive relationship between WTC and repairing L2 speech for appropriacy ($p$< .05 and r = .312). Thus, WTC is positively linked with monitoring speech in terms of appropriacy. A similar result was obtained as to the connection between being willing to communicate in an L2 and correcting speech to convey different information. Precisely, the results set out in Table 2 showed that there is a statistically significant positive association between WTC and the number of D-repairs EFL learners make ($p$< .01 and r = .404). Therefore, in response to the second research question, the correlational analysis indicated that WTC is negatively related to E-repairs. On the contrary, the links between WTC and A- and D-repairs were positive.

**Discussion**

This research study sought to explore the relationship between the individual variable of WTC and EFL learners' task-based speech production and monitoring. The findings suggested that there exist significant relationships among these variables. In this section, an attempt will be made to provide a plausible account of the outcomes by drawing upon relevant theories.

As was observed, whereas a significant positive correlation existed between participants' WTC and their speech fluency, the associations with complexity and accuracy were negative. So, it seems that the more willing to communicate language

learners consider themselves to be, the higher their fluency of L2 speech is. Nevertheless, high rating of WTC manifests itself in decreased levels of complexity and accuracy. In effect, learners who are more willing to communicate are more likely to focus their attention on meaning aspects of their speech than monitoring their output in terms of form. Consequently, their task-based speech is more fluent but less accurate and less complex. The finding regarding fluency gives support to the conviction that "being willing to communicate is part of becoming fluent in a second language" (MacIntyre and Doucette 2010, 1). From a theoretical point of view, this observation could be attributed to the fact that the meaning-based context of language use which performing a task establishes may predispose learners who are focused on message conveyance to direct their limited attention to fluency at the expense of complexity and accuracy. Indeed, the 'trade-off' effect (Skehan, 1998) seems to result in enhanced fluency and decreased complexity and accuracy. Alternatively, the outcomes can be accounted for with reference to Skehan's (1998) dual- mode system hypothesis based on which L2 learners' interlanguage consists of an exemplar-based system and a rule-based system. The former, he posits, consists of ready-made chunks of language needing less processing time and effort to access and the latter comprises explicit linguistic knowledge accessible through long-term memory. Based on this hypothesis, it may be reasoned that learners who have a strong desire to communicate in an L2 are primarily concerned with employing their exemplar-based, less demanding L2 knowledge the result of which is enhanced fluency. In fact, they seem to be less likely to draw on the generative rules of language which enable them to use the most advanced level of their knowledge and produce more accurate and complex speech. To summarize, the positive correlation between WTC and fluency seems to be due to the combined effects of meaning-based language use context performing the task creates as well as participants' tendency to get their message across by falling back on their easily accessible exemplar-based L2 knowledge. This optimum focus-on-meaning context leads to negative effects on formal aspects of language use, i.e., accuracy and complexity of speech.

The results concerning the relationship between WTC and the frequency and type of error corrections showed a positive correlation with A- and D-repairs and a negative correlation with E-repairs. These outcomes can be explained with reference to Levelt's (1989) perceptual loop theory of monitoring. It may be that L2 learners who are highly willing to communicate in L2 concentrate much of their attention on monitoring their pre-verbal message conceptually through conceptual loop and, owing to their limited attentional resources, fail to simultaneously monitor their speech by detecting encoding errors through pre-articulatory and external loops. Therefore, we may argue that having a strong desire to communicate in L2, coupled with the meaning-based context of performing a task, induces learners to monitor their pre-verbal message in terms of pragmatic appropriateness and adequate organization of information and, as a result, effectuate more D- and A-repairs, but fewer E-repairs. This account accords with Ahmadian et al.'s (2012) hypothesis whereby limitation in attention has consequences which are manifest in not only performance dimensions of complexity, accuracy, and fluency, but also the

conceptual, pre-articulatory, and external loops of monitoring as the underlying processes generating speech. As such, the linguistic correlate of effectuating more A-, and D-, and fewer E-repairs is enhanced fluency and decreased accuracy and complexity.

Overall, the findings of the present investigation delineated that the individual variable of WTC is significantly interrelated to and predicts the linguistic aspects as well as the underlying mechanisms generating L2 speech. The results also provide psycholinguistic evidence adding further support to the validity of WTC as a predictor of linguistic quality of L2 speech.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of the present study was to explore the relationship between individual variables and L2 oral production and monitoring. To this aim, the researcher examined the association between L2 learners' WTC, their self-repair behavior, as well as the complexity, accuracy, and fluency of their speech elicited through a narrative task. The results showed significant interrelations among their ratings of WTC, frequency and types of errors they make, and the CAF of their speech. The most noteworthy implication of the outcomes of the present research is growing awareness of the role of individual variables in promoting L2 development suggesting that language teachers should foreground this factor when individualizing their teaching practice by setting up optimum conditions for raising their pupil's perceived level of WTC which, in turn, is likely to enhance the fluency of their speech. In addition, students' perception of WTC is assumed to be linked with linguistic quality of their L2 oral discourse. As such, an awareness of the centrality of WTC in an L2 is essential because it enables language instructors to teach more effectively through providing learners with ample communication opportunities which encourage their actual engagement in communication behaviors. This practice is likely to promote different dimensions of L2 oral production. Therefore, as a key contributing factor in the process of language learning, WTC should be given due attention and investigated with rigor to develop L2 speech. The findings are also of theoretical significance for task-based language teaching indicating that when using tasks as a pedagogical or research tool, L2 educators and researchers need to take into account not only task design and implementation factors, but also such individual variables as WTC and speaking style. This will hopefully help them move towards developing a framework featuring a more comprehensive list of cognitive/affective factors associated with the CAF of L2 speech.

To conclude, future studies are definitely needed to throw more light on the possible interaction between WTC and other L2 skills, e.g., writing. Another line of work could be exploring the relation between learning context, e.g., cultural values, and WTC. Indeed, as individuals from different cultures value themselves and their capabilities differently, conducting research to find the link between WTC and CAF in different cultures would be a worthwhile undertaking.

## References


Ahmadian, M. J. (2012).The relationship between working memory capacity and L2 oral performance under task-based careful online planning condition. *TESOL Quarterly,* 46, pp.164-175.

Ahmadian, M. J., Abdolrezapour, P. and Ketabi, S. (2012). Task difficulty and self-repair behavior in second language oral production. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, pp. 310-330.

Bygate, M. (2001). 'Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language' in M. Bygate, P. Skehan, and M. Swain (eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing,* Harlow, UK: Longman, pp.23-48.

Cao, Y. (2011). Investigating situational willingness to communicate within second language classrooms from an ecological perspective. *System,* 39, pp. 468-79.

Clément, R., Baker, S.C. and 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, pp.190-209.

Dornyei, Z. (2005). The *psychology of the language learner, individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A. and Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: A-unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, 21, pp. 354-375.

Gass, S. (2003). 'Input and interaction', in C. Doughty, and C, Long (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition,* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, pp.224-55.

Gilabert, R. (2007). Effects of manipulating task complexity on self-repairs during L2 oral production, *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45, pp. 215-240.

Kang, S. J. (2005). Dynamic emergence of situational willingness to communicate in a second language. *System*, 33, pp. 277-92.

Kormos, J. (1999). The effect of speaker variables on the self-correction behavior of L2 learners. *System,* 27, pp. 207-221.

Levelt, W. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

MacIntyre, P., Babin, P. and Clément, R. (1999). Willingness to communicate: antecedents and consequences. *Communication Quarterly,* 47, pp. 215-233.

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

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

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z. and Noels, K.A. (1998). Conceptualising willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal,* 82, pp. 545-562.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Doucette, J. (2010). Willingness to communicate and action control. *System,* 38, pp. 161-71.

McCroskey, J.C. and Baer, J. (1985). *Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement*. In: *the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association*, Denver, CO, USA.

McCroskey, J. C. and Richmond, V.P. (1982). Communication apprehension and shyness: conceptual and operational distinctions. *Central States Speech Journal,* 33, pp. 458-68.

Mojavezi, A. and Ahmadian, M.J. (2014). Working memory capacity and self-repair behavior in first and second language oral production. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research,* 43, pp. 289-297.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics,* 22, pp. 27-57.

Saeedi, M. (2020). The effects of simultaneous use of task-based strategic and careful online planning on EFL learners' self-repairs. *RELP,* 8, pp. 147-166.

Shumin, K. (2003). 'Factors to consider: developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities', in J. C. Richards, and W. A. Renandya (eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, *practice* pp. 204-211.

Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual differences in second-language learning.* London: Arnold

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2016).Tasks versus conditions: Two perspectives on task research and their implications for pedagogy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 36, pp. 34-49.

Stroud, R. (2019). The effects of strategic planning and rehearsal on second language group discussion task performance, *The Language Learning Journal,* pp. 1-14.

Suzuki, S. and Kormos, J. (2019). Linguistic dimensions of comprehensibility and perceived fluency: an investigation of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language argumentative speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* pp. 1-25.

Tavakoli, P. (2009). Assessing L2 task performance: Understanding effects of task design. *System,* 37, pp. 482-495.

Tavakoli, P. and Foster, P. (2008). Task design and second language performance: The effect of narrative type on learner output. *Language Learning,* 61, pp. 37-72.

Yuan, F. and Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and online planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics,* 24, pp. 1-27.

Zarrinabadi, N. (2014). Communicating in a second language: investigating the effect of teacher on learners' willingness to communicate. *System*, 42, pp. 288-95.

Zarrinabadi, N. and Tanbakooei, N. (2016). Willingness to communicate: rise, development, and some future directions. *Language and Linguistics Compass,* 10, pp. 30-45.

**HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE**

Saeedi, M. (2021). The Association between Second Language Learners' Willingness to Communicate, Self-monitoring, and Task-based Speech. *Language Art*, 6(3):69-82, Shiraz, Iran.

**DOI:** 10.22046/LA.2021.17

**URL:** https://www.languageart.ir/index.php/LA/article/view/248

Language Art, 6(3): pp. 69-82, 2021, Shiraz, Iran
DOI: 10.22046/LA.2021.17 DOR:
فصلنامه هنر زبان، دوره ۶، شماره ۳، سال ۲۰۲۱، از صفحه ۶۹ تا ۸۲

# بررسی رابطهٔ بین تمایل به برقراری ارتباط، اصلاح خطاها و کیفیت کلام تکلیف‌محور زبان‌آموزان ایرانی

**دکتر مسعود سعیدی** [1]

استادیار آموزش زبان انگلیسی، گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران.

(تاریخ دریافت: ۱۱ اسفند ۱۳۹۹؛ تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۰ تیر ۱۴۰۰؛ تاریخ انتشار: ۱۰ شهریور ۱۴۰۰)

این مطالعه به بررسی رابطهٔ بین میزان تمایل زبان‌آموزان ایرانی، گفتار تکلیف محور آنها و نحوه اصلاح خطاها توسط ایشان می‌پردازد. بدین منظور، از یک پرسشنامه، مصاحبه شفاهی و معیارهای کمی پیچیدگی، دقت و روانی برای پاسخ به دو سوال استفاده شد: الف) چه ارتباطی بین میزان تمایل زبان‌آموزان به برقراری ارتباط و تعداد و نوع اصلاح خطا توسط آنها وجود دارد؟ ب) چه ارتباطی بین میزان تمایل زبان‌آموزان به برقراری ارتباط و کیفیت کلام آنها به لحاظ پیچیدگی، دقت و روانی وجود دارد؟ پنجاه نفر از زبان‌آموزان سطح متوسط زبان انگلیسی در این مطالعه شرکت کردند به منظور تعیین میزان تمایل شرکت‌کنندگان به برقراری ارتباط به زبان انگلیسی از پرسشنامه مربوطه استفاده شد. علاوه بر این، برای جمع‌آوری نمونه‌هایی از کلام شرکت‌کنندگان، از آنها خواسته شد تا تکلیفی شامل روایت یک داستان تصویری را انجام دهند. بلافاصله پس از انجام تکلیف، شرکت‌کنندگان مورد مصاحبه قرار گرفته و از آنها خواسته شد در مورد نوع خطایی که هنگام انجام تکلیف متوجه شده و اصلاح نموده بودند صحبت کنند. نتایج نشان داد که رابطه مثبتی بین میزان تمایل به برقراری ارتباط و روانی و پیچیدگی و همچنین اصلاح خطاهای مرتبط با محتوای کلام وجود دارد. نتایج همچنین بیانگر وجود رابطه منفی بین میزان تمایل به برقراری ارتباط و دقت و اصلاح خطاهای مرتبط با ساختار کلام بودند. در پایان، پیامدهای نظری و عملی نتایج حاصل برای امر آموزش زبان دوم مورد بحث قرار گرفت.

***واژه‌های کلیدی***: تکلیف، تمایل به ارتباط، دقت، پیچیدگی، روانی کلام.

[1] E-mail: saeedi.tefl@gmail.com